ANNUAL REPORT OF
ON THE USE OF CERF GRANTS IN LIBYA 2011

COUNTRY	LIBYA
RESIDENT/HUMANITARIAN COORDINATOR	**Georg Charpentier**

I. SUMMARY OF FUNDING IN 2011 – US$

Funding	1. Total amount required for the humanitarian response		464,213,551
	2. Breakdown of total response funding received by source	2.1 CERF	1,444,890
		2.2 COMMON HUMANITARIAN FUND/ EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND (*if applicable*)	N/A
		2.3 OTHER (Bilateral/Multilateral)	N/A
		2.4 TOTAL	N/A
	3. Breakdown of funds received by window	☐ Underfunded	N/A
		1. First Round	N/A
		2. Second Round	N/A
		☒ Rapid Response	1,444,890
	4. Please provide the breakdown of CERF funds by type of partner	4.1 Direct UN agencies/IOM implementation	1,444,890
		4.2 Funds forwarded to NGOs for implementation	N/A
		4.3 Funds forwarded to government partners	N/A
		4.4 TOTAL	1,444,890

II. SUMMARY OF BENEFICIARIES PER EMERGENCY

Please see comment under Geographical Arease of implementation – the Humanitarian Community benefited from this allocation.

Total number of individuals affected by the crisis	Individuals	
Total number of individuals reached with CERF funding	Female	
	Male	
	Total individuals (Female and male)	
	Of total, children under 5	

III. GEOGRAPHICAL AREAS OF IMPLEMENTATION

ETC and WFP had its main offices in Tripoli and Benghazi, but WFP had supporting offices in Cairo (Egypt) as well as Zarzis (Tunisia).

The flight service provided by UNHAS for humanitarian travel into and within Libya required international flights from Malta, Tunisia, and Egypt as well. Within Libya, flights served Tripoli, Benghazi, and Misrata.

IV. PROCESS AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY

I) Was the CERF report discussed in the Humanitarian and/or UN Country Team and by cluster/sector coordinators?
YES ☐ NO ☐

Remarks: WFP was the only recipient agency.

II) Was the final CERF report shared for review with in-country stakeholders (i.e. the CERF recipient agencies, cluster/sector coordinators and members and relevant government counterparts)?

YES ☒ NO ☐

The report was shared with WFP as a recepient agency.

V. ANALYSIS

1. *The humanitarian context*

Civil unrest in Libya last year, which eventually resulted in the ousting of then-leader Muammar Ghaddafi, led to a humanitarian crisis in the country as well as spill over into its north African neighbors. Heavy fighting throughout the country, as well as the population displacements which followed, prevented normal functioning of basic services and required international humanitarian intervention.

However, CERF funding provided to WFP was directed to assist the humanitarian community – through supporting two Special Operations: the United Nation's Humanitarian Air Sevice (UNHAS), and Emergency Telecommunications (ETC) coordination. Both services, UNHAS and ETC, were supported by CERF funding to enhance operational capacity of humanitarian actors – such as UN agencies, NGOs, and other institutional support systems.

With no commercial airlines operating into or within Libya due to the the operation Odyssey Dawn – No Fly Zone, established in March 2011, and with lengthy road travel being a dangerous alternative due to the ongoing conflict, the Humanitarian Coordinator requested the activation of UNHAS to safely move humanitarian staff into and within Libya. WFP, as head of the Logistics Cluster, had the capacity to initiate UNHAS and ensure that travel support would be available for the humanitarian community, donors, diplomats, and the media.

WFP, through the Emergency Telecommunications Cluster (ETC) Special Operation, aimed to ensure effective and efficient humanitarian responses to affected populations by coordinating the emergency telecommunications needs of humanitarian actors. Objectives of the Special Operation included: to support, augment and coordinate the telecommunications capacity of the humanitarian community to respond and operate in Libya, during and after the conflict; to provide cost-effective common inter-agency security and data communications networks and services. Through the same Special Operation, WFP also provided logistical support to the humanitarian community – however, CERF funds were only used for the ETC portion.

This support remained vital for humanitarian actors to continue their respective activities.

2. *Provide brief overview of CERF's role in the country*

CERF funding was only provided to these two WFP Special Operations in Libya. The funding was in-line with overall humanitarian priorities and appeals; a Flash Appeal was revised in May when the evolving situation meant that there was an increasing need for humanitarian assistance inside Libya, particularly in areas where people were trapped by the conflict, as well as for internally displaced people (IDPs).

3. *What was accomplished with CERF funding*

With CERF funding UNHAS was able to be the sole provider of regular air service into and out of Libya during most of the conflict. Between 1 May and through 30 October, UNHAS transported free of charge over 4,785 humanitarian actors from 153 agencies and performed 100 flights, serving the destinations: Malta, Cairo, Benghazi, Tripoli, Misrata, Djerba, and Kufra. In response to the expressed needs by the humanitarian community and activities for continued service into and within Libya, and despite financial difficulties, UNHAS implemented a cost recovery mechanism for the month of November. More than 500 passengers flew during this period. As part of its mandate, UNHAS also facilitated several charter flights for specific missions of the UN system (e.g. Special Envoy of the SG, ERC-Head of OCHA etc.).

UNHAS operated in the region to facilitate movement of humanitarian workers and relief cargo whilst the situation in Libya was considered unstable and complex. When commercial air operators met the safety standards and requirements of the humanitarian community, WFP with an appropriate course of action and taking into consideration the participating user groups, ended UNHAS activities.

Also with CERF funding, WFP ensured availability of inter-agency telecommmunications infrastructure and services covering both data and operational voice communications. The ETC set up a very small aperture terminal (VSAT) and two security communications very high frequency (VHF) radio repeaters in Benghazi, and in Tripoli established two VHF radio repeaters, a VSAT and a high-speed link to a local internet service provider (ISP). As part of the emergency telecommunications plan, two radio rooms were established in Tripoli and Benghazi, following the Minimum Operating Security Standard (MOSS) requirements for United Nations presence and activities. All services were provided to the wider United Nations and NGO community in Libya.

ETC established procedures and protocols for the importation of telecommunications equipment and frequency licenses. ETC continues to provide support to UN and NGO agencies for voice and data connectivity in Benghazi and secure telecommunications in Tripoli.

Humanitarian need has evolved greatly since the crisis of last year. Fighting subsided in September 2011, and the humanitarian community has phased out most large scale relief activities by the end of December 2011. While there are still persisting needs in pockets of Libya, the CERF funding provided last year served the humanitarian community at a time while it was in greatest need.

4. *An analysis of the added value of CERF to the humanitarian response*

a) Did CERF funds lead to a fast delivery of assistance to beneficiaries? If so how?
YES ☒ NO ☐

Indirectly CERF funding led to faster delivery of assistance to beneficiaries. Cooperation and coordination between humanitarian partners, on account of both UNHAS and ETC, led to a more effective response. For example, UNHAS was able to bring humanitarian actors on location to areas in need when no other options of safe transportation were available; on-the-ground presences allowed for quicker comprehension of needs and faster responses.

b) Did CERF funds help respond to time critical needs?
YES ☒ NO ☐

WFP and ETC operations ensured sufficient communication capabilities between humanitarian players, as well as for their own operations. WFP, through the assistance of CERF funding, established emergency telecommunications services at a time when such services were unavailable in Libya. Also, at the time WFP submitted its proposal for CERF funds, the entire ETC operation had been resourced solely at the expense of a WFP internal advanced funding mechanism. CERF funding was one of the earliest contributions to the ETC operation, and helped ensure that the emergency communication needs could continue to be met in Libya.

Additionally, the CERF contribution to UNHAS was especially well received at a critical period. The UNHAS operation was severely underfunded; despite its need and that most flights flew at full passenger capacity, the operation received minimal financial support. Without the generous CERF contribution, it is very likely that the cost recovery mechanism implemented in November would have had to be initiated earlier. CERF contributed to the ability of UNHAS to provide its service free of charge from 1 May through 30 October.

c) Did CERF funds result in other funds being mobilized?
YES ☐ NO ☒

d) Did CERF improve coordination amongst the humanitarian community?
YES ☒ NO ☐

CERF funding directly supported the improvement of coordination among the humanitarian community. ETC cluster meetings provided a forum for NGOs and other UN agencies to benefit from ETC communications support as well as reduce duplication, allowing for a more focused and faster response.

VI. LESSONS LEARNED

LESSONS LEARNED	SUGGESTION FOR FOLLOW-UP/IMPROVEMENT	RESPONSIBLE ENTITY

ANNEX I. INDIVIDUAL PROJECT RESULTS BY AGENCY

WFP - UNHAS SPECIAL OPERATION

CERF PROJECT NUMBER	11-WFP-027	Total Project Budget	$ 12,676,970
PROJECT TITLE	Air Passenger Service in response to the crisis in Libya	Total Funding Received for Project	$ 7,295,478
STATUS OF CERF GRANT	Completed in 2011	Amount disbursed from CERF	$ 1,000,000

BENEFICIARIES	Targeted	Reached
Individuals		
Female		
Male		
Total individuals (Female and male)		
Of total, children under 5		
TOTAL	500 passengers per month	882 passengers transported per month

Note: Humanitarian community/passengers

Gender Equity

Humanitarian community/passengers

OBJECTIVES AS STATED IN FINAL CERF PROPOSAL	ACTUAL OUTCOMES	MONITORING AND EVALUATION MECHANISMS
Ensure the humanitarian community has access to the affected population, through the provision of safe, efficient and cost-effective inter-agency air transport service to United Nations agencies, Non-Governmental organizations (NGOs) and donor organizations. Ensure access to urgently needed light relief items and cargo, such as medical supplies, high energy foods and Information and Communication Technology (ICT) equipment, through the provision of light air cargo services. Ensure humanitarian personnel deployed in the areas of operation, can be evacuated in a safe and timely in case a security or medical emergency.	Outcome statistics ▪ On average, 882 passengers were transported per month. ▪ By the project's completion, 153 agencies and organizations had used the air service. ▪ Total number of passengers transported: 5,293. Of this total, 37 per cent belonged to NGOs, 28 per cent were government officials, 20 per cent belonged to UN agencies, 8 per cent were press, and 7 per cent were donors. Light air cargo services ▪ Some 18 metric tons of light cargo were transported on UNHAS flights, including cold chain deliveries. Medical/Security Evacuations ▪ 100 per cent of requests for medical and security evacuations were met.	882 passengers were transported per month

WFP - LOGISTICS AND EMERGENCY TELECOMMUNICATIONS SPECIAL OPERATION

CERF PROJECT NUMBER	11-WFP-028	Total Project Budget	$ 12,794,405

BENEFICIARIES	Targeted	Reached
Individuals		
Female		
Male		
Total individuals (Female and male)		
Of total, children under 5		
TOTAL		

Gender Equity

Humanitarian community

PROJECT TITLE	Logistics and Emergency Telecommunications Augmentation and Coordination in Response to the crisis in Libya	Total Funding Received for Project	$ 5,302,147
STATUS OF CERF GRANT	Ongoing	Amount disbursed from CERF	$ 444,890

Note: Humanitarian community/passengers

OBJECTIVES AS STATED IN FINAL CERF PROPOSAL	ACTUAL OUTCOMES	Monitoring and Evaluation Mechanisms
To provide effective and reliable common security, data and voice communications networks and services	• In response to the emergency the ETC component ensured surge capacity and immediately mobilized support equipment, establishing a reliable working environment which included IT and emergency telecommunications services to support the operational activities of the humanitarian community.	
To coordinate the provision of common ICT services to the humanitarian community.	• Operational activities of multiple agencies were strengthened by a comprehensive ICT infrastructure which ensured that appropriate and sufficient emergency telecommunication capacity was in place to support humanitarian operations, as well as fully functioning data communications capacity to facilitate timely reporting and information exchange for decision making requirements. • 20 UN agencies and NGOs relied on ETC for access to a security telecommunications network. • Additionally, 115 individuals with UN agencies and NGOs were trained through the ETC.	

ANNEX 2. CERF FUNDS DISBURSED TO IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS – NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL NGOS AND GOVERNMENT PARTNERS

CERF PROJECT CODE	CLUSTER/ SECTOR	AGENCY	IMPLEMENTING PARTNER NAME	PARTNER TYPE[1]	TOTAL CERF FUNDS TRANSFERRED TO PARTNER[2] US$	DATE FIRST INSTALLMENT TRANSFERRED[3]	START DATE OF CERF FUNDED ACTIVITIES BY PARTNER[4]	Comments/ Remarks
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

[1] E.g. INGO (International NGO), NNGO (National NGO) or Gov. (government partner)
[2] Please indicate the total amount subcontracted to the partner under this CERF grant.
[3] If the CERF sub-grant is paid to the partner in several instalments, please indicate the date for the first instalments here.
[4] Please indicate the estimated start date for the sub-contracted partner activities under the CERF project. If the start date for activities predates the disbursement of CERF sub-grant funding, please use the 'Comments/Remarks' field to elaborate and explain the modality for this.

ANNEX 3: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS (Alphabetical)

ETC	Emergency Telecommunications Cluster
ISP	internet service provider
MOSS	Minimum Operating Security Standard
UNHAS	United Nations Humanitarian Air Service
VSAT	Very small aperture terminal