

RESIDENT / HUMANITARIAN COORDINATOR REPORT ON THE USE OF CERF FUNDS RWANDA RAPID RESPONSE CONFLICT-RELATED DISPLACEMENT

RESIDENT/HUMANITARIAN COORDINATOR

Mr. Lamin Manneh

| | REPORTING PROCESS AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY |
|----|--|
| a. | Please indicate when the After Action Review (AAR) was conducted and who participated. An informal After Action Review was conducted during a technical consultation meeting between all in-country UN agencies recipient of this CERF funds and Government Counterpart namely the Ministry of Disaster Management and Refugee Affairs (MIDIMAR). The meeting took place in August 2014 and focussed on analysing achievements (comparison of intended vs. actual results achieved), sharing lessons learnt and formulating recommendations for future. During the meeting, MIDIMAR expressed the need for continued support to the expellees whose socio-economic reintegration is not yet to be achieved. |
| 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 |
| 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 |
| | Under the overall coordination of UNHCR, the final draft report was prepared by a Technical Committee and was then submitted to the Resident Coordinator for final review, endorsement and submission to the CERF Secretariat. This committee was composed of technical focal points from each UN Agency recipient of CERF funds namely UNHCR, UNICEF, UNWOMEN, UNFPA, FAO, WFP, WHO and IOM. |

I. HUMANITARIAN CONTEXT

| TABLE 1: EMERGENCY ALLOCATION OVERVIEW (US\$) | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------|--|--|--|
| Total amount required for the humanitarian response: US\$ 8,862,291 | | | | | |
| | Source | Amount | | | |
| | CERF | 2,392,374 | | | |
| Breakdown of total response funding received by source | COMMON HUMANITARIAN FUND/ EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND (if applicable) | 0 | | | |
| | OTHER (bilateral/multilateral) | 0 | | | |
| | TOTAL | 2,392,374 | | | |

| TABLE 2: CERF EMERGENCY FUNDING BY ALLOCATION AND PROJECT (US\$) | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------|--|--|
| Allocation 1 – date of official submission: 25-Oct-2013 | | | | | |
| Agency | Agency Project code Cluster/Sector | | | | |
| UNICEF | 13-RR-CEF-141 | Water and sanitation | 99,825 | | |
| FAO | 13-RR-FAO-042 | Agriculture | 125,174 | | |
| UNFPA | 13-RR-FPA-052 | Health | 96,882 | | |
| UNHCR | 13-RR-HCR-066 | Shelter and non-food items | 360,004 | | |
| IOM | 13-RR-IOM-040 | Camp Management | 673,760 | | |
| WFP | 13-RR-WFP-073 | Food | 843,337 | | |
| WHO | 13-RR-WHO-074 | Health | 99,831 | | |
| WOM | 93,561 | | | | |
| TOTAL | 2,392,374 | | | | |

| TABLE 3: BREAKDOWN OF CERF FUNDS BY TYPE OF IMPLEMENTATION MODALITY (US\$) | | | | |
|--|-----------|--|--|--|
| Type of implementation modality Amount | | | | |
| Direct UN agencies/ /IOM implementation | 1,899,141 | | | |
| Funds forwarded to NGOs for implementation | 40,209 | | | |
| Funds forwarded to government partners (MIDIMAR) | 453,024 | | | |
| TOTAL 2,3 | | | | |

HUMANITARIAN NEEDS

In July 2013, an ultimatum was given by the Tanzanian Government to thousands of undocumented immigrants living in the Kagera region to return to their countries of origin or to regularize their stay so as to restore security in the region. The Rwandans started crossing the border in the second half of July 2013. As of 23 October 2013, over 12,500 Rwandans from Tanzania had arrived in Rwanda. While some 7,600 people had been transported to their districts of origin, over 4,900 had remained in transit centres (TC) in Kiyanzi and Rukara and MIDIMAR was anticipating that an additional 6,000 people will require assistance in the coming months. In addition, 5,007 cattle had been registered at official entry points. The expellees had crossed the border with few belongings; many were forced to sell their cattle and goods at a low price, while some were able to leave their belongings with neighbours in hope of returning and collecting them when the situation becomes calm. Among the expellees were pregnant women and unaccompanied minors.

At the request of MIDIMAR, an inter-agency (UNCHR, UNICEF, WHO, UNFPA, UNWOMEN WFP, and IOM) rapid needs assessment was carried out on 3 August 2013 in order to get an overall understanding of the prevailing humanitarian situation. The findings from this assessment are as follows: (i)The food security situation was precarious as the Government food stocks were expected to run out at the end of August 2013 (ii) Basic needs/amenities including Core Relief Items (CRIs) for all expellees, especially women and girls, were lacking and poor hygiene was observed in TC, (iii) Access to primary health care services was limited since there was no health post in either TC, therefore all medical cases were to be referred to the nearest health centres or district hospitals for treatment (iv) Emergency shelters, water and sanitation facilities were needed, (iv) No proper registration was found at the Kiyanzi and Rukara TC and (v) There was also a risk of spreading potential Trans-boundary Animal Diseases (TADs) via livestock coming from Tanzania. The threat of Gender-based Violence (GBV) towards women and children was heightened significantly among expellees as a result of deprivation of financial, legal, and psychological services.

The urgent need for funding was a direct consequence of the deterioration of the situation following the sudden influx of expellees into Rwanda. The final decision to develop this CERF grant request was taken by the Resident Coordinator of the UN in Rwanda jointly with the Heads of UN agencies involved in responding to this new emergency.

II. FOCUS AREAS AND PRIORITIZATION

As of 23 October 2013, over 12,500 Rwandans had arrived in Rwanda from Tanzania. While some 7,600 people had been transported to their districts of origin, over 4,900 had remained in TCs in Kiyanzi and Rukara (MIDIMAR, 2013). In response to the GoR request for assistance to expellees, the UN conducted a joint mission to the above-mentioned sites to assess the living conditions of expellees. The main findings are summarized below.

The numbers crossing the border on a daily basis were unpredictable, making planning difficult. The GoR officials (MIDIMAR and Kirehe District Personnel) were posted at the border to welcome, screen and register all expellees for the purpose of proper planning and monitoring. However, there was no adequate information management system that could populate information on expellees' profiles to be shared with agencies to assist in programming for immediate needs and future reintegration requirements.

The transit centers were also at their full capacity and with more expellees coming every day, the need to transfer people to their districts of origin in safe and orderly manner was paramount.

The expellees hosted in the Kiyanzi and Rukara transit centres did not have any means of livelihood, while those settling in their host communities were landless and missed the cultivating season. The food security situation was also precarious as the Government food stocks were nearing depletion at the end of August 2013. Screening of moderately malnourished children under five and pregnant and lactating women was not possible given limited health facilities' capacity and mobility of the population.

Access to water and sanitation facilities at the established transit centres was an urgent concern as the expellees continued to arrive on a daily basis. On average, there were 375 persons per water tap in Rukara TC (Kayonza District). In addition, there were 6 blocks of latrine, with 72 cubicles, with a ratio of 21 people per cubicle. There were 72 bath rooms and no hand washing facilities near the latrines. In the Kiyanzi TC in Kirehe district, the ratio was 222 people per water tap. There were 182 cubicles within 34 latrine units with a ratio of 22 people per cubicle. Furthermore, only 88 showers were in use. In support of MIDIMAR's efforts to protect expellees' health while they were at the TC, safe sanitation and hygiene facilities were of paramount importance.

In terms of shelter, over 5,500 were accommodated in communal shelter/hangars, which had been temporarily established in the TC. Each hangar was partitioned into 20 blocks and, each block was meant to accommodate 5 persons. As a result of the over congestion, women, men and children from different households continued to be housed together, a situation that was considered undesirable as it could easily trigger potential risk of gender based violence and sexual abuse. In the Kiyanzi Reception Centre which started operating on 15 July 2013, shelter facilities were very rudimentary. They were made up of partially open tents and makeshift temporary

accommodations that were overcrowded and lacked adequate privacy for the expellees. The hangars were rapidly getting worn out, and the state of affairs was exacerbated by the onset of the heavy rainy season and urgently needed to be reinforced.

The evictees fled empty handed with no means for basic livelihoods. Most of them arrived in Rwanda without any belongings and they were in dire need of basic household items in order to enable them to sustain their lives and dignity. They were completely reliant on support from the GoR, UN and NGO actors for survival. This level of dependency could lead to stress and frustrations that could be contributing factors to GBV. Such dependency also left expellees highly vulnerable to sexual abuse and exploitation (SEA) in search of life-saving dignity kits.

Furthermore, the assessment revealed that 52 per cent (5,200) of beneficiaries are women, with most of them in reproductive age. Among the expellees, 82 were pregnant women at the time of the assessment. The disruption of social norms and lack of personal security has put women and girls at an elevated risk of sexual assault, HIV/STI infections, and unwanted pregnancy. This figure underscored the need for urgent interventions through provision of the Minimum Initial Service Package (MISP) for reproductive health, focusing particular attention to the needs of adolescents, youth and women. MISP and RH/Hygienic kits were distributed in 4 eastern districts which received a high number of Rwandan expellees from Tanzania. These districts are Kirehe, Bugesera, Ngoma and Nyagatare.

With regards to animal health, 5,007 cattle had been registered at official entry points and more were expected to cross. There was a risk of potential Trans-boundary Animal Diseases (TADs) spreading from Tanzanian to local cattle. There was an urgent need to vaccinate cattle against Food mouth Disease (FMD) and lumpy skin disease (LSD) and to rehabilitate the main quarantine site of Mahama in the Kirehe District to avoid potential TAD transmission.

In the course of project implementation, the Government of Rwanda decided to relocate all the expellees housed in Kiyanzi and Rukara settlement sites to their districts of origin or choice. It was then deemed necessary to align all planned health and GBV interventions, and to re-adjust planned activities in order to suit the current needs of these expellees who were being reintegrated. The UN decided to conduct a rapid needs assessment to get a clear picture of the current needs of the expellees.

Owing to the findings from this assessment, there was a need to re-programme health and GBV activities from the original proposal to focus more on the deployment of GBV risk mitigation personnel who will carry out on-the-spot sensitization on GBV and on provision of primary health care services, including emergency care to 10,000 expellees and the prevention and control of malaria through the supply of 3,920 mosquito nets.

Regarding WASH interventions, as the Government had decided to shift all the expellees housed in Kiyanzi and Rukara settlement sites to their districts of origin or choice, all planned and procured WASH supplies were simply transferred accordingly to these 30 districts across the country.

III. CERF PROCESS

Following a joint assessment mission led by UN agencies together with GoR counterparts from MIDIMAR, it was agreed to provide immediate emergency assistance in terms of food rations and Core Relief Items (CRIs) such as jerry cans, emergency kits, blankets, sanitary pads, kitchen sets, etc., emergency shelters, water and sanitation facilities, and primary health care and protection services to the expellees population at Kirehe and Kayonza districts.

The decision regarding the allocation of the CERF grants was taken by the RC, in consultation with the UN Heads of Agencies and MIDIMAR. Priority was given to the projects included in the sectoral appeals and not funded properly. Each Agency had to have adequate implementation capacity to implement the project before the end of 2014. Allocations of funds to UN agencies were done as per the CERF request and with UN Agency specialisation.

A Legal and Organizational framework established by the National Disaster Management Policy was approved by the Cabinet in June 2013 to develop an efficient mechanism for preventing, mitigating, responding to, recovering, securing and monitoring natural and manmade disasters. As part of this integral framework, the role of the UN was up-streamed. It is in this context that the MIDIMAR and the UN together established a Joint Intervention Management Committee (JIMC). The JIMC is intended to facilitate coordination between MIDIMAR and the UN in Rwanda, and is chaired by MIDIMAR and Co-Chaired by the UN RC in Rwanda.

The primary Inter-Agency coordination body chaired by MIDIMAR and co-chaired by UNHCR, on behalf of the RC, would meet to discuss on all issues related to the Rwandese expellees from Tanzania. Regarding the division of labour within the UN system, the UN sector lead approach was applied. It was a sector coordinated approach to respond to the emergency under the auspices of the

Delivering as One framework. UNHCR played the overall coordination role and other UN agencies assumed "sector-lead" roles as follows: UNICEF played a significant role in supporting WASH activities, WFP provided food and supplementary feeding in coordination with MIDIMAR and, with the support of World Vision, Action Aid and ADRA, WHO provided health, nutrition and reproductive health in coordination with MIDIMAR and in collaboration with UNFPA, UN Women implemented all GBV activities and FAO coordinated all livestock management related activities. The overall camp coordination and management, security, provision of emergency shelter and other infrastructure and transport and logistics was ultimately given to MIDIMAR with the support of IOM.

The design, implementation and monitoring of activities under the CERF allocation was a gender driven approach. Requesting agencies reflected gender aspects in the analysis of needs and in the formulation of key activities and outcomes to take into consideration the different needs of men, women, boys and girls. During the registration and profiling of expellees, there was a key and mandatory variable/field to fill in for gender information. Among the data entry clerks, there was a significant number of females. In addition, some CRI or kits were procured to respond to specific needs of women or adolescent girls. In light of WFP's Enhanced Commitment for Women (ECW), all WFP operations ensured that women were part of locally based food assistance management committees and distribution mechanisms. In view of implementing this commitment, 80 per cent of the committee members were women. Women were also given priority when issuing ration cards. During the relocation exercise of expellees from the TCs to their district of origin or choice, seating arrangements in the buses were made in a manner/order that gave first priority (allocated best seats) to expellees with specific needs including pregnant women, and second priority to women.

IV. CERF RESULTS AND ADDED VALUE

| TABLE 4: AFFECTED INDIVIDUALS AND REACHED DIRECT BENEFICIARIES BY SECTOR | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------|-------|--------|--|--|
| Total number of individuals affected by the crisis: 10,000 | | | | | | |
| | Cluster/Sector | Female | Male | Total | | |
| | Camp Management | 3,495 | 3,357 | 6,852 | | |
| | Protection/Human Rights/Rule of Law | 5,090 | 4,910 | 10,000 | | |
| The estimated total number of individuals | Shelter/Non-food items | 5,090 | 4,910 | 10,000 | | |
| directly supported through CERF funding by cluster/sector | Agriculture | 5,090 | 4,910 | 10,000 | | |
| by cluster/sector | Food | 5,090 | 4,910 | 10,000 | | |
| | Health | 5,090 | 4,910 | 10,000 | | |
| | Water and sanitation | 3,512 | 2,332 | 5,844 | | |

BENEFICIARY ESTIMATION

At the onset of the influx, the numbers that crossed the border on a daily basis was unpredictable which made planning difficult. The GoR officials (MIDIMAR and Kirehe District Personnel) were posted at the border to welcome, screen and register all expellees for the purpose of proper monitoring. Owing to the fact that there was no adequate information management system with the capacity to produce reports on expellees' 'profile – information required for planning - IOM supported the registration exercise which was coordinated by MIDIMAR. Since then, IOM had been sharing information on expellees' numbers with agencies to assist in programming for immediate needs and for future reintegration requirements. In addition, some cooperating partner's reports were used to collect data on targeted beneficiaries on a monthly basis. Data were disaggregated by gender and age (below 5, 5 to 18 and 18 and above). For food, close monitoring of the existing WFP Ngoma Sub-office (located not far from the TCs) was ensured by a dedicated field monitor assigned to each transit centre.

Data on animal herds were collected from staff deployed by the Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Production at the main entry borders for the monitoring of cattle herds.

| TABLE 5: PLANNED AND REACHED DIRECT BENEFICIARIES THROUGH CERF FUNDING | | | | | |
|--|--------|--------|--|--|--|
| Planned Estimated Reached | | | | | |
| Female | 5,090 | 5,090 | | | |
| Male | 4,910 | 4,910 | | | |
| Total individuals (Female and male) | 10,000 | 10,000 | | | |
| Of total, children under age 5 | 1,408 | 1,408 | | | |

CERF RESULTS

Globally, CERF enabled humanitarian actors to provide support to the expellee community to progressively regain control of their lives as quickly as possible. CERF enabled IOM to setup and establish a proper registration system with technical capacity to generate and disseminate complete and accurate registration information for planning.

WFP quickly responded to the emergency using its own advanced emergency response funding and carried out the first general food distribution on 11 September 2013 for all Rwandan returnees in Kiyanzi and Rukara TCs. They were entitled to a monthly food ration composed of mixed commodities to cover 100 per cent of their food needs. All expelled Rwandans crossing the border were also assisted with full food ration at arrival. Those transferred to their home districts were provided with a one month food ration package on departure to help them reintegrate in host communities. Thanks to the CERF funds, all the Rwandan expelled from Tanzania received food assistance to cater for their food needs while in the TCs from September and were provided with a one month return food package at the time of relocation to their districts of origin. By January, with the massive relocation to durable resettlement in districts, a three-month food package was provided through WFP cooperating partner namely ADRA. Upon MIDIMAR request, an additional three-month food ration was provided to 3,603 people in six districts (Bugesera, Ngoma, Kirehe, Kayonza, Gatsibo and Nyagatare) in June 2014. During this period, 892mts of mixed commodities were distributed. Main food commodities distributed were maize grain (413mts), maize meal (221mts), beans (186mts), vegetable oil (46 mts), sugar (18 mts) and salt (8 mts), equivalent to a value of US\$1,133,590.

Funding from CERF enabled UNHCR to procure and distribute basic household items to 10,000 expellees grouped into 3,920 families. These items are essential for their daily survival and enabled them sustain their lives and maintain dignity.

IOM began supporting MIDIMAR with transport services from 5 September and enabled the beneficiaries to travel from the border to the transit centres in a bus rather than a truck. Following registration and identification of districts of origin IOM provided buses and trucks (for luggage, food and NFIs) to support MIDIMAR in their transfer out of the TCs. For the journey IOM also provided water and biscuits. Upon the request of MIDIMAR a vehicle was made available as a non-emergency ambulance to allow people to visit the local hospital in Kirehe. A total number of 10,670 beneficiaries were transported (some more than once -from the border to the TC and from the TC to the districts)

Further support to MIDIMAR was provided via IOM to allow the Ministry to cover costs for running the TCs (firewood, electricity and water) thus providing a suitable and safe environment for the beneficiaries.

MIDIMAR, via IOM was also able issue to over 1,700 households in areas of return or relocation 144,000 pieces of corrugated iron and plastic sheets and 9,000 kg of nails, thus providing emergency shelter for the most needy.

The results achieved in WASH interventions include increased access to safe drinking water by providing material for fetching and storing water. Safe and clean water helped beneficiaries to improve their cleanliness. The CERF funds also supported expellees with latrines and this improved their hygienic conditions and prevented disease infections.

Before the project implementation, the expellees in targeted districts had limited knowledge on gender based violence (GBV). In their testimonies, expellees said that they faced GBV in the past but they did not recognize that it was GBV, while men said that they were perpetrators due to the ignorance. As a result of sensitization sessions, expellees developed understanding about GBV and promised to change their behaviors in order to break a culture of silence in case of GBV issues. The beneficiaries appreciated the assistance as some of them no longer had clothes to put on; hygienic materials were also a serious issue. Mothers were able to bathe their children and also cover them in tikes of coldness.

The CERF grant ensured adequate and timely coverage of life-saving needs in the target areas, which could not have been as successful without the collaboration of the UN partners and MIDIMAR. The CERF funds benefited 1,828 persons receiving dignity kitsIn view of coordinating all GBV emergency interventions; a collaboration framework between the UN women and other partners in GBV like (MIDIMAR, UNFPA, and UNICEF) was established. This was for better coordination and ensuring that synergy is seen in the area of GBV. The UNHCR and MIDIMAR ensured good coordination and sectorial group meetings which made the implementation a success through participation, sharing of reports, plans, and achievements by the respective agencies/projects. The districts of Nyagatare, Ngoma, Bugesera and Kirehe were very active in delivering dignity kits to the beneficiaries with the supervision of MIDIMAR and UN Women staff. Sectorial meetings supported deliberations concerning operational thematic issues on the ground, which ultimately improved the performance of agencies working in the sector and guaranteed complementarity, reduced duplication of efforts, and enhanced an efficient humanitarian response.

CERF funds enabled UNFPA to avail timely lifesaving products such as sexual and reproductive health (SRH) kits to be used by health facilities where expellees from Tanzania were relocated. These funds helped to provide capacity to health services providers to manage SRH issues including GBV prevention and management, HIV prevention and maternal and new-born issues.

The CERF complemented WHO core funds to conduct a round of supplementary immunization campaigns. During that campaign, polio and measles vaccines were delivered to children 0-59 months with coverage rates of 98 per cent percent and 95 percent, respectively. Overall, CERF funds facilitated access of 10,000 expellees to health services in the nearest health facilities of their respective places and provision of one mosquito net per expellee family for prevention against malaria still endemic in country. The coverage was 100 per cent since all 3,920 registered families received one mosquito net each. Globally, the health indicators reported were good as evidenced by the low crude mortality rate at 0.21/10,000/day, and under 5 mortality rate of 0.9/10,000/day.

In the agriculture sector, the livestock vaccination campaign vaccinated 7406 cattle from Tanzania against Food mouth Disease (FMD) and lumpy skin disease (LSD), as well as all cattle bordering Tanzania, making a total of 58 650 cattle vaccinated with the financial support CERF. The CERF funds enabled fast and quick delivery of assistance to the Ministry of Agriculture in preventing the spread of animal diseases within Rwandan territory. The CERF funds also increased the level of community awareness on trans-boundary diseases and enabled MINAGRI to set strategies for their eradication.

CERF's ADDED VALUE

| a) | Did CERF funds lead to a fast delivery of assistance to beneficiaries | 3 |
|----|---|---|
| | YES PARTIALLY NO NO | |

As some agencies were able to pre-finance activities under their mandate, when the CERFs fund arrived, they were used immediately to replenish the food and non-food stock by directly procuring additional commodities.

After the government decided to close temporary settlement camps and transfer expellees to different districts, CERF funds quickly helped to supply WASH materials to households by meeting their immediate needs in terms of hygiene and sanitation as well as by providing material for fetching and storing water.

The CERF funding helped UN Women to respond immediately to the Rwandan expellees from Tanzania in the area of GBV by providing lifesaving assistance in the first critical months of the emergency. UN Women reached 1828 expellees (women, girls, elderly and the disabled persons).

With the support of the Ministry of Health and MIDIMAR, CERF enabled the provision of basic health services and reproductive services to 10,000 returnees and 82 pregnant women. Kirehe being a district prone to malaria pandemic, CERF funding enabled quick procurement and distribution of mosquito nets to families of expellees.

The CERF funds came in while the situation was very critical as FAO had no funds to support MINAGRI, FAO's government partner, who constantly requested both technical and financial support to prevent animal diseases. It was a relief and enabled quick response; without it things would have turned worse and consequently led to a systematic spread of animal diseases country wide that could incur loss of social and economic assets of the expellees and Rwandans.

| b) Did CERF funds help respond to time critical needs¹? YES ☑ PARTIALLY ☐ NO ☐ |
|---|
| CERF funds were used to meet critical needs of the people who had nothing. Basic needs and essential services in the health and WASH sectors were provided. WASH was of special concern since there was a need to improve their hygiene conditions in order to reduce the risk of being contaminated by WASH related infections such diarrhoea, cholera outbreak, skills diseases, and deaths. |
| CERF funds for UN Women delayed slightly because of the process in re-programming GBV activities as a request from MIDIMAR but when funds were availed, UN Women responded swiftly to humanitarian assistance amongst the expellees from Tanzania and 1,828 expellees were assisted. The CERF funds allowed WFP to respond immediately and enabled purchase of food commodities required to ensure continuity in food distribution for the critical first three months. Due to CERF funds, FAO managed to put in place, within a short time, a project on epidemic surveillance. Awake |
| c) Did CERF funds help improve resource mobilization from other sources? |
| YES PARTIALLY NO The UN multi-sectorial emergency assistance to expellees which was the first of this nature served as awakening sign that mobilize other humanitarian actors to join the UN family to respond to this humanitarian crisis in a coordinated and comprehensive manner. It is within this context that additional \$210,349 were received from UNDP to support coordination related activities of this crisis and Action Aid, World Vision, Tear Fund and ADRA to provide lifesaving services/items including food, shelters and nutrition for children, nursing and expectant mothers. |
| Since the needs exceeded the available resources, CERF served as basis to raise other resources for continuous support and also leverage resources from other partners and donors. It is in this spirit that a budget revision to the current WFP's PRRO 200343 was initiated with the inclusion of support to Rwandans expelled from Tanzania. This ensured continuity of the assistance from December 2013 onwards through the PRRO 200343. Concerned sectorial Ministries were also deployed to the sites to ensure effective coordination of sectorial interventions. |
| d) Did CERF improve coordination amongst the humanitarian community? YES ⊠ PARTIALLY □ NO □ |
| Since the National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction which a <u>multi-stakeholder national mechanism</u> that serves as an advocate of DRR at different levels and <u>provides coordination</u> , <u>analysis</u> and <u>advice</u> on areas of priority requiring concerted action was established, this organ had never managed to gather all humanitarian actors operating in Rwanda. As a result of CERF funds and subsequent alliances to effectively respond to this crisis, a coordination mechanism was put in place. There were two levels of coordination: (i) one amongst UN Agencies recipient of CERF funds around the RC with the support of UNHCR as a way for the UN family in Rwanda to speak with one voice and (ii) the second at MIDIMAR level involving other government institutions, UN and non-government organizations (both international and national). |
| This coordination setup enabled good planning, effective implementation of activities and avoidance of overlapping activities through the allocation of clear responsibilities and roles. Some mechanisms were put in place to monitor and implement the programme. The programme was executed through a technical working group composed of technical experts from agencies and a Steering Committee that was overseeing and over sighting the programme implementation. |
| e) If applicable, please highlight other ways in which CERF has added value to the humanitarian response |
| N/A |
| |

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.).

V. LESSONS LEARNED

Most of the planned activities were successfully implemented within the set timeframe despite the abrupt change which impacted on health and GBV interventions. It is worth mentioning that the delay in implementation as a result of UN Women receiving funds late caused difficulties and delays during the implementation of the projects. MIDIMAR requested UN Women and WHO to re-program their activities from what was planned in the CERF proposals. This was because most returnees had been reintegrated and tracing them in their different locations was challenging.

| TABLE 6: OBSERVATIONS FOR THE CERF SECRETARIAT | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| Lessons learned | Suggestion for follow-up/improvement | Responsible entity | | | |
| Time-critical lifesaving interventions began promptly due to the rapid disbursement of CERF funds. | Keep up this momentum | CERF secretariat | | | |
| Nutritional screening is very hard in a situation where the population is in constant movement within transit centres and with limited health facilities capacities. | Conduct a blanket supplementary feeding for children under five and pregnant and lactating women. | CERF secretariart | | | |
| Due to the re-programming CERF GBV activities, the supply of dignity kits was challenging because expellees had been reintegrated in different locations. This involved high transport costs to deliver dignity kits to different sites. Late disbursement of funds to UN Women Country Office delayed the implementation of earlier planned activities based on the current needs of expellees in Transit Centres (TC). When funds arrived to UN Women CO, expellees had already been transferred from TC to different locations in the community. Because of this, MIDIMAR requested UN Women to re-programme its activities as expellees had been relocated. | Quick disbursement of funds from HQ | CERF secretariat and UN Women HQ – New York | | | |
| Unfamiliarities with CERF requirements, guidelines and tools for planning, budgeting and grantsmanship impact on timely submssiion of sound project document | CERF to provide training to technical focal points on grant writing and reporting | CERF secretariat | | | |

| TABLE 7: OBSERVATIONS FOR COUNTRY TEAMS | | | | | |
|---|--|--------------|--|--|--|
| Lessons learned Suggestion for follow-up/improvement Responsible entit | | | | | |
| Unfamiliarities with CERF requirements, guidelines and tools for planning, budgeting and grantsmanship impact on timely submssiion of sound project document | UN agencies should ensure their CERF technical focal points are trained on grant writing and reporting | UN agencies | | | |
| A robust coordination of partners and transparency in planning and implementation has created a smooth working environment which increased effectiveness of the joint response. | Strengthen the coordination with the view of delivering as a team | One UN / GoR | | | |
| The coordination mechanism is very critical for the response because decisions can have implications on the intervention | Development partners in humanitarian response should continuosly align to government priorities | UN Agencies | | | |

VI. PROJECT RESULTS

| | TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|-----------------|------------------------|---|--|
| CERF Project Information | | | | | | |
| 1. Agen | ncy: | WFP | | 5. CERF Grant Period: | 1 Oct 2013 – 31 March 2014 | |
| 2. CER | F project code: | 13-RR-WFP-0 | 73 | | 6. Status of CERF grant: | ☐ On-going |
| 3. Clust | ter/Sector: | Food Security | | | | |
| 4. Proje | ect Title: | Protracted Relic | | | I RRO) 200343: Food and Safety Ne | et Assistance to refugee camp Residents |
| | a. Total project | budget: | US | \$\$ 2,961,191 | d. CERF funds forwarded to | implementing partners: |
| 7.Funding | b. Total funding project: | received for the | US | \$\$ 1,318,463 | ■ NGO partners and Red C | ross/Crescent: US\$ 42,209 |
| 7.F | c. Amount recei | Amount received from CERF: US\$ 843,337 | | ■ Government Partners: | US\$ 0 | |
| Result | ts | | | | | |
| 8. Tota | al number of <u>direc</u> | <u>ct beneficiaries</u> p | lanned and re | eached throug | gh CERF funding (provide a bre | akdown by sex and age). |
| Direct | Beneficiaries | | Planned | Reached | In case of significant discrepa beneficiaries, please describe | ancy between planned and reached e reasons: |
| a. Fem | nale | | 5,090 | 5,090 | | |
| b. Male | 9 | | 4,910 | 4,910 | | |
| c. Tota | al individuals (fema | ale + male): | 10,000 | 10,000 | | |
| d. Of to | otal, children <u>unde</u> | <u>er</u> 5 | 1,408 | 1,408 | | |
| 9. Oriç | ginal project objec | ctive from approv | ed CERF pro | posal | | |
| Contrik | oute to the improv | ement and stabi | lization of the | food security | and nutritional situation of expe | elled Rwandans from Tanzania. |
| 10. Or | 10. Original expected outcomes from approved CERF proposal | | | | | |
| • In • In | Outcome: Stabilized or improved food consumption over assistance period for targeted households and/or individuals Indicator 1: Numbers of beneficiaries receiving WFP food rations by category, age group and gender, as % of planned figures; Indicator 2: Quantities of food distributed by commodity and beneficiary category, as % of planned distribution; Indicator 3: % of households with adequate food consumption score (FCS) – target 60%. | | | | | |

- Immediate food needs met for 10,000 individuals while in transit centres or when relocated to their home districts
 - Boys under 5 years: 699 childrenBoys 5 to 18 years: 1,508 people

Men: 2,703 peopleGirls: 709 children

O Girls 5 to 18 years: 1,769 people

- O Women: 2,612 people
- During this period, 892mts of mixed commodities were distributed. Main food commodities distributed were maize grain (413mts), maize meal (221mts), beans (186mts), vegetable oil (46 mts), sugar (18 mts) and salt (8 mts)
- Improved food consumption to 10,000 people in the communities of origin with provision of a return home food package. It was not possible to carry out a Post Distribution Monitoring and data for FCS are not available

| 12. In case of significant discrepancy between planned and actual outcomes, please describe reasons: | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------|----------------|--|--|--|
| WFP assistance was not provided to prevent deterioration of nutritional situation of moderately malnourished children under five and pregnant and lactating women. The nutrition screening was difficult to conduct in a population in constant movement with limited heath facilities capacity and there were other stakeholders who provided fresh milk to children under five and porridge flour for both categories (AEE and World Vision). | | | | | |
| 13. Are CERF-funded activities part of a CAP project that applied ar | n IASC Gender Marker code? | YES ⊠ NO □ | | | |
| If 'YES', what is the code (0, 1, 2a, 2b): 2a | | | | | |
| Ration cards issued in names of women where possible, 59 per cent for women against 41per cent for men. | | | | | |
| If 'NO' (or if GM score is 1 or 0): | | | | | |
| 14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending? | | | | | |
| Evaluation is expected to start in October 2014, and the report will | EVALUA | TION PENDING 🛚 | | | |
| be posted by December 2014. | NO EVALUA | TION PLANNED | | | |

| | TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|-----------------------------|--|--|
| CER | CERF project information | | | | | | | |
| 1. Aç | gency: | UN Women | | | 5. CERF grant period: | 9 Dec 2013-8 June 2014 | | |
| 2. C | ERF project code: | 13-RR-WO | M-003 | | 0.014 × 105D5 × 1 | ☐ On-going | | |
| 3. Cl | uster/Sector: | Protection | | | - 6. Status of CERF grant: | | | |
| 4. Pr | oject title: | Risk Mitigat | ion and Resp | onse to Gende | er Based Violence among Rwand | dan Returnees from Tanzania | | |
| b. Total funding received for the project: US\$ 93,56 | | | US\$ 280,000 US\$ 93,561 US\$ 93,561 | d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners: NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent: Government Partners: US\$ 0 | | | | |
| Res | ults | | · | | | | | |
| 8. T | otal number of <u>direc</u> | t beneficiaries | planned and | I reached thro | ugh CERF funding (provide a brea | akdown by sex and age). | | |
| Direct Beneficiaries | | | Planned | Reached | In case of significant discrepancy between planned and reached beneficiaries, please describe reasons: | | | |
| a. Fe | emale | | 5,090 | 1,000 | In the reprogrammed activities, UN Women planned to reach | | | |
| b. M | ale | | 4,910 | 828 | 1500 women and men but only reached 1000 because of limited funds to buy all the lifesaving dignity kits. | | | |
| c. To | otal individuals (fema | le + male): | 10,000 | 1,828 | In the original submission, UN Women had planned to carry out | | | |
| d. O | f total, children <u>unde</u> | <u>r</u> age 5 | 1,408 | 86 | GBV awareness raising and sensitisations but this did not happen as funds were limited. The big budget was spent on life saving activities for women in the area of GBV. | | | |
| 9. C | riginal project object | tive from appr | oved CERF p | proposal | | | | |
| from | The overall objective of the project is to reduce risks of and respond to GBV within the refugee camps hosting Rwandans expelled from Tanzania. The specific objectives are as follows: To sensitize the camp population on gender, GBV and human rights related issues To link up victims to the appropriate referral services in the vicinity To assist GBV victims to access timely holistic services | | | | | | | |
| 10. | Original expected ou | itcomes from | approved CE | RF proposal | | | | |
| Indic Indic Outo Indic | eator 1: Change in parator 2: Percentage come 2: GBV and ch | perceptions of of returnees d hild abuse vict omen, men, b | n attitudes re isaggregated ims/survivors oys and girls | lated to GBV a by sex with kr have access receiving time | nowledge of GBV and child abuse | risk mitigation | | |

11. Actual outcomes achieved with CERF funds

GBV and child abuse victims/survivors had access to timely dignity kits that saved lives of those in need. UN Women intended to save lives of women, girls, lactating, pregnant mothers, elderly and the disabled. This was done through provision of timely dignity lifesaving kits. Around 70 per cent of beneficiaries were able to access these services under this outcome. UN women's CERF project aimed at Risk Mitigation and Response to Gender Based Violence among Rwandan Returnees from Tanzania. Around 1,828 lifesaving dignity kits were provided to women, girls, elderly and the disabled persons. This was part of UN Women's humanitarian action to promote early action and response to reduce loss of life in-critical times for women. The re-programming fund redeployment request approved by the ERC on 6 March 2014 activities were Towel (Essuie); Baby crib (Kigoma); Soap (savon ordinaire), Bucket (seau avec couvercle), Baby body lotion (Vaseline). This were the current needs of expellees in the communities where they were reintegrated than the ordinal needs when the expellees were in the TC. These were more of immediate lifesaving activities to women who were in dire need of support. The CERF project helped in responding and saving life of women and especially the pregnant mothers, lactating mothers, children and the elderly when they received the dignity and life savings kits. The kits include basic necessities that expelled women and girls require maintaining feminine hygiene, acceptable level of respect in their daily lives, as well as other items aiming at reinforcing their protection. - Women's emergency kits (WEKs) also served as first entry points for more protection and response related interventions such as addressing Sexual and Gender Based Violence (SGBV) 12. In case of significant discrepancy between planned and actual outcomes, please describe reasons: Outcome 2: GBV and child abuse cases are reduced through changed attitudes and behaviour among returnees This outcome was partially achieved (40 per cent) because there was limited time to carry out sensitisations and GBV campaigns to change the attitudes and behaviour of returnees. Changing attitudes and behaviour is not a short term activity to be measured in the shortest period for this emergency response. It needs much more time and resources. 13. Are the CERF funded activities part of a CAP project that applied an IASC Gender Marker code? YES ☐ NO 🖂 If 'YES', what is the code (0, 1, 2a or 2b): If 'NO' (or if GM score is 1 or 0): The Gen-Cap who was hosted in UNHCR checked and participated in the design of the CERF proposal/appeal by checking whether gender activities had been mainstreamed in the wider CERF proposal and whether the gender activities had been budgeted for. This ensured a collective responsibility for all UN agencies to take into consideration of gender activities in all sectors of intervention. This formed a kind of checklist using the gender lens to ensure that gender activities are mainstreamed in all sectors of CERF. 14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending? EVALUATION CARRIED OUT EVALUATION PENDING | An evaluation of the project is expected to start in October 2014, and the report will be posted by December 2014. NO EVALUATION PLANNED

| | TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--|---|----------|---|---|---------------------------|--|--|
| CER | F project informati | on | | | | | | |
| 1. Aç | gency: | WHO | | | 5. CERF grant period: | 01 Oct 2013 – 31 Mar 2013 | | |
| 2. CI | ERF project code: | 13-RR-WHO | -074 | | 6 Status of CEDE grants | ☐On-going | | |
| 3. Cluster/Sector: | | Health | | - 6. Status of CERF grant: | ⊠Concluded | | | |
| 4. Project title: | | Provide access to basic health services for t | | | the Rwandans returnees expelled from Tanzania | | | |
| βι | a. Total project budget: | | | JS\$ 283,200 | d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners: | | | |
| 7.Funding | b. Total funding re | ceived for the | project: | US\$ 99,831 | NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent: U | | | |
| 7.F | c. Amount receive | d from CERF: | | US\$ 99,831 | Government Partners: | | | |
| Resi | ults | | | | | | | |
| 8. T | 8. Total number of direct beneficiaries planned and reached through CERF funding (provide a breakdown by sex and age). | | | | | | | |
| Direct Beneficiaries | | Planned | Reached | In case of significant discrepancy between planned and reache beneficiaries, please describe reasons: | | | | |
| a. Female | | | 5,090 | 5,090 | The number of returnees reached was 10,000 | | | |

9. Original project objective from approved CERF proposal

c. Total individuals (female + male):

d. Of total, children under age 5

b. Male

To ensure timely detection of epidemics through strengthening disease surveillance

4,910

10,000

1,408

To provide timely and good quality basic primary health care services including treatment of minor ailments, maternal and child care, HIV/STI, TB treatment, nutrition care and psychosocial care and support; management of medical emergencies including trauma and emergency obstetrics care provided to this expelled population.

4,910

10,000

1,408

- To ensure effective service provision, supervision, monitoring and evaluation of health services in the camp
- To ensure effective communication with the District Hospital for referral cases

10. Original expected outcomes from approved CERF proposal

Outcome1: Access to basic health services ensured to Rwandans returnees community.

Indicator 1: OPD attendance rate maintained greater than 1

Indicator 2: Immunization coverage for measles> 90 per cent

Indicator 3: Immunization coverage for polio < 95 per cent

Outcome 2: The trend of major communicable diseases among Rwandan expelled community monitored on a weekly basis.

Indicator 1: Completeness and timeless of weekly surveillance reports maintained at greater than 90 per cent

Outcome 3: Timely and relevant response to outbreaks

Indicator 1: Proportion of disease outbreaks investigated within 72 hours is greater than 90 per cent

Indicator 2: Case fatality rates of outbreak maintained within the acceptable range.

11. Actual outcomes achieved with CERF funds

Following WHO request for reprogramming of CERF funded interventions and subsequent amendment of outcome's statement, revised outcomes were achieved as follows:

Outcome 1: Access to basic health services including emergency health care ensured to 10,000 Rwandans returnees expelled from Tanzania

Indicator 1: under 5 mortality rate of 0.9/10,000/day

Indicator 2: Number of C-section: 3 C sections done in the district hospital.

Indicator 3: Immunization coverage for measles> 90 per cent

Indicator 4: Immunization coverage for polio< 95 per cent

Outcome 2: Prevent and control of malaria through the supply of mosquito nets to all the project beneficiaries Indicator: 1 mosquito net per family for malaria prevention

Indicator2: Prevalence of malaria in the population of expellees was below the prevalence in the population of their respective hosting district (prevalence of malaria is calculated in each district of country)

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

The project was aiming at providing access to basic health services for 10,000 Rwandans expelled from Tanzania, hosted in two Transit Centers in Kiyanzi and Rukara and the funds (CERF) to support the project were approved and disbursed on 19 November 2014. However, in the beginning of December 2013, the Government of Rwanda decided to dismantle these centers and opted for the deployment and integration of all expellees in the districts of their choice. This exercise was completed between 03rd and 25th January 2014 as confirmed in MIDIMAR letter to WHO. District authorities are tasked to host them in temporary shelters pending the construction of durable housing and to provide all basic needs for their community insertion.

Note that early in the beginning of the project, an immunization campaign was supported and conducted in collaboration with MOH for polio for the under 5 and for measles for the under 15.

In this context, the project activities, which consisted in the provision of health emergency kits, laboratory equipment and trainings for quality health services in the camps could not be implemented as returnees are deployed and spread in 30 districts (maximum 500 returnees per district). The logistic required to implement the original proposal approach for this population spread in 30 districts particularly to distribute health emergency kits... and to provide refresh training becomes a challenge and unrealistic. Therefore the Ministry in charge of Disaster Management and Refugees Affairs (MIDIMAR) requested to review the health intervention from CERF in facilitating access to primary health services available in all districts (Health Centers and District Hospital).

In addition, for WHO the disbursement of CERF on 19 November 2013 met the period of deadlines for submitting various requests in Global System Management (GSM) for the closure 2012-2013 WHO Work plan. For example the last date for Approval of Purchase Requisition for goods non catalogue using 2012-2013 work plans was 15 November 2013 and for goods catalogue was 22 November 2013. Therefore, the submission of new purchase requisition in Global Management System become possible later in January 2014 with the availability of the new WHO work plan 2014-2015.

As access to basic health services remained a major gap but the implementation of support needed to be reviewed, a reprogramming request was sent to CERF secretariat and approved. In this request was clarified that two following life-saving interventions were required: Enable access to primary health care, including emergency care, in providing medical items and supplies in the health facilities of 6 districts where 50 per cent of returnees were deployed; and Prevent and control malaria through the supply of mosquito nets to all the families of all the 10,000 returnees (3920 families).

That new life -saving activities were covering objectives and activities identified in the original proposal but the actual outcomes changed and were revised accordingly.

| 13. Are the CERF funded activities part of a CAP project that applied an IASC Gender | YES □ NO 🏻 |
|--|------------|
| Marker code? | 1E3 🗀 NO 🖂 |

| If 'YES', what is the code (0, 1, 2a or 2b): | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| If 'NO' (or if GM score is 1 or 0): | | | | | |
| The gender dimension was taken into consideration while designing and implementing activities under CERF allocation. Gender aspects were mainstreamed in needs assessment of different groups of expellees namely male, female pregnant and children. | | | | | |
| 14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending? EVALUATION CARRIED OUT | | | | | |
| A formal evaluation of the project is not yet conducted, however a regular monitoring of the | EVALUATION PENDING | | | | |
| implementation of planned activities were jointly carried out by the UN team composed of WHO, UNICEF, WFP, IOM, UN Women and UNHCR and other involved stakeholders". | NO EVALUATION PLANNED 🖂 | | | | |

| | TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------|--------------|----------------------------------|--|------------------------------|--|--|
| CER | CERF project information | | | | | | | |
| 1. Ag | ency: | UNICEF | | | 5. CERF grant period: | 1 Oct 2013 - 31 Mar. 2014 | | |
| 2. CE | ERF project code: | 13-RR-CEF | -141 | | 6 Status of CEDE grants | ☐ On-going | | |
| 3. CI | uster/Sector: | WASH | | | 6. Status of CERF grant: | □ Concluded | | |
| 4. Pr | oject title: | Provision of | Water Sanita | tion and Hyg | iene facilities and services for Rwa | ndans Expelled from Tanzania | | |
| a. Total project budget: US\$ 1,620,000 | | | | d. CERF funds forwarded to imple | ementing partners: | | | |
| 7.Funding | b. Total funding received for the project: US\$ 99,825 | | | S\$ 99,825 | ■ NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent: US\$ 0 | | | |
| | c. Amount receive | d from CERF: | l | JS\$ 99,825 | ■ Government Partners: US\$ | | | |
| Resu | ilts | | | | | | | |
| 8. To | otal number of direct | t beneficiaries | planned and | reached thro | ough CERF funding (provide a breat | kdown by sex and age). | | |
| Direc | t Beneficiaries | | Planned | Reached | In case of significant discrepancy bet beneficiaries, please describe reason | | | |
| a. Fe | male | | 5,090 | 3,512 | The assisted number of expellees decreased by about 42 per cent. The Government decided to close the camps and integrate the returnees into local communities across the country. | | | |
| b. Ma | ale | | 4,910 | 2,332 | | | | |
| c. To | tal individuals (fema | le + male): | 10,000 | 5,844 | Following this decision and in consultation with the Government, CERF funding was used to provide critical WASH supplies to the returnees living in 30 priority districts. The number of returnees in these priority districts totalled 5,844. | | | |
| d. Of | total, children <u>unde</u> | <u>r</u> age 5 | 1,408 | 818 | | | | |
| 9. O | riginal project object | ive from appr | oved CERF p | roposal | | | | |
| | Implement Water Sanitation and Hygiene life savings facilities to protect the health of refugees specifically the most vulnerable like women and children | | | | | | | |
| 10. (| 10. Original expected outcomes from approved CERF proposal | | | | | | | |
| • | Outcome: 10,000 persons will be provided with Water, Sanitation and Hygiene service: Indicator 1: Proportion of refugees accessing safe drinking water 15 litres/person/day Indicator 2: Proportion of refugees using one cubicle of latrines (20 per/per cubicle) | | | | | | | |

11. Actual outcomes achieved with CERF funds

<u>WATER AND SANITATION: Following the change in the context and re-programming of the funds, the outcome was changed as follows:</u>

• Provide critical WASH supplies to 5844 people living in 30 districts.

The achievements against the revised outcome are as follows:

• At least 5,844 people benefitted from provision of critical WASH supplies including mobile toilets, showers, soap, jerry

| cans, buckets, handwashing facilities, water storage tanks, slabs for latrine construction and disinfectant for cleaning latrines. The provision of these supplies greatly assisted the returnees in getting access to improved WASH services and in reduction of the risk of WASH related diseases. | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 12. In case of significant discrepancy between planned and actual outcomes, please describe reasons: | | | | | | | |
| During implementation of the planned interventions, changes were made in order to align with the Government decision to close the camps and requested to assist the returnees in their hosting districts rather than in the initial temporary settlement or camps. Following the re-programming request approved by ERC on 24 Feb 2014 and in consultation with the Government, the outcome was changed to "provision of critical/need-based WASH supplies to 5844 people living in 30 districts". | | | | | | | |
| 13. Are the CERF funded activities part of a CAP project that applied an IASC Gender Marker code? YES⊠ NO □ | | | | | | | |
| If 'YES', what is the code (0, 1, 2a or 2b): The project considered human rights and gender issue and the | e code is 1 | | | | | | |
| If 'NO' (or if GM score is 1 or 0): The humanitarian response was inclusive and no population was left out during the response. Women had same the WASH access and even were outstripping the number of males. | | | | | | | |
| 14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending? EVALUATION CARRIED OUT | | | | | | | |
| The project interventions were regularly monitored by UNICEF and Government. No | EVALUATION PENDING | | | | | | |
| evaluation of this project, however, is planned. | NO EVALUATION PLANNED 🖂 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| | | | TAI | BLE 8: PROJI | ECT RESULTS | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------|--|
| CER | F project informati | on | | | | | |
| 1. Ag | gency: | FAO | | | 5. CERF grant period: | 19 Nov. 2013 -18 May 2014 | |
| 2. CI | ERF project code: | 13-RR-FAC |)-042 | | | ☐ On-going | |
| 3. CI | uster/Sector: | Food Secur | rity/Livelihoo | d | 6. Status of CERF grant: | | |
| 4. Pr | oject title: | | onse to redu expelled fror | - | or Trans boundary Animal Diseas | es (TADs) from cattle herds of | |
| Б | a. Total project bu | ıdget: | · | US\$ 980,000 | d. CERF funds forwarded to im | plementing partners: | |
| 7.Funding | b. Total funding re | b. Total funding received for the project | | | NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent: US | | |
| 7.Fu | c. Amount receive | d from CERF: US\$ 125 174 | | US\$ 125 174 | Government Partners: | rs: US\$ Fill in | |
| Resi | ults | | | | | | |
| 8. T | otal number of <u>direc</u> | t beneficiaries | s planned an | d reached throu | ugh CERF funding (provide a brea | akdown by sex and age). | |
| Direct Beneficiaries ² Planned Reached | | | Reached | In case of significant discrepancy b beneficiaries, please describe reas | • | | |
| a. Fe | emale | | 5,090 | 5090 | The reality on the ground led the support becoming House hold targets regardless the disaggregate dimension due to the level of crisis. So 2346 household's benefited from CERF funds (with an average of 25 cattle per household). It is also important to know that not all returnee had a cow/cattle, the number of | | |
| b. M | ale | | 4,910 | 4910 | | | |
| c. To | tal individuals (fema | ale + male): | 10,000 | 10,000 | | | |
| d. Of total, children <u>under</u> age 5 | | 1,408 | 1,408 | householders assisted includes the local community whose cattle have been also taken care as a measure of preventing any contamination of the disease within cow from Tanzania | | | |
| 9. O | Original project objective from approved CERF proposal | | | | | | |
| | ide urgent responsering Rwanda | e to the crisis | of the retu | rnees, by mitig | ating the risks of major trans-bo | oundary Animal Diseases (TADs) | |
| 10. | Original expected or | utcomes from | approved C | ERF proposal | | | |
| | Outcome 1: Cattle herds of returnees Ear tagged Indicators: | | | | | | |

• 100 per cent cattle with ear tag; by month 3

Outcome 2: Cattle in the areas bordering with Tanzania protected against main trans -boundary diseases Indicators:

- 2000 samples tests of targeted TADs done by the National veterinary laboratory by month 3
- 100 per cent cattle vaccinated against Food Mouth Disease (FMD) and lumpy skin disease (LSD) by month 5

Outcome 3: Returnees and local farmers cattle health improved Indicators:

- Mahama (Kirehe District) Quarantine site rehabilitated, by month 4
- 100 per cent of shepherds trained on cattle movement during quarantine, by month 1
- 11. Actual outcomes achieved with CERF funds:

² It is difficult to provide number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender because of the following reason. The incoming cattle from expellees created a serious threat in animal husbandry disease (36 heads with FMD symptoms) and the emergency turned not only for cattle from Tanzania but also the existing ones regardless the disaggregated gender aspect in order to protect them from any trans boundary disease that might rise. In total 58 650 heads (cattle) were vaccinated

Outcome 1

• 7,406 cows representing 100 per cent of cows ear tagged upon arrival

Outcome 2.

- 5600 samples test were done by RAB (National Veterinary laboratory) by December 2013
- In terms of cattle vaccinated 58,650 instead of 40,000 cattle expected were vaccinated against foot and mouth disease (FMD) and Lump Skin Disease (LSD). The vaccination campaign ended by end of January 2014.

| Cattle from Tanzania | 7406 |
|-----------------------------|--------|
| Cattle sold | 1584 |
| Ded | 64 |
| Cattle transfered to Gabiro | 3954 |
| Cattle transfered to Gako | 227 |
| Cattle affected | |
| From Tanzania | 36 |
| Local | 24 |
| Total vaccinated | 58 650 |

Outcome 3

- Mahama site has been rehabilitated while 18 shepherds (100 per cent) of the cattle from Tanzania received training on cattle movement during quarantine by April 2014
- 12. In case of significant discrepancy between planned and actual outcomes, please describe reasons:

The incoming cattle from expellees created a serious threat in animal husbandry disease (36 heads with FMD symptoms) and the emergency turned not only for cattle from Tanzania but also the existing ones regardless the disaggregated gender aspect in order to protect them from any trans boundary disease that might rise. In total 58,650 heads (cattle) were vaccinated.

The high number of cattle vaccinated is a result of impact from the cattle coming from Tanzania and the risk of contaminating the community. So to address the issue as planned in the CERF intervention, all surrounding region cattle were also vaccinated totalling 58,650 cattle vaccinated from FMD and LSD.

13. Are the CERF funded activities part of a CAP project that applied an IASC Gender Marker code?

| VEC | ¬ , | \cap | ∇ |
|------|------|--------|----------|
| 1501 | - 11 | Ю | IXI |

If 'YES', what is the code (0, 1, 2a or 2b): Fill in If 'NO' (or if GM score is 1 or 0):

The Gen-Cap who was hosted in UNHCR checked and participated in the design of the CERF proposal/appeal by checking whether gender activities had been mainstreamed in the wider CERF proposal and whether the gender activities had been budgeted for. This was to ensure a collective responsibility for all UN agencies to take into consideration of gender activities in all sectors of intervention including agriculture. However in the course of implementation and owing to the threat created by 36 heads found with FMD symptoms, it was then deemed necessary to target not only incoming cattle from Tanzania but also the existing ones regardless the disaggregated gender aspect in order to protect them from any trans boundary disease that might rise. In total 58 650 heads (cattle) were vaccinated.

14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?

| An evaluation of the project is expected to start in October 2014, and the report will be posted by December 2014. | EVALUATION PENDING 🖂 |
|--|-----------------------|
| 5, 200020. 10 | NO EVALUATION PLANNED |

| | TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|---|-------------|---|-------------------------|-------|--|--|--|
| CER | F project informati | ion | | | | | | | |
| 1. Agency: | | UNFPA | | 5. CERF grant period: | 1 Nov 2013 -30 Apr 2014 | | | | |
| 2. CERF project code: | | 13-RR-FPA-052 | | 6. Status of CERF grant: | ☐ On-going | | | | |
| 3. Cluster/Sector: | | Health | | | □ Concluded | | | | |
| 4. Project title: | | Provide minimal initial service package | | for Rwandans returnees expelled | I from Tanzania. | | | | |
| D. | a. Total project budget: | | US\$283,200 | d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners: | | | | | |
| 7.Funding | b. Total funding re | eceived for the project: | US\$ 96,882 | NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent: | | US\$0 | | | |
| | c. Amount received from CERF: | | US\$ 96,882 | ■ Government Partners: | | US\$0 | | | |
| | 14 | | | | | | | | |

Results

8. Total number of direct beneficiaries planned and reached through CERF funding (provide a breakdown by sex and age).

| Direct Beneficiaries | Planned | Reached | In case of significant discrepancy between planned and reached beneficiaries, please describe reasons: | | |
|--|---------|---------|--|--|--|
| a. Female | 5,090 | 1,495 | The number of Rwandese returnees from Tanzania was 12, 5 by October 2013 and the number continued to increase during | | |
| b. Male | 4,910 | 5,500 | last months of 2013. Rwandan expellees were relocated to their districts of origin in the 30 districts of country. Distribution of | | |
| c. Total individuals (female + male): | 10,000 | 6,995 | male condoms reached all planned men. However, not all planned women were reached by the distribution of MISP and | | |
| d. Of total, children <u>under</u> age 5 | 1,408 | N/A | RH/hygienic kits because these kits were distributed to women in Reproductive health only. | | |

- 9. Original project objective from approved CERF proposal
- To ensure timely provision emergency obstetric care including referral for caesarean section
- To ensure timely provision of new born care
- To provide medical management of sexual gender based violence
- To provide monitoring and supervision of health services including strengthening of the district based health system to handle the emergency
- 10. Original expected outcomes from approved CERF proposal

Outcomes

Access to basic health services including emergency obstetric care ensured to Rwandans returnees community.

Indicators:

- OPD attendance rate maintained greater than 1
- Proportion of deliveries by trained service providers
- Case fatality rate due to obstetric complications
- 11. Actual outcomes achieved with CERF funds

Access to basic health services including emergency obstetric care ensured to expellees' community.

The availability of life saving commodities such as Sexual and Reproductive Health (SRH) kits in hospitals and health centres from Kirehe, Bugesera, Goma and Nyagatare Districts increased access to the SRH services for women in reproductive age and especially pregnant women. The capacity of health services providers from these districts were also increased especially in minimum initial service package related to SRH including HIV, GBV prevention and management. Women and men in reproductive age had access to female and male condoms and dignity kits. Complicated Obstetric cases were referred to hospital and managed by trained health service providers.

| 12. In case of significant discrepancy between planned and actual outcomes, please describe reasons: | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|--------------|--|--|--|
| Affected populations were reintegrated in their different districts of origin and the camps were destroyed. It was therefore not possible to collect the information related to original outcome indicators after camps populations were rellocated. | | | | | |
| 13. Are the CERF funded activities part of a CAP project that applied an IASC Gender Marker of | code? | YES □ NO ⊠ | | | |
| If 'YES', what is the code (0, 1, 2a or 2b): If 'NO' (or if GM score is 1 or 0): During the planning and implementation of the CERF project, gender equality was taken into account by disagragating data by sex for different targets. For instance, dignity kits were meant for for women in Reproductive Health and young girls while male condoms were for men. | | | | | |
| 14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending? EVALUATION CARRIED OUT | | | | | |
| An evaluation of the project is expected to start in October 2014, and the report will be posted | EVALUATI | ON PENDING 🖂 | | | |
| by December 2014. | NO EVALUATION PLANNED | | | | |

| TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|--|---|-----------------------------|--|
| CER | F project informati | on | | | | | |
| 1. Ag | jency: | IOM | | | 5. CERF grant period: | 1 Oct 2013 – 31 Mar 31 2014 | |
| 2. CE | ERF project code: | 13-RR-IOM- | -040 | | 6. Status of CERF grant: | ☐ On-going | |
| 3. Cl | uster/Sector: | Movement a | assistance, Sh | nelter, CCCM | | □ Concluded | |
| 4. Pr | oject title: | Emergency | Humanitarian | Assistance to I | Returning Irregular Migrants fron | n Tanzania | |
| | a. Total project bu | dget: | Ĺ | JS\$1,254,700 | d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners: | | |
| b. Total funding received for the | | | project: | US\$ 750,375 | NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent: | US\$0 | |
| c. Amount received from CERF: | | F: US\$ 673,760 | | ■ Government Partners: US\$ 453,024 | | | |
| Results | | | | | | | |
| 8. Total number of direct beneficiaries planned and reached through CERF funding (provide a breakdown by sex and age). | | | | | | | |
| Direct Beneficiaries | | Planned | Reached | In case of significant discrepancy between planned and reached beneficiaries, please describe reasons: | | | |
| a. Female | | 5,090 | 4,183 | | eneficiaries assisted between 5 | | |
| b. Male | | 4,910 | 4,212 | September and 1 October 2013 while the planned num included them. | | | |
| c. Total individuals (female + male): | | 10,000 | 8,395 | Children under 5 were not disa statistics. | Children under 5 were not disaggregated in the movement statistics. | | |
| d Oftatal abildran under age 5 | | 1,408 | n/a | | | | |

9. Original project objective from approved CERF proposal

To support the Government of Rwanda in the provision of safe and orderly movement assistance to the Rwandan migrants expelled from Tanzania, effective camp coordination and camp management and shelter support

Specific objective:

d. Of total, children <u>under</u> age 5

- Ensure effective and timely transportation of the migrants from the border points to the transit centres, to the districts of origin and between the transit centres and to hospitals as necessary.
- Support MIDIMAR to put in place an effective camp coordination and camp management for the emergency
- Support MIDIMAR to conducting efficient and effective registration and ensure access to ID documents upon arrival
- Support MIDIMAR in ensuring access to emergency shelter in the reception facilities by repairing hangars made up with plastic sheeting and timbers
- Support MIDIMAR in provision of temporary shelter assistance to 1500 households in areas of return/relocation
- 10. Original expected outcomes from approved CERF proposal

Outcome 1: The Rwandan expellees from Tanzania safely received at the border and taken to the transit centers and relocated to districts of origin / new communities

Indicators:

- number of transported expellees: 10,670 (some expellees were transported more than once (from the border to the TC and from the TC to the districts)
- number of buses and trucks hired; 167 buses, 96 trucks and 59 ambulances were hired (calculated per day)

Outcome 2: Camp coordination and camp management is enhanced at the transit centres Indicator:

• Number of joint coordination meetings: 20 briefing meeting /month and 4 Coordination meeting / month.

Outcome 3: The expellees are screened, registered and provided with ID in a timely manner Indicator:

• Numbers of beneficiaries registered and screened for ID documents by category, age group and gender, as % of planned figures: 8,395 expellees (4,183 female, 4,212 male) were screened and registered in TCs, 2,602 were provided with ID (those above 18 years).

Outcome 4: Expelled migrants in the transit centres are provided with emergency shelter facilities Indicators:

- number of individuals assisted provided with emergency shelter: 5,879
- number of families provided with iron sheets and nails: 1,050.

11. Actual outcomes achieved with CERF funds

Outcome 1:

From October 1, 2013 – February 2, 2014, IOM ensured effective and timely transportation of 10,670 expellees from Rusumo (Kirehe district) and Ndego (Kayonza district) border points to Kiyanzi reception and transit centres (Kirehe district) and Rukara transit centre (Kayonza district). To relieve the pressure from the centres which were surpassing their capacities, further transportation to the districts of origin and relocation was also provided, as well as transfer between the reception and transit centres. Most of the destinations were in the border areas of Eastern Province, followed by the Southern and Western Provinces. IOM provided water and high energy biscuits during the travel. In addition, IOM provided vehicles to act as ambulances to transfer patients to and from the health dispensaries in the transit centres to hospitals in the nearby towns and Kigali, when necessary.

The number of expellees who benefited from the transportation services is higher than the number given in section 8 because the beneficiaries were transported more than once, thus the number of people moved is more than the actual number of expellees.

Outcome 2:

IOM provided funds to cover the cost of electricity, water and firewood in order to improve management and daily work at the centres.

Outcome 3:

IOM provided financial support to MIDIMAR to purchase 10 laptops for registration of the expellees.

Outcome 4: IOM also assisted MIDIMAR in repairing hangars made with plastic sheeting and timbers and increasing access to emergency shelter in the reception and transit facilities.

MIDIMAR used IOM's support to provide temporary shelter assistance to over 1,050 households in areas of return or relocation. 144,000 pieces of corrugated iron and plastic sheets and 9,000 kg of nails have been purchased and provided to the host districts building the temporary housing facilities for the relocated expellees and emergency shelter at the transit centres

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

A re-alignment within the budget has been made to accommodate the increased needs in running and maintenance of the transit centres. The amount of the transfer to the government was increased from original US\$397,020 to US\$453,024; the realignment moved funds from the salaries section (under seconded IOM staff) to the operational section. The staff for camp management, screening and registration of the expellees was not hired. This was at the request of the Rwandan Government (MIDIMAR) based on the administration required for secondment to the transit centres. Instead the funds were used to cover the costs of running the centres – for electricity (including security lighting), water (from state supplier EWSA) and firewood (for cooking).

| Marker code? | |
|---|------------------------|
| 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 |
| An evaluation of the project is expected to start in October 2014, and the report will be | EVALUATION PENDING 🖂 |
| posted by December 2014. | NO EVALUATION PLANNED |

| | | | TA | BLE 8: PRO | JECT RESULTS | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|----------------|------------------------|--|
| CER | F project informati | on | | | | | | |
| 1. Ag | gency: | UNHCR | | | 5. CERF grant period: | 01 Oct. 2013 | – 31 Mar. 2014 | |
| 2. CI | ERF project code: | 13-RR-HCF | R-066 | | 0.01.1 (OFDE | Ongoing | | |
| 3. CI | uster/Sector: | NFI | | | - 6. Status of CERF grant: | ⊠ Conclude | ed | |
| 4. Pr | oject title: | Provision of | Core Relief I | Items for Rwar | ndans Expelled from Tanzania | | | |
| a. Total project budget: US\$ 1,200,000 | | | | ,200,000 | d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners: | | | |
| 7.Funding | b. Total funding re | ceived for the | project: L | JS\$ 360,004 | ■ NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent: US\$ 0 | | | |
| 7. | c. Amount receive | d from CERF | : L | JS\$ 360,004 | ■ Government Partners: | US\$ 0 | | |
| Resi | ults | | , | | | , | | |
| 8. T | otal number of <u>direc</u> | t beneficiaries | planned and | d reached thro | ugh CERF funding (provide a brea | akdown by sex | and age). | |
| Direc | t Beneficiaries | | Planned | Reached | In case of significant discrepancy between planned and reached beneficiaries, please describe reasons: | | | |
| a. Fe | emale | | 5,090 | 5,090 | No discrepancy was observed | | | |
| b. Male | | | 4,910 | 4,910 | | | | |
| c. Total individuals (female + male): | | | 10,000 | 10,000 | | | | |
| d. Of total, children <u>under</u> age 5 1,408 1,408 | | | | | | | | |
| 9. O | riginal project object | tive from appr | oved CERF p | oroposal | | | | |
| | objective of the proj sic household items | | ide life-savinç | g, timely prote | ction delivery to Rwandans expel | led from Tanza | ania through provision | |
| 10. | Original expected ou | utcomes from | approved CE | RF proposal | | | | |
| Indic | ome: 10,000 person ator 1: Number of ho ator 2: Numbers of p | ousehold item | s procured a | nd preposition | , , | ge and gender | ·) | |
| 11. | Actual outcomes act | nieved with C | ERF funds | | | | | |
| 3,603 families/households with 10,000 expellees were provided with basic household's items comprising of blankets, sleeping mats, kitchen sets, jerry Cans, soap, sanitary napkins and mosquito nets. These items were essential for their daily survival and enabled them sustain their lives and dignity. Specific items were procured to be exclusively distributed to female in reproductive age; these items are soap for general distribution and sanitary pads/flannel for women. | | | | | | | | |
| 12. | In case of significant | t discrepancy | between plar | nned and actua | al outcomes, please describe reas | sons: | | |
| No d | iscrepancy was obs | erved | | | | | | |
| 13. | 13. Are the CERF funded activities part of a CAP project that applied an IASC Gender Marker code? YES NO | | | | | | | |

| If 'YES', what is the code (0, 1, 2a or 2b): If 'NO' (or if GM score is 1 or 0): The procurement and distribution of core relief items took into co and girls. The quantity of soap distributed to female in reproductive age was double than that of | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| 14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending? EVALUATION CARRIED O | | | | |
| An inter-agency evaluation is expected to start in October 2014, and the report will be posted | EVALUATION PENDING 🖂 | | | |
| by December 2014. | NO EVALUATION PLANNED | | | |

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 Transferre d | FIINADA | Comments/Remarks |
|----------------------|-----------------|--------|--|--|-----------------|--|--|---------|---|
| 13-RR-IOM-040 | Camp Management | IOM | Ministry of Disaster Management and Refugee Affairs (MIDIMAR) | No | GOV | \$453,024 | 21-Mar-14 | | IOM received an internal loan mechanism which was reimbursed when the CERF funds became available |
| 13-RR-WFP- 073 | Food Security | WFP | ADRA | No | INGO | \$48,229 | 1-Oct-13 | | WFP used advance funding to reimburse when CERF funds are available. |

ANNEX 2: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS (Alphabetical)

| ADRA | Adventist Development and Relief Agency |
|----------|--|
| CRI | Core Relief Items |
| DAO | Under the umbrella of Delivering as One |
| ECW | Enhanced Commitment for Women |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organization |
| FMD | Food mouth Disease |
| GBV | Gender-Based Violence |
| HIV | Human immunodeficiency virus |
| HIV/AIDS | Human Immunodeficiency Virus/ Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome |
| JIMC | Joint Intervention Management Committee |
| MIDIMAR | Ministry of Disaster Management and Refugee Affairs |
| MISP | Minimum Initial Service Package |
| NFI | Non Food Items |
| SGBV | Sexual and Gender-Based Violence |
| STI | Sexually Transmitted Infections |
| TAD | Trans-boundary Animal Diseases |
| TC | Transit Center |
| UN | United Nations |
| UNFPA | United Nations Population Fund |
| UNHCR | United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees |
| UNICEF | United Nations Children's Fund |
| WASH | Water Sanitation and Hygiene |
| WFP | World Food Organization |
| WHO | World health Organization |