



United Nations

**CENTRAL
EMERGENCY
RESPONSE FUND**



A SOUND HUMANITARIAN INVESTMENT

**RESIDENT / HUMANITARIAN COORDINATOR
REPORT ON THE USE OF CERF FUNDS
ZIMBABWE
RAPID RESPONSE
DROUGHT**

RESIDENT/HUMANITARIAN COORDINATOR

Mr. Reza Hossaini

REPORTING PROCESS AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY

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

Between 1 and 5 July 2014, OCHA and WFP held an informal after action review by mainly focusing on the challenges faced during the preparatory phases of the application. These are reflected in Tables 6 and 7.

- 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

This report has been shared with the WFP and OCHA.

I. HUMANITARIAN CONTEXT

TABLE 1: EMERGENCY ALLOCATION OVERVIEW (US\$)		
Total amount required for the humanitarian response:86,000,000		
Breakdown of total response funding received by source	Source	Amount
	CERF	1,967,415
	COMMON HUMANITARIAN FUND/ EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND (if applicable)	224,994
	OTHER (bilateral/multilateral)	42,925,711
	TOTAL	45,118,120

TABLE 2: CERF EMERGENCY FUNDING BY ALLOCATION AND PROJECT (US\$)			
Allocation 1 – date of official submission: 15 November 2013			
Agency	Project code	Cluster/Sector	Amount
WFP	13-RR-WFP-079	Food	1,967,415
TOTAL			1,967,415

TABLE 3: BREAKDOWN OF CERF FUNDS BY TYPE OF IMPLEMENTATION MODALITY (US\$)	
Type of implementation modality	Amount
Direct UN Agencies/IOM implementation	1,691,166
Funds forwarded to NGOs for implementation	276,249
Funds forwarded to government partners	0
TOTAL	1,967,415

HUMANITARIAN NEEDS

The 2012/2013 agricultural season was characterised by a late start of rains, then heavy rainfall/flooding in January, followed by a prolonged dry spell. As a result, Zimbabwe's April 2013 harvest was poor, leaving the country with a large food deficit. The 2013 Second Round Crop and Livestock Report indicated that the national cereal production for 2012/2013 was only 909,965 tons - far below the national requirements of 2,100,000 tons per year. According to the 2013 Zimbabwe Vulnerability Assessment Committee (ZimVAC) Rural Livelihoods Report which was released in late July 2013, at the peak of the 'hunger season' in January to March 2014, 2.2 million people (25 percent of the rural population) were assessed to be in need of food assistance - 32 percent higher than the previous year, when 1.67 million (or 19 percent) of the rural population required food assistance. The 2014 food insecure population was the highest in the past five years.

In April 2013, the Government of Zimbabwe expressed concern about the 2013 cereal harvest, stating that there were many areas that had registered zero harvests, and immediately requested food assistance from the international community. At this time, WFP monitoring

found that the average price of maize grain was \$0.39 per kilogram, which was 13 percent higher than the average price in June 2012. Given the deteriorating food security situation, there was imminent risk of increased poverty and vulnerability, the reduction of vital assets and the erosion of resilience. Zimbabwe already had high levels of chronic malnutrition, with one in three children malnourished and 72 percent of the population living below the national poverty line (on less than US\$1.25 per day). In addition, some 30.4 percent of rural poor were considered to be food poor or extremely poor at the time. Although the prevalence of HIV had reduced, it still remained high with 14.9 percent of adults living with HIV – many of whom were also suffering from malnutrition due to food insecurity. Following signs pointing towards deteriorating food insecurity, WFP negotiated with the Government and other partners to finalize the number to be assisted and the numbers were established after careful verifications and consultation with a number of partners. This process culminated to a request to CERF in November 2013.

II. FOCUS AREAS AND PRIORITIZATION

Geographic targeting of the STA programme is based on the Zimbabwe Vulnerability Assessment Committee (ZimVAC) rural livelihood assessment, which identified Matabeleland North and South, Masvingo and Midlands as the worst-affected areas. The districts projected to have the highest proportion of food insecure households at the peak were Zvishavane (51 per cent), Binga (50 per cent), Mangwe (50 per cent) and Chiredzi (47 per cent) - the districts targeted for the CERF grant.

When comparing the 2013 ZimVAC report to the information on the most affected districts in the Zimbabwe Demographic Health Survey (ZDHS), there is a clearer picture of who is affected and why. The ZDHS 2010-11 states that 83 per cent of farmers, those in unstable employment and unemployed, are women. Consequently, this expected increase in food insecurity could disproportionately affect women as they are the most vulnerable not only to food insecurity but also to livelihood security.

The Zimbabwe Demographic Health Survey (ZDHS) 2010-2011 as the most recent data available still holds validity as there has not been significant improvement in the stunting rates. According to this survey, 32 per cent of children under the age of 5 years are stunted (short for their age), 3 per cent are wasted (thin for their height) and 10 per cent are underweight (thin for their age). Rural children are worse off across all indicators than children living in urban areas. In rural areas, 33.4 per cent of children under 5 years are stunted, 3.2 per cent are wasted, and 10.2 per cent are underweight, while in urban areas, 27.5 per cent of children under 5 are stunted, 2.1 per cent are wasted and 8.1 per cent are underweight.

III. CERF PROCESS

WFP's STA programme was part of the Food Cluster's priority interventions in Zimbabwe's 2013 Humanitarian Gaps appeal. A consultative strategic planning workshop in October 2012 brought together the Government, donors, UN agencies and NGOs to jointly prioritise, plan, coordinate, implement and monitor responses to food insecurity. The Food Cluster's priority was to save lives and protect the livelihoods of households that are most affected by seasonal and transitory food shortages; to improve nutritional well-being of vulnerable groups; and to strengthen Government and community capacity to manage and implement hunger reduction approaches. Activities were prioritised on the basis of the 2013 Zimbabwe Vulnerability Assessment Committee (ZimVAC) which was released in late July 2013 and resulted in a humanitarian action plan in the Food Cluster. There were no projected changes in needs in the WASH and Protection clusters.

This CERF appeal was reviewed by members of the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) at the request of the Humanitarian Coordinator. The Food response was a standing agenda item at the HCT meetings. The request was informed through a consultative process through the Food Assistance Working Group meetings, whose members formed the Food Cluster. In addition, various donors have been approached through bilateral meetings and correspondence apprising them of the on-going crisis. Since the release of the ZimVAC report in August 2013, the deteriorating food security situation in Zimbabwe was discussed extensively in meetings at the HCT, with NGOs, Government representatives, World Bank and other donors.

The reason this request was solely from the Food Cluster was because other sectors such as agriculture, education, WASH and health were using transition funds and other recovery mechanisms to meet some of the emergency needs. There is no transition fund for food, therefore food was only funded through humanitarian/emergency funding channels.

The intervention was carried out within the above coordination frameworks, including key NGO co-operating partners involved in programme implementation, the Ministry of Labour and Social Services as WFP's partner ministry, and provincial and district authorities at field level.

IV. CERF RESULTS AND ADDED VALUE

TABLE 4: AFFECTED INDIVIDUALS AND REACHED DIRECT BENEFICIARIES BY SECTOR				
Total number of individuals affected by the crisis: 1,800,000				
The estimated total number of individuals directly supported through CERF funding by cluster/sector	Cluster/Sector	Female	Male	Total
	Food	61,620	56,880	118,500

BENEFICIARY ESTIMATION

As this was a single agency CERF submission, the estimated reached beneficiaries was the number directly assisted by WFP through the Seasonal Targetted Assistance (STA) programme.

TABLE 5: PLANNED AND REACHED DIRECT BENEFICIARIES THROUGH CERF FUNDING		
	Planned	Estimated Reached
Female	85,800	61,620
Male	79,200	56,880
Total individuals (Female and male)	165,000	118,500
Of total, children under age 5	28,050	20,145

CERF RESULTS

The CERF funding was used to provide food assistance to 118,500 people for four months through WFP's Seasonal Targetted Assistance (STA) programme, which contributed towards protecting lives, livelihoods and enhancing self-reliance in vulnerable households affected by the 2013 drought. The highest proportion of food insecure households at peak was estimated by ZIMVAC to be in Zvishavane (52 per cent), followed by Binga (50 per cent), Mangwe (50 per cent) and Chiredzi (47 per cent). The WFP assistance basket in Binga, Chiredzi, Mangwe and Zvishavane during seasonal targeted assistance comprised of 10kg of cereal, 2kg of pulses and 0.75kg of vegetable oil in these four most food insecure districts of the country.

WFP used the Household Food Consumption Score (FCS) to establish the outcome of food assistance to targeted households. The FCS is a food consumption indicator that reflects the quantity and quality of households' diet and is therefore used as a proxy for household food security. The food consumption score is used to classify households into three groups: poor, borderline or acceptable food consumption. Households with poor food consumption are not consuming staples and vegetables every day and very seldom any protein-rich foods. Households with borderline consumption are consuming staples and vegetables every day accompanied by vegetable oil and pulses a few times a week. Those with acceptable consumption are consuming staples and vegetables every day, frequently accompanied by vegetable oil and pulses and occasionally meat, fish or dairy products.

Results from a community and household surveillance exercise conducted by WFP during the first quarter of 2014, showed that over half of the assisted households (56 per cent) had acceptable food consumption and 38 per cent borderline consumption. This contrasts favourably with non-beneficiary households, 54 per cent of whom had acceptable consumption and 37 per cent borderline consumption, and highlights the impact of food assistance in bringing household food consumption in vulnerable food insecure households up to the level of that of food secure households in targeted areas.

CERF's ADDED VALUE

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

YES PARTIALLY NO

WFP utilized its Forward Purchase Facility (FPF) to procure food commodities with the CERF contribution. WFP's Forward Purchase Facility (FPF) is a fund from WFP's headquarters, availed to WFP procurement units to facilitate the purchase of commodities for a particular zone/region in advance. It assists with cost effectiveness, as procurement takes place when the commodity prices are lowest, soon after the harvest period. The FPF also reduces the lead-time from contribution confirmation to delivery, as suppliers have readied the commodity in advance for WFP to uplift later. With the CERF grant, WFP was able to reduce the lead-time by 2 months and assistance was quickly delivered at the peak of the hunger season to all the four districts.

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

YES PARTIALLY NO

The contribution was received as the peak of the hunger season was setting in. The CERF grant increased food access and helped to cover critical food needs during the peak hunger season and also promote dietary diversity. According to the SMART Nutrition survey, districts that received low or no food assistance reported low dietary diversity and poor food consumption scores. In addition, the assistance also reduced the use of negative coping strategies that would otherwise undermine household abilities to meet their future needs.

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

YES PARTIALLY NO

During the monthly Food Assistance Working Group meetings, confirmed contributions were announced. Donors took note of where funds were coming from, and were pleased that several sources had been approached and various funds granted. Following the CERF contribution, WFP received an additional US\$4 million contribution from USAID in February 2014 for support to food assistance programming.

d) Did CERF improve coordination amongst the humanitarian community?

YES PARTIALLY NO

The Food Assistance Working Group provides strong coordination to actors in the food sector. The CERF grant strengthened dialogue and coordination with other structures such as the HCT, which had to approve the CERF application. This resulted in improved linkages between the two coordination structures.

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

TABLE 6: OBSERVATIONS FOR THE CERF SECRETARIAT

Lessons learned	Suggestion for follow-up/improvement	Responsible entity

TABLE 7: OBSERVATIONS FOR COUNTRY TEAMS

Lessons learned	Suggestion for follow-up/improvement	Responsible entity
The delayed release of ZIMVAC impacted negatively on the timely humanitarian response.	Advocacy with Government on release on timely information where emergency indicators/stress levels are showing is required.	Resident Coordinator, OCHA, relevant Agency
Need to prepare for overcoming bureaucratic procedures to ensure timely humanitarian response	Country Team, based on solid evidence, including agency reports should sound alarm bells where bureaucracy stifles timely release of Government reports.	Resident Coordinator, UNCT, relevant agencies
There was an issue of timeliness and late submission of the proposal to CERF secretariat owing to a lengthy negotiation process. This has been a recurring issue over the last few years.	There is need for clearer guidance from OCHA on timelines, submissions and the templates to be used at the various stages – proposal, reporting.	OCHA

VI. PROJECT RESULTS

TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS

TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS			
CERF project information			
1. Agency:	WFP	5. CERF grant period:	25 November 2013 to 24 May 2014
2. CERF project code:	13-RR-WFP-079	6. Status of CERF grant:	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing
3. Cluster/Sector:	Food		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded
4. Project title:	Responding to humanitarian needs of people severely affected by food shortage in 4 districts		
7. Funding	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 86,000,000 ²	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$45,118,120	▪ NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent: US\$ 276,249
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 1,967,415	▪ Government Partners: US\$ 0
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	85,800	61,620	WFP's original target was to reach 1.8 million people in 42 districts. Given the original plan, WFP would target 118,500 people (directly attributable to CERF). However, owing to resource constraints, distributions had to be prioritised with WFP revising the number of people being targeted downwards in-order to sustain operations and assist the most vulnerable.
b. Male	79,200	56,880	
c. Total individuals (female + male):	165,000	118,500	
d. Of total, children <u>under</u> age 5	28,050	20,145	
9. Original project objective from approved CERF proposal			
To save the lives and protect the livelihoods of vulnerable households affected by this year's drought and consequential seasonal food shortages.			
10. Original expected outcomes from approved CERF proposal			
The expected outcome is improved food consumption over the assistance period for targeted emergency-affected populations.			
The SMART indicators are as follows:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Household food consumption score: Target: Food consumption score exceeds 35 (a score of 35 or more indicates acceptable food consumption) Number of women, men, girls and boys receiving food and non-food items, by category and as per cent of planned: Target: 100 per cent Tonnage of food distributed, by type, as per cent of planned Target: 100 per cent 			

² The original requirement was US\$86 million targetting 1.8 million people. The project proposal indicated \$40 million as total requirement following operational revision to target 950,000.

11. Actual outcomes achieved with CERF funds	
<p>94 percent (111,390) of the 118,500 assisted beneficiaries had a food consumption score exceeding 35. 100 percent of women, men; girls and boys following the revised target received food items over the assistance period. 100 percent of food bought with the CERF grant was distributed (1,839.25mt maize and 435.90mt pulses bought from Zambia and Malawi respectively)</p>	
12. In case of significant discrepancy between planned and actual outcomes, please describe reasons:	
<p>Due to changes in the commodity prices on the regional market, WFP was unable to procure the 2,168 mt that had been envisaged at the proposal stage of this application. However, the funds received were fully utilised whilst purchasing 1,839.25 mt of cereals from Zambia.</p>	
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"/>
<p>If 'YES', what is the code (0, 1, 2a or 2b): 1 If 'NO' (or if GM score is 1 or 0): WFP's programme was in line with the WFP gender policy, ensuring that women and children have equal access to and benefit from food assistance programmes that meet their nutrition needs. WFP facilitated gender mainstreaming at all district programme trainings. WFP carried out sensitization sessions and partners on the importance of gender equality so as to achieve gender parity in leadership positions in food management committees. More women received monthly rations for their families and were also represented as beneficiaries and managers of the assets created. WFP included information on gender and the prevention of sexual abuse and harassment in all its programme training. Pre-distribution meetings were used as platforms to advocate for gender issues. This enabled women to actively contribute to decision making related to planning and management of the programme. As the primary ration card holders, women were also assured direct access to food. More than 52 percent of food recipients were women and at least 80 percent of decision making positions in food distribution committees were held by women. WFP prioritised the needs of child-headed families and elderly headed households for assistance.</p>	
14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?	EVALUATION CARRIED OUT <input type="checkbox"/>
No specific CERF evaluation has been planned in the project.	EVALUATION PENDING <input type="checkbox"/>
	NO EVALUATION PLANNED <input checked="" 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-079	Food Assistance	WFP	ADRA	Yes	INGO	\$33,391	13-Jan-14	1-Nov-13	
13-RR-WFP-079	Food Assistance	WFP	Plan International	Yes	INGO	\$72,878	13-Jan-14	1-Nov-13	
13-RR-WFP-079	Food Assistance	WFP	ORAP	Yes	NNGO	\$86,817	6-Dec-13	1-Oct-13	
13-RR-WFP-079	Food Assistance	WFP	Save the Children	Yes	INGO	\$83,163	16-Dec-13	1-Oct-13	

ANNEX 2: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS (Alphabetical)

FCS	Food Consumption Score
FPF	Forward Purchase Facility
HCT	Humanitarian Country Team
WFP	United Nations World Food Programme
ZDHS	Zimbabwe Demographic Health Survey
ZimVAC	Zimbabwe Vulnerability Assessment Committee Rural Livelihoods Report.