



United Nations

**CENTRAL
EMERGENCY
RESPONSE FUND**



A SOUND HUMANITARIAN INVESTMENT

**RESIDENT / HUMANITARIAN COORDINATOR
REPORT ON THE USE OF CERF FUNDS
KENYA
RAPID RESPONSE
LOCUST**

RESIDENT/HUMANITARIAN COORDINATOR

Mr. Marcel Rudasingwa

REPORTING PROCESS AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY

- a. Please indicate when the After Action Review (AAR) was conducted and who participated.

The AAR was conducted as part of a County Steering Group (CSG) meeting in Turkana. The 15 January 2014 meeting discussed the response to the locust invasion. Members of the CSG are: county government departments relevant to food security, representatives of national government line ministries, World Food Programme (WFP), Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and NGOs (including two WFP's partners - World Vision and Oxfam GB). Apart from the January 15th 2014 meeting that was held in Lodwar, no other meeting was held regarding this grant.

- b. Please confirm that the Resident Coordinator and/or Humanitarian Coordinator (RC/HC) Report was discussed in the Humanitarian and/or UN Country Team and by cluster/sector coordinators as outlined in the guidelines.

YES NO

The report was not discussed in the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) due to the late submission of reports. However progress on CERF funded projects was regularly shared and discussed within sectors.

- c. Was the final version of the RC/HC Report shared for review with in-country stakeholders as recommended in the guidelines (i.e. the CERF recipient agencies and their implementing partners, cluster/sector coordinators and members and relevant government counterparts)?

YES NO

The report was shared with HCT, sectors and inter-sector members. Comments and suggestions were incorporated in the final version of the report. The consolidated report was also shared with Kenya Humanitarian Partnership Team (KHPT).

I. HUMANITARIAN CONTEXT

TABLE 1: EMERGENCY ALLOCATION OVERVIEW (US\$)		
Total amount required for the humanitarian response: 11,060,703		
Breakdown of total response funding received by source	Source	Amount
	CERF	1,503,314
	COMMON HUMANITARIAN FUND/ EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND (if applicable)	0
	OTHER (bilateral/multilateral)	0
	TOTAL	1,506,314

TABLE 2: CERF EMERGENCY FUNDING BY ALLOCATION AND PROJECT (US\$)			
Allocation 1 – date of official submission: 22-Oct-13			
Agency	Project code	Cluster/Sector	Amount
FAO	13-RR-FAO-041	Agriculture	519,947
WFP	13-RR-WFP-072	Food	986,367
TOTAL			1,506,314

TABLE 3: BREAKDOWN OF CERF FUNDS BY TYPE OF IMPLEMENTATION MODALITY (US\$)	
Type of implementation modality	Amount
Direct UN agencies/IOM implementation	1,433,940
Funds forwarded to NGOs for implementation	43,114
Funds forwarded to government partners	29,260
TOTAL	1,506,314

HUMANITARIAN NEEDS

In June 2013, a locust invasion was observed in Turkana county, in north-western Kenya. Initial field observation indicated coverage of approximately 6,000 hectares. In the following months of July and August, the infestation doubled to about 12,000 hectares as a result of delay in control, with survey indicating a spread into Turkana South sub-county, Katilu division, covering approximately 1,500 additional hectares.

People living in the affected areas are mainly pastoralists and agro-pastoralists. Pastoralists rely on pastures and browse for their livestock; agro-pastoralists depend mainly on rain-fed and irrigated crops planted along seasonal rivers in Turkana. The locusts destroyed crops, pasture and browse, resulting in loss in body condition of livestock, and in some cases death of the emaciated animals, leading to loss of survival income for the affected households. Socio-economic consequences include out-migration of the pastoralists in search of pasture and browse for their livestock and food. This locust infestation happened when people in Turkana had just begun recovering from successive years of drought. The effect of the locust invasion was assessed during the Long Rains 2013 Food Security

Assessment that took place in August 2013. The assessment recommended that up to 102,400 people in Turkana County be provided food assistance due to locust invasion and drought, through general food distributions (44,400 people) and food-for-assets activities (58,000 people). The nutritional situation in children less than 5 years of age remained also critical.

There was a lapse of two months between the reporting of the invasion in June and the start of control operations by the Crop Protection in early September. This was due to several factors. The invasion was not considered to have reached peak levels. Furthermore, the Government of Kenya had a limited stock of pesticides for locust control and was undertaking control operations in other parts of the country. With the ongoing transition to devolution of national functions to county level, and the start of the financial year on 1 July 2013, there may have been a lack of coordination and adequate funds.

Both the Government of Kenya and the County Government of Turkana spent over US\$120,000 in the initial stages. These funds have been used to purchase pesticides for spraying and logistics. Other organizations working in the area such as Oxfam and VSF Belgium had been contacted to provide assistance to support the control of the locust invasion. However, the type, nature and time of support from these organizations were still not clear leaving a big gap in funding. As the response was inadequate, the locusts continued to spread to other locations in the region. As such, FAO and WFP requested funding through the CERF Rapid Response Window to assist in preventing the spread and mitigate the negative impacts already caused by the invasion.

II. FOCUS AREAS AND PRIORITIZATION

The locust invasion negatively affected the lives and livelihoods of pastoralist and agro-pastoralist households living in the four affected areas that are sub-counties of Turkana County namely: Turkana North, Turkana Central, Turkana South and Loima. As a result, they required urgent food and nutrition support as well as interventions to protect their livelihoods and assets.

Identified priorities were:

- to distribute relief food for one month of December to the affected communities to cover the food gaps and protect vulnerable communities from malnutrition
- to control the spread through spraying to reduce the negative impacts on the pastoral/agro-pastoral livelihoods common in the region as the major impact has been on pastures and browse
- to prepare adequately to control new locusts invasions from laid eggs that will be triggered to hatch by the onset of short rains at mid/end October
- to distribute pasture seed and drought-tolerant crop seed to pastoralists and agro-pastoralists communities whose pastures and crops had been devastated by locusts, for planting during the upcoming rainy season to protect and rebuild livelihood assets
- to provide feed for the breeding and lactating animals for the purposes of provision of milk for children in the affected areas
- to conduct an assessment on the spread of the locusts and the damage

Based on these priorities, FAO and partners:

- Conducted surveillance on locust invasion in Turkana County to determine the spread and damage.
- Undertook aerial and terrestrial spraying to prevent further damage and spread of the locusts.
- Procured and distributed pasture seeds and seeds of drought-tolerant crops such as sorghum, millet, maize, cowpea, and green grams) to the affected men, women and youth.
- Made available hay for the breeding and lactating animals so as to ensure availability of milk for children in the affected areas.
- Conducted sensitization and awareness and control management trainings for farmers and extension officers in the affected areas.

WFP and partners:

- Procured food commodities and transported them Turkana County.
- Conducted a one-month distribution of food commodities in December 2013, using structures that are already in place.
- Monitored, evaluated and reported on the food security and nutrition situation.

III. CERF PROCESS

Based on the reports from the county extension officers on the invasion of tree locusts in Turkana North sub-county, the County Government of Turkana approached UN Agencies for assistance to control the locust infestation. In addition, the Turkana County Long Rains 2013 Food Security Assessment Report indicated that despite the above-normal rains, the temporal distribution was poor, with most rains being experienced in April, an indication of potential negative impact on the already vulnerable pastoralist and agro-pastoralist communities suffering from poor rains in the previous short rains season and consecutive years of drought. Consequently, CERF was identified as an early response option to mitigate the worst effects and prevent loss of livelihoods and assets as compared to the need for more expensive response options later.

OCHA initiated the discussions on the potential for a CERF allocation through the bi-weekly inter-sector meetings using the Turkana County Field reports and field assessment reports prepared by the FAO field office based in Turkana. In addition, data from drought bulletins (including FEWSNET), the Kenya EHRP, and information from partners such as WFP in the field was also used. Each sector analysed its needs as per the relevant available information, prioritized needs and set a strategy for implementation with partners. Gender, human rights and social issues were considered based on existing information from FAO and partners.

IV. CERF RESULTS AND ADDED VALUE

TABLE 4: AFFECTED INDIVIDUALS AND REACHED DIRECT BENEFICIARIES BY SECTOR				
Total number of individuals affected by the crisis: 134,467 individuals (of which 102,400 are food insecure)				
The estimated total number of individuals directly supported through CERF funding by cluster/sector	Cluster/Sector	Female	Male	Total
	Agriculture	97,250	64,600	161,850
	Food	53,017	43,263	96,280

BENEFICIARY ESTIMATION

TABLE 5: PLANNED AND REACHED DIRECT BENEFICIARIES THROUGH CERF FUNDING		
	Planned	Estimated Reached
Female	76,067	97,250
Male	58,400	64,600
Total individuals (Female and male)	134,467	161,850
Of total, children under age 5	18,140	29,312

Food security

The CERF grant to WFP supported beneficiaries from an ongoing operation. There are already established guidelines and processes of the registering and counting beneficiaries. In this case, the planned beneficiaries were based on the recommendations of the 2013 LRA in areas affected by the locusts. The actual number of beneficiaries reached by WFP was based the monthly reports submitted to WFP by NGO partners. The partners' reports desegregate the figures by age and gender, and are based on the households that signed the registers when collecting food in December 2013.

As indicated in table 4 and table 5, the total estimated reached number exceeded the number of persons affected by the crisis. The reason for this was because there was no increase in the area sprayed however, the population increased in concentration as a result of more households moving into the sprayed area because of enhanced regeneration of browse and pasture and also to escape from the conflicts along the West Pokot and Uganda borders.

The beneficiary estimation was based on numbers obtained from Turkana County Field reports and from the FAO and WFP field offices based in Turkana. Data was also obtained from the Drought bulletins, FEWSNET and Kenya EHRP.

CERF RESULTS

Agriculture and livelihood support

The project provided both immediate and medium term assistance to targeted pastoralist and agro-pastoralist communities in Turkana. After the initial spraying, using available pesticide from the government to control the locust, browse and pasture for livestock regenerated. CERF funding supported continuity of humanitarian programme, covered gaps of on-going interventions and prevented a further spread of the locusts. All of this enabled pastoralists who had moved to Uganda to return to their traditional homes, thus avoided conflicts.

Food

Given the precarious food security and nutrition status and chronic vulnerability in Turkana, even the least severe shocks significantly affect the poorest households' ability to meet their basic food needs. The CERF therefore ensured that WFP provided food assistance at a time when no funding had been budgeted for catering a disaster such as a locust invasion. It is highly likely that the food security and nutrition situation of affected households would have worsened without the intervention in December 2013 given the prevailing situation.

CERF's ADDED VALUE

a) Did CERF funds lead to a fast delivery of assistance to beneficiaries?

YES PARTIALLY NO

The project funds were released in time and provided both immediate assistance and medium-term benefits to targeted communities. The areas sprayed allowed browse and pasture to regenerate, enabling beneficiaries to return their livestock to their traditional grazing areas. In addition, the hay delivered enabled weak and lactating livestock to recover and therefore obtain better prices. There was, however, an issue in procuring additional quantities of pesticide which led to a delay in finalising the spraying for locusts, so whilst the worst-affected areas were able to benefit immediately, the less-affected areas (which were not targeted with the initial quantities of pesticide) had to wait until before benefiting from the locust control. This said, they were still able to benefit from the provision of hay which was crucial. CERF funding supported humanitarian programme continuity, preventing breaks as well as covering gaps of ongoing interventions.

Similarly, an initial commitment and eventual receipt of CERF funds ensured that WFP was able to begin planning for response early enough in November. Because CERF supported an ongoing operation, food was available quickly for response in December.

b) Did CERF funds help respond to time critical needs¹?

YES PARTIALLY NO

Pastoralists and agro-pastoralists primarily depend on livestock for their survival in terms of direct food and sale to purchase other essential needs. Early control of the worst areas affected by the locusts ensured protection of livelihoods in the vulnerable areas by ensuring pastoralists and agro-pastoralists avoided areas with high risk of resource-based conflicts and opportunity for better livestock prices as a result of the interventions. The CERF funding was a good opportunity for the Turkana County Government to adopt approaches used to learn and enhance their capacity to scale up the interventions in the county.

The locust's invasion called for food to be supplied to the worst-affected households in December 2013. There were no available financial resources available at the time to deliver food assistance to the locust-affected people. This CERF grant allowed WFP to fill this gap during a very critical period.

¹ Time-critical response refers to necessary, rapid and time-limited actions and resources required to minimize additional loss of lives and damage to social and economic assets (e.g. emergency vaccination campaigns, locust control, etc.).

c) Did CERF funds help improve resource mobilization from other sources?

YES PARTIALLY NO

The CERF funds helped to mobilize resources from the County Government of Turkana (for extension and sensitization), the National Government of Kenya (for aircraft hire) and the Algerian Government (for the provision of pesticide). In addition, NGOs operating in the area provided resources for sensitization and mobilization of the target beneficiaries. The CERF support enabled sustainable locust control in the County. However, WFP and its partners were unable to receive additional funding to extend the much-needed food distribution into January 2014, which was also another difficult month for the locust-affected pastoralists and agro-pastoralists.

d) Did CERF improve coordination amongst the humanitarian community?

YES PARTIALLY NO

The project facilitated and strengthened effective coordination between the State Department of Plant Protection Services in the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries (MoALF), the County Government of Turkana, the National Drought Management Authority (NDMA) and National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) and NGOs. The project brought all implementing agencies in the county together. The food security sector used existing coordination structures at the national and county level. However, there were also more interactions between FAO and WFP to discuss best ways to respond to the locust invasion.

e) If applicable, please highlight other ways in which CERF has added value to the humanitarian response

Before the project, there was a huge duplication in reporting and limited response to locust control in the county. This has been streamlined and is now undertaken by a department within the County government.

V. LESSONS LEARNED

TABLE 6: OBSERVATIONS FOR THE <u>CERF SECRETARIAT</u>		
Lessons learned	Suggestion for follow-up/improvement	Responsible entity

TABLE 7: OBSERVATIONS FOR <u>COUNTRY TEAMS</u>		
Lessons learned	Suggestion for follow-up/improvement	Responsible entity
Use of CERF resources to train and sensitize target communities enhanced knowledge on reporting mechanisms on locust invasion.	Training of more pastoralists and agro-pastoralists in the risk prone areas is required.	County Government of Turkana, MoALF, NGOs
Availability, quality and registration standards of inputs for implementation of a locust control operation project need to be confirmed at the design stage of the project to avoid delay.	List of recommended pesticides for control of specific pests need to be periodically updated against internationally accepted standards	Pesticide Control Products Board (PCPB), FAO
Scale of intervention	Resource allowing, it would have been good to provide food assistance for two months i.e. December 2013 and January 2014 as initially requested. The resulting impact on food security and nutrition would have been better.	WFP/donors/ CERF secretariat
Flexibility	WFP continued to monitor the situation after the submission of funding proposal. Realizing that Turkana Central had equally been affected by early December, WFP mobilized additional resources and provided assistance to 4,845 food-insecure persons.	Receiving agencies and CERF secretariat.

VI. PROJECT RESULTS

TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS			
CERF project information			
1. Agency:	FAO	5. CERF grant period:	01.11.13 – 30.04.14
2. CERF project code:	13-RR-FAO-041	6. Status of CERF grant:	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing
3. Cluster/Sector:	Agriculture		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded
4. Project title:	Control of Locust Invasion in Turkana Kenya		
7. Funding	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 932,462	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$ 789,947 ²	▪ NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent: US\$ 00
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 519,947	▪ Government Partners: US\$ 00
Results			
8. Total number of <u>direct beneficiaries</u> planned and reached through CERF funding (provide a breakdown by sex and age).			
<i>Direct Beneficiaries</i>	<i>Planned</i>	<i>Reached</i>	<i>In case of significant discrepancy between planned and reached beneficiaries, please describe reasons:</i>
a. Female	76,067	97,250	Whilst there was no increase in the area sprayed, the population increased in concentration as a result of more households moving into the sprayed area because of enhanced regeneration of browse and pasture and also to escape from the conflicts along the West Pokot and Uganda borders.
b. Male	58,400	64,600	
c. Total individuals (female + male):	134,467	161,850	
d. Of total, children <u>under age 5</u>	18,140	29,312	
9. Original project objective from approved CERF proposal			
<p>The overall objective: was to protect the livelihoods of the most vulnerable men, women and youth affected by the locust invasion in the pastoral and agro-pastoral areas of Turkana.</p> <p>Specific objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To provide immediate and timely support to men and women pastoralists and agro-pastoralists to prevent the current and future spread of the invading locusts To provide support to affected vulnerable men, women and youth affected by locust invasion to rebuild their livelihoods 			
10. Original expected outcomes from approved CERF proposal			
<p>Outcome 1: Livelihood assets of pastoral and agro-pastoral men and women affected by locust invasion protected</p> <p>Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction in new areas affected by the Spread and damage by locust as evidenced by surveillance reports and GIS maps showing the spread Total Area covered through aerial spraying Number of crop protection and extension officers trained on pest awareness and control management Number of households provided with feeds for the breeding and lactating animals <p>Outcome 2. Vulnerable men, women and youth affected by locust invasion rebuilt their livelihoods and increase resilience.</p>			

² The estimated in kind value of additional support is broken down as follows:

Pesticide: USD 200,000

Hire of airplane: USD 70,000

Indicators:

- Number of affected households provided with pasture seeds (Planned: 5,000 HHs)
- Number of households provided with assorted drought tolerant seeds (Planned: 5,000 HHs)
- Quantity of Pasture seeds distributed (Planned: 5 MTs)
- Quantity of drought tolerant seeds distributed (Planned: 20 MTs)
- Average yields per households

Outcome 3: Networks and collaboration with relevant stakeholders in the county established to fast track prevention of the spread of locust invasion.

Indicators:

- Number of County steering group committee meetings convened for information and planning.
- Number of Stakeholders represented in meetings convened for coordination and harmonization of activities.

11. Actual outcomes achieved with CERF funds

Outcome 1: Livelihood assets of pastoral and agro-pastoral men and women affected by locust invasion protected

Indicators:

- The area sprayed was 15,000 ha compared to the initial target of 21,000 ha. As the initial spraying exercise targeted the worst affected areas, it resulted in a reduction of 75 percent of new areas affected by locusts (based on surveillance reports and GIS mapping). About 25 percent of the initial target area was not sprayed due to a delay in obtaining additional pesticide, which meant that the project ended prior to finalising the spraying exercise. At the time of reporting the last areas are being sprayed using funds from a different source.
- A total of 16 crop protection and extension officers were trained on pest awareness and control management.
- 500 households were provided with hay for the breeding and lactating animals

Outcome 2: Vulnerable men, women and youth affected by locust invasion rebuilt their livelihoods and increase resilience.

Indicators:

- Number of affected households provided with pasture seeds
- Number of households provided with assorted drought tolerant seeds
- Quantity of Pasture seeds distributed
- Quantity of drought tolerant seeds distributed
- Average yields per households

Following the initial spraying exercise in December there was significant regeneration of pasture, which mitigated the need to provide seed to these areas. Initial fears were that pasture would not re-generate after the locust infestation. This however proved unfounded and as, in delicate dry land environments, it would be counterproductive to distribute commercially available grass seed (which could out compete local varieties but is less hardy) a decision was made not to distribute the seed. The money saved here, **USD 120,421**, will be returned to the donor.

Outcome 3: Networks and collaboration with relevant stakeholders in the county established to fast track prevention of the spread of locust invasion.

Indicators:

- 3 County steering group (CSG) committee meetings convened for information and planning.
- 12 Stakeholders represented in meetings convened for coordination and harmonization of activities.

12. In case of significant discrepancy between planned and actual outcomes, please describe reasons:

The reasons for the discrepancy in not achieving all the outcomes were:

Delay in getting approval to import pesticides into the country. Note that whilst this delay lead to a reduction in the number of hectares sprayed during the lifetime of the project, the full target area will be reached by the end of July.

<p>The spraying operation had not been concluded as on 30 April, 2014. This was occasioned by delay in arrival of the pesticide that was to be used for spraying to control the locust in Turkana. The pesticide was sourced from Algeria. On realizing there would be a delay in importation of the pesticide from Algeria, FAO requested for a NCE to enable the project to complete the operations but this was declined. When the pesticide arrived in May, 2014, FAO used other funds to complete the spraying operation.</p>	
<p>13. Are the CERF funded activities part of a CAP project that applied an IASC Gender Marker code?</p>	<p>YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>If 'YES', what is the code (0, 1, 2a or 2b): If 'NO' (or if GM score is 1 or 0):</p> <p>The project ensured gender equality was mainstreamed into the project design and implementation by involving men, women and youth at all levels.</p>	
<p>14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?</p>	<p>EVALUATION CARRIED OUT <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Evaluation was conducted internally using the M&E staff in the field.</p>	<p>EVALUATION PENDING <input type="checkbox"/></p>
	<p>NO EVALUATION PLANNED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>

TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS

CERF project information				
1. Agency:	WFP	5. CERF grant period:	01.11.2013 – 30.04.2014	
2. CERF project code:	13-RR-WFP-072	6. Status of CERF grant:	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing	
3. Cluster/Sector:	Food		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded	
4. Project title:	Food assistance to the Locust affected Communities in Turkana			
7. Funding	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 10,128,241	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:	
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$ 9,141,874		▪ NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent: US\$ 43,114
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 986,367		▪ Government Partners: US\$ 29,260
Results				
8. Total number of <u>direct beneficiaries</u> planned and reached through CERF funding (provide a breakdown by sex and age).				
<i>Direct Beneficiaries</i>	<i>Planned</i>	<i>Reached</i>	<i>In case of significant discrepancy between planned and reached beneficiaries, please describe reasons:</i>	
a. Female	54,432	53,017	The number of children under 5 reached was significantly higher than planned because of under-estimation of the age group at the time of planning.	
b. Male	42,768	43,263		
c. Total individuals (female + male):	97,200	96,280		
d. Of total, children <u>under</u> age 5	13,112	28,526		
9. Original project objective from approved CERF proposal				
The main objective of this project was to provide food and nutritional security support to the 97,200 people affected by locust invasion in Turkana South and Turkana North.				
10. Original expected outcomes from approved CERF proposal				
The Expected Outcomes for this CERF Project is to ensure acceptable consumption during the month of December 2013 for the 97,200 targeted food insecure people in Turkana South and Turkana North.				
Outcome Indicators:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50 per cent of households have an acceptable food consumption score. • Household expenditure devoted to food is equal or less than 65 per cent. 				
11. Actual outcomes achieved with CERF funds				
<p>WFP reached 96,280 people in December, a 99 per cent achievement. The WFP Food Security and Outcome Monitoring (FSOM) report for December 2013 reported that 42 per cent of the beneficiary households had an acceptable food consumption score. While this was below the target of 50 percent, it was an improvement compared to 38 percent in September 2013 and 20 percent in December 2012. The food consumption score measures the number of food groups consumed, and how often. The results showed that majority of the poorest households in Turkana have a poor dietary diversity.</p> <p>The FSOM also reported that a majority of households (83 per cent) devoted 65 percent or more of their expenditure on food.</p>				

12. In case of significant discrepancy between planned and actual outcomes, please describe reasons:	
According to the Turkana County Long Rains 2013 Food Security Assessment Report, in addition to locust infestation in Turkana the county had poor rainfall performance in the successive seasons, escalation of conflicts over livestock resources, high food prices and reduced livestock productivity. This explains why food security indicators were not positive, particularly given the chronic vulnerability and high poverty of the county.	
13. Are the CERF funded activities part of a CAP project that applied an IASC Gender Marker code?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
If 'YES', what is the code (0, 1, 2a or 2b): 2a If 'NO' (or if GM score is 1 or 0):	
14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?	EVALUATION CARRIED OUT <input type="checkbox"/>
While no specific evaluation of the CERF grant is planned, the entire project - that covers 17 counties - will be evaluated (mid-term review) in mid-2014. The results will be available later in the year.	EVALUATION PENDING <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	NO EVALUATION PLANNED <input type="checkbox"/>

ANNEX 1: CERF FUNDS DISBURSED TO IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS

CERF Project Code	Cluster/Sector	Agency	Implementing Partner Name	Sub-grant made under pre-existing partnership agreement	Partner Type	Total CERF Funds Transferred to Partner US\$	Date First Installment Transferred	Start Date of CERF Funded Activities By Partner	Comments/Remarks
13-RR-WFP-072	Food Assistance	WFP	Child Fund	Yes	INGO	\$10,490	11-Dec-13	11-Dec-13	These dates denote the day the food distribution started.
13-RR-WFP-072	Food Assistance	WFP	Turkana Rehabilitation Programme	Yes	GOV	\$29,260	10-Dec-13	10-Dec-13	
13-RR-WFP-072	Food Assistance	WFP	Oxfam GB	Yes	INGO	\$29,016	17-Dec-13	17-Dec-13	
13-RR-WFP-072	Food Assistance	WFP	World Vision International	Yes	INGO	\$3,608	11-Dec-13	11-Dec-13	

ANNEX 2: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS (Alphabetical)

AAR	After Action Review
CAP	Consolidated Appeals Proecss
CERF	Central Emergency Response Fund
CSG	County Steering Group
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organisation
FEWSNET	Famine Early Warning Systems Network
FSOM	Food Security and Outcome Monitoring
HA	Hectares
HH	Household
HCT	Humanitarian Country Team
IASC	Inter Agency Standing Committee
KEHRP	Kenya Emergency Humanitarian Response Plan
KHPT	Kenya Humanitarian Partnership Team
LRA	Long Rains Assessment
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MoALF	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries
MT	Metric Tons
NDMA	National Drought Management Authority
NEMA	National Environment Management Agency
NGO	Non-governmental organization
PCPB	Pesticide Control Products Board
RC/HC	Resident Coordinator / Humanitarian Coordinator
VSF Belgium	Veterinaires sans Frontieres Belgium
WFP	World Food Programme