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Figure 1: Map of Somalia
Executive Summary

This report is one of four country studies looking at the added value of the CERF in the overall response to the Horn of Africa Drought in 2011, as part of the implementation of the Fund’s Performance and Accountability Framework (PAF). A regional synthesis report looks at overarching conclusions from the four reports. Somalia in 2011 was an extremely challenging environment for humanitarian actors. As the crisis escalated during the first half of the year, funding levels for humanitarian actors remained very low, following the established pattern from the previous year. Only when the crisis reached its peak in the middle of the year, did donors switch from reticence to response.

Timeliness of CERF: The use of the CERF in Somalia in 2011 has to be seen against the backdrop of a slow response on the part of the whole humanitarian system. In combination with the CHF, the UFE grant at the beginning of the year went some way to offsetting a critical funding shortfall. Funds from the RR window came marginally, but critically, ahead of a general upswing in funds, due largely to responsive and quick processing by the CERF Secretariat. There was an overall consensus that the request to the RR window could have been made earlier\(^1\). The potential for use of the CERF at an earlier stage of crisis response is covered in the regional synthesis report.

Transparency and inclusivity of process: Previous PAF reports have noted the extent to which the CERF is viewed as an internal funding stream for the larger UN humanitarian Agencies. This perception was very apparent in Somalia and arguably to a greater extent than in other PAF review countries. A clear majority of actors felt that the CERF strengthened the hand of the HC but there was no sense that reform more broadly was strengthened directly by the CERF. There is a clear sense that coordination in Somalia is strong overall and that participation in the clusters and the CAP, a prerequisite for access to the CHF, is high. That the CAP and the clusters provide the over-arching frame work within which the CERF operates, is taken by some as evidence that the CERF supports reform indirectly. The role of the clusters is not strengthened directly by the CERF, however, as they have little or no role in the allocation of CERF funds. This finding is in keeping with the Somalia CHF review, which noted the lack of cluster involvement in strategic allocations. Placed in the context of Somalia in 2011, the need for a directive rather than consultative allocation is understandable, albeit against CERF guidance. NGOs and donors interviewed for the study felt unsighted on all issues related to the CERF.

Gap filling by the CERF: Allocations from the UFE were made in conjunction with the CHF and as such, through a gap analysis. Allocations from both windows were perceived to have filled gaps, including the need for significant expansions, within the programmatic responses of UN agencies. The large allocations to WFP and UNICEF were used to fill large pipeline gaps caused, in part, by the large funding deficits at the time. Other CERF recipients, notably WHO and FAO were felt that they were able to use CERF funding from both windows to fill critical gaps.

\(^1\) The regional synthesis report looks at the issue of the CERF in ‘early response’
Monitoring, evaluation and reporting: Given the extreme challenges of access in Somalia, many agencies cannot undertake first hand monitoring or evaluation of partners. Agencies have responded to this challenge in a number of ways, including the extensive use of third party monitoring. The CERF has primarily deepened UN programmes through existing partners. As a result, whilst there are a number of issues related to evaluation in Somalia, none of the respondents felt that the CERF had a significant impact in either monitoring or evaluation.

There is no current link between monitoring or evaluation of CHF and CERF projects. Monitoring and evaluation have long been acknowledged as a critical weakness in country level pooled funds and the Somalia CHF Review makes a number of recommendations for OCHA’s FCU. As the FCU actively plans to follow up on these recommendations, it should explicitly look for ways to make concrete links to CERF projects, and to extend monitoring arrangements and evaluation plans where at all feasible.

Given repeated experience of the CERF, most agencies were satisfied that they could construct reports to the CERF from their internal / existing monitoring and reporting systems and have not undertaken specific arrangements for CERF projects. By and large, the FCU were happy with the quality and timeliness of agency reporting. For the large majority of CERF projects, partners were not involved in the construction of reports to the CERF. In keeping with the very limited role of clusters in the CERF, there were no joint, cluster led processes around reporting. There was no joint process in the HCT around reporting to the CERF and the report was not jointly discussed amongst UN agencies or with partners as part of the reporting process.

Recommendations:

a. Complementarity between future CERF allocations (in particular UFE allocations) and the CHF should be formalised and continue to the fullest extent possible. This should include ensuring that any future UFE allocations take place at the same time as standard allocation rounds for the CHF.

b. The Somalia CHF makes a number of specific recommendations. The management plan to follow up on these recommendations should explicitly review these recommendations and consider how each may be relevant to the CERF.

c. Special attention should be played by the FCU in extending enhanced monitoring and evaluation processes for the CHF to CERF projects where at all feasible.

d. By way of increasing transparency of CERF allocations, the role of the clusters in CERF allocations should be examined. Again, this should be undertaken alongside the examination of the clusters’ role in CHF allocations, recommended by the review.

e. By way of increasing transparency of CERF allocations, the CHF Advisory Board (which contains donors and NGO representatives) should formally review CERF allocations. The Board is a diverse group, including UN agency heads, donors and NGO representatives and already focussed on the issue of funding priorities for the CHF. The Board should consider the strategic justifications for the CERF allocations (geography, sector and responding agency) rather than the programmatic detail.
Section 1: Introduction and the Somali Context

This report is the result of an independent review of CERF funding in Somalia. As part of the implementation of the Fund’s Performance and Accountability Framework (PAF), the added value of the CERF in the overall response to the Horn of Africa drought in 2011 was examined through a regional review consisting of four country reviews, of which this is one. The findings are based on a visit to Nairobi between May 9th and May 24th and a complementary review of documents related to the Somali context. As per the study's TOR, the primary focus of the discussions was CERF funding to Somalia during 2011, however, discussions related to earlier CERF allocations, and the first CERF allocation in 2012 are included where relevant. The visit consisted of a series of interviews with those involved with CERF processes in 2011, including UN staff and other humanitarian actors. The full TOR is at annex A. In keeping with the TOR and discussions with the CERF Secretariat, interviews were semi-structured and based on an interview guide expanded from a template developed for the pilot study in Kenya in 2010.

Somalia represents a highly challenging political and security environment for humanitarian actors and instruments, including the CERF. It is essential that the findings and recommendations of this review are placed in context and viewed in light of recent studies on coordination in Somalia. Two key studies are frequently referenced in this report:

- A review of the Somalia Common Humanitarian Fund\(^2\) undertaken in 2012, referred to hereafter as the Somalia CHF review
- The IASC Real Time Evaluation\(^3\) of the response to the drought crisis in Somalia, referred to hereafter as the Somalia RTE

The description below aims to set a backdrop specifically for the use of the CERF and, as such to introduce issues deemed of particular importance by respondents for this review. It does not set out to explain government structures or the political environment in Somalia in a comprehensive fashion.

1.1 Caveats and constraints

Although most Nairobi based stakeholders made themselves available for the study, a small number have no significant representation in Nairobi and their views could not be sought. The challenge of fully understanding the operational context in Somalia through a relatively short set of interviews in Nairobi is representative of the broader challenges of ‘displaced’ coordination structures. Given security and logistical constraints, it was not feasible to undertake any field visits for this study; these have been critical in understanding the field realities in similar country studies for the CERF. A high level of staff turnover in a number


\(^3\) Darcy, J., et al (2012) IASC Real Time Evaluation of the Somalia drought crisis response – First draft report. This was the latest available draft at the time of the field visits.
of key agencies since the height of the response in 2011 meant that a number of views on
the use of the CERF were second hand.

1.2 Somali Context

The Somalia RTE and other evaluations of the Somali crisis in 2011 note that although
labelled a ‘drought crisis’, emergency conditions arose from a number of inter-related factors
including:

- ‘the (La Niña-related) failure of two consecutive rains and the escalation of food
  prices relative to the value of livestock and wages.
- the [cumulative] effects of successive shocks in recent years to overwhelm… fragile
  livelihoods and purchasing power, particularly among the agro-pastoralist
  communities of South Central Somalia.’

Even though crisis conditions had become the norm in Somalia, 2011 represented a major
escalation. Whilst the most prominent facet of the crisis was a lack of access to food,
ultimately resulting in famine conditions in parts of South Central in mid to late 2011, a
number of distinct crises were evident: failing food security, livelihoods and nutrition; a lack
of access to water; mass stress displacement and violent insecurity.

Clearly the collective crisis has to be placed within the context of the on-going armed
conflict and the national and tribal politics of Somalia. All of these have had a strong
influence on the emergency itself and also in influencing the shape and dynamics of the
response. A great deal has been written about the situation in Somalia in 2011. In setting out
the context, this report will focus on three issues of direct relevance to the CERF:

- relations between the UN and partners / implementers in Somalia.
- the challenges related to sustained and secure access to central and southern Somalia,
  including the worst affected areas
- the behaviour of donors and, specifically the timing of funding into Somalia in 2011

The RTE notes a general mistrust of the UN resulting from events in the 1990s and a
consequent ‘bunker’ mentality which has continued to characterise UN operations. Also
noted is the engagement of the broader UN system in political and military agendas which
have led to tensions with the UN’s humanitarian role and strained relations with NGOs,
particularly INGOs, who have been wary of association. The proliferation of Islamic NGOs
and interventions by OIC member states, most notably Turkey, has also been held up to a
certain extent as an alternative to the UN led humanitarian system in this specific context.

The RTE also notes the impact of international counter terrorism efforts on the
humanitarian response. Security Council resolutions and the legislation of donors (in
particular the US) have effectively restricted both aid flows and interaction with Al Shabaab.
Many interviewees for the study also noted the effect of the report of the Monitoring Group
on Somalia, which reported in 2010 on the large scale diversion of WFP food, although
WFP strongly contest the report’s findings.
One of the key characteristics of relief efforts has been the severe limitation on secure access to the South Central region, which contains many of the worst affected areas. It is impossible to construct any summary which, for the purposes of this exercise, usefully describes which areas were accessible to which actors during which time frames. The RTE and interviewees for this study highlighted a number of points specifically relevant to access:

- the UN system as a whole had significant challenges in negotiating access with the Al Shabaab, who controlled a very significant proportion of the areas most badly affected. The consequences of these issues were particularly acute for the food sector.
- UN agencies dealing with nutrition and non-food assistance were better able to sustain some operations areas through predominantly local partners.
- Independent actors ICRC and MSF had on going challenges with negotiating access but were able to operate at scale in Al Shabaab areas for long periods during 2011. In the absence of a WFP programme in Al Shabaab areas, ICRC undertook general food distribution.
- A number of other INGOs, and a large number of NNGOs were able to operate in limited geographical areas.

Constraints on access manifest themselves in a lack of first-hand information and the need to run operations by remote. Evaluations note the implications for effectiveness and accountability that come with such a heavy reliance on remote operations.

Studies also note the central role of food aid in Somalia and the significant impact of its withdrawal in the run up to the drought. The RTE states that approximately 30% of the cereal requirement for South Central Somalia had been provided by WFP and its partners. On this basis alone, their forced withdrawal was a very significant event. The RTE also notes that malnutrition rates were running well above emergency thresholds in some areas, before the famine emergency was declared.

### 1.3 Humanitarian Funding to Somalia

This section aims to provide an overview of humanitarian funding flows to Somalia, including a view on the relative importance of the CERF and the CHF.

#### 1.3.1 Funding Flows / timing:

Figures 2 and 3 demonstrate the low levels of funding for Somalia during 2010 and into 2011. Figure 3 is taken from OCHA’s ‘Humanitarian Funding Analysis from Somalia’. It demonstrates graphically the relatively low funding flows into programmes until mid-July 2011, followed by an exponential rise during that month. This has to be viewed in the context of the emergency revision of the CAP; which doubled the original request to $1.06

---

4 The majority of the data is drawn from OCHA’s Financial Tracking System (FTS) with the exception of the analysis of implementation channels, which is taken from the CERF Secretariat database and the HC’s 2011 Annual Report.

5 OCHA, February 2012
billion. An additional figure (13) below (see timeliness of CERF funding) demonstrates the inputs of the CERF in relation to other donors.

Figure 2: Humanitarian Funding to Somalia (2000-2012)

Humanitarian Funding to Somalia (2000-2012)

Figure 3: 2011 CAP Funding by Month

A detailed analysis of funding flows is beyond the scope of this report. The RTE and respondents for this study noted a number a key factors surrounding this funding pattern:
That the dearth of financial flows during 2010 early 2011 was, in part, due to restrictions on the funding of food aid and the effects of the Monitoring Group report on Somalia. This was reported as instrumental in influencing the behaviour of donors in 2010 and early 2011 and exacerbating what many described as a pervasive atmosphere of risk aversion until July of 2011. At this point, and following the declaration of famine, reticence was overtaken by political pressure to respond. The re-engagement of USAID at this time was obviously a very significant factor.

The transference of risk to the multi-lateral system through the CHF was a feature of funding until mid-2011. The CHF has been seen to play a valuable role in the response through its standard allocations and its own emergency reserve. Both the CHF review and the RTE (in keeping with other evaluations of country level pooled funds) note that the process is relatively long and heavy. Following the declaration of famine, donors tended to favour large bilateral allocations. In part, this was reported as being due to the relative administrative efficiency of larger grants. Donors also acknowledged that this was a sign of pressure to spend overtaking risk related reticence.

1.3.2 CERF funding:

Somalia has received $157,483,135m in CERF funding since 2006, the second largest recipient. Somalia was the largest recipient of CERF funding in 2011, receiving a total of almost $53m. Figure 4 shows the size of CERF funding in relation to other donors. Relative to other donors, the CERF was the 19th largest donor to Somalia providing approximately 4% of overall funding. This stands in contrast to the 2010 FTS reported CERF contributions which place the CERF as the sixth largest humanitarian donor (albeit with a smaller overall contribution). In 2011, the top 20 donors to Somalia in 2011 are responsible for providing almost 70% of overall funding.

Figure 4: Breakdown of top 20 humanitarian contributors to Somalia 2011
When food aid is eliminated, the donor profile changes and the CERF plays a larger role rising from 19th to ninth largest donor.

Figure 5: Breakdown of non-food humanitarian contributions to Somalia 2011

Somalia received one underfunded and two rapid response allocations in 2011, including a special second allocation to UNICEF. The RR window accounted for approximately 70% of this total.

1.3.3 The CERF and the Somalia Common Humanitarian Fund (CHF):

The Common Humanitarian Fund (CHF) is a country-level pooled fund for Somalia, described in detail at the end of this section (the transition from the previous Humanitarian Response Fund (HRF) took place in 2010). In terms of both intent and process, the CHF has many areas of complementarity with the CERF. In 2011, the CHF disbursed approximately $85 million USD in 2011. Figure 6 shows donors to the CHF in 2011. One specific aim of the CHF model is to provide a channel for small donors with no representation in country.

Figure 6: 2011 CHF Donor Breakdown
Table 1 and Figure 8 show the relative contributions of the CERF and CHF/HRF since 2007. This table illustrates steadily increasing contributions through the CERF RR as well as a sharp increase in funding following the transition from the HRF to CHF in mid-2010.

Table 1: CERF, CHF/HRF and Total Humanitarian Funding to Somalia in USD (2007 - 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CERF UFE</th>
<th>CERF RR</th>
<th>CHF/HRF</th>
<th>Total Humanitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1 million</td>
<td>15 million</td>
<td>19 million</td>
<td>360 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12 million</td>
<td>21 million</td>
<td>640 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>10 million</td>
<td>17 million</td>
<td>21 million</td>
<td>660 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33 million</td>
<td>21 million</td>
<td>500 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>15 million</td>
<td>38 million</td>
<td>105 million</td>
<td>1,340 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7: CERF, CRF/HRF and Total Humanitarian Funding to Somalia (2007 - 2011)
1.3.4 CERF Implementation Channels:

The 2011 HC report states that nearly 90% of CERF funds were channelled through the UN system. This is an unusually high proportion, but can explained at least in part in two ways:

- The CHF shows a higher than average percentage of funding to NGOs. Where CERF and the CHFs are used in a complementary fashion, it is not unusual for the CHF to focus on NGO programming and the CERF on the UN. That said, a fully complementary allocation process (described below), was only evident for the UFE window.
- The largest funding tranches from the RR window to UNICEF and WFP were used predominantly for the purchase / transportation of large bulks of relief commodities, ultimately to be distributed through implementers but registered as allocations to the UN.

Figure 8: Implementation Channel CERF funding 2011
As noted in Figure 9, the lion’s share of funding went to two UN agencies, UNICEF and WFP. The proportion of funding to UNICEF was enhanced as a result of the second, special allocation. Figure 10 shows the proportion of CERF funding to Somalia in 2011, by UN agency.

**Figure 9: CERF Funding 2011 by UN Agency**

Figure 11 shows the relative amount of humanitarian funding that each agency has received from the CERF. As is typical in pooled funding arrangements, FAO and WHO receive a relatively high proportion of funding from the CERF. The largest recipients in absolute terms receive less as a percentage of overall funding, by virtue of their extremely large programmes. UNDP receives a relatively high proportion of its funding for humanitarian labelled programmes from the CERF. Figure 13 makes the same comparison by cluster.
Table 2 provides a breakdown of CERF allocations by window.

Table 2: Summary of 2011 CERF Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Window</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| February | $15m | **UNICEF** – Nutrition, medical and water, hygiene and sanitation interventions for affected communities.  
**FAO** – Acute food and livelihood support.  
**UNHCR** – NFI kits.  
**WFP** – Food and livelihood assistance.  
**WHO** – Emergency health interventions. | Underfunded |
| July   | $38m  | **UNICEF** – Nutrition, medical and sanitation interventions for affected communities. (includes second special allocation of $10 million)  
**FAO** – Livelihood support for agropastoralists.  
**WFP** – Food and coordination services. | Rapid response |
WHO – Health support to affected populations.

UNDP – Emergency drought support.

TOTAL $53m

Figure 11: Proportion of Cluster Funding Received from CERF 2011

Figure 12: CERF Funding by Sector 2011
1.4 Humanitarian Coordination for Somalia

Humanitarian coordination for Somalia remains based predominantly in Nairobi. Although coordination mechanisms are not the direct focus of this study, the CERF (as all pooled funding mechanisms to a greater or lesser extent) uses them as core structures through which to make allocation decisions. The CERF Secretariat, through its own guidance notes and the PAF indicator set, makes it clear that it expects an allocation process to be led by the HC and rooted in the cluster system. In this respect, the CERF has certain synergies with the Somalia Common Humanitarian Fund (CHF), described below.

1.4.1 Standing coordination structures for Somalia

The UNCT is the formal meeting place for the heads of all UN agencies across all of their roles. The ‘Heads of Humanitarian Agencies’ is an informal and un-minuted meeting, attended by only heads and or senior staff of UN humanitarian agencies. It was originally initiated as a forum to discuss or consolidate cross UN positions on humanitarian issues behind closed doors.

Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) meeting is the highest level consultative forum on humanitarian issues. The HCT is chaired by the HC and includes UN agencies (in their agency guise, not as cluster leads), representatives of INGOs and the Somalia NGO Consortium and representatives of the Red Cross in an observer role. Donors do not attend the HCT, but are invited to a separate HCT donor meeting. The Inter Cluster Working Group, as per its title, plays a technical function, bringing together the individual cluster leads for cross cluster analysis. The group ‘reports’ to the HCT.

Each cluster has its own meeting schedule, at the national level in Nairobi and in a small number of field locations. Clusters play a significant role in the construction of the CAP and in the allocation of funding through the Somalia CHF.

1.4.2 The Somalia CHF:

The Somalia CHF is a significant funding channel for Somalia, as noted above. Common Humanitarian Funds are utilised in a number of large, long standing emergencies. Each is based on a set of standard principles, but no two are the same. CHFs are typically significantly sized pools of funding (typically US$90 - $150 million per annum), placed by contributing donors at the disposal of the Humanitarian Coordinator. Common characteristics of CHFs include their intention to:

- contribute to the timeliness and coherence of humanitarian response
- fill gaps (sectoral and geographical)
- improve prioritisation within the CAP (or equivalent) and to complement other funding flows, not least through improving transparency and coordination of all humanitarian funding
- strengthen the role and capacity of the Humanitarian Coordinator and the clusters
In keeping with other CHFs, the Somalia Fund has four basic process steps and supporting management structures:

- **Governance / oversight structure** – typically undertaken by an advisory or management board. In Somalia this is the CHF Advisory Board – chaired by the HC and made up of UN agency heads, donors and NGO representatives.

- **An ‘allocation’ process.** In simple terms, the mechanism through which fund managers decide how, where and through which partners the fund is best spent. In Somalia the fund is managed by the Funding Coordination Unit (FCU) within OCHA, on behalf of the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC). Allocations at the strategic level are driven by the HC, in conjunction with the FCU, this process results in ‘envelopes of funding’, divided according to perceived geographical and sectoral priorities. Clusters, including Cluster Review Committees (CRCs), then recommend project level allocations from these envelopes.

- **Funding disbursement and financial management function** – for NGOs this role is played by OCHA (a combination of FCU in Nairobi and OCHA in Geneva). For UN agencies this role is played by UNDP, via its Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office (MPTF) in New York.

- **Monitoring, evaluation, and information management function.** Evaluation is a challenging issue in all pooled funds. Pooled funds often provide partial funding to large projects or programmes, making it hard to attribute outcomes to the Fund’s specific inputs. Another fundamental challenge is that neither the fund managers, nor the HC on whose behalf they operate, have the authority to evaluate, or to commission evaluations of funded projects The primary line of accountability in all current pooled funding arrangements (including the CERF), remains between the funded agency and the contributing donor, according to the standing arrangements via the respective Executive Boards. Some level of monitoring is essential, however, to ensure that fund managers and the HC can feedback results into each funding cycle. There also has to be a significant level of reporting to donors at the country level, in order to retain their confidence.

Other specific characteristics of the Somalia CHF include:

- **The fund has two standard allocations per year, the timing of which is similar to the rounds of the CERF UFE window.** It also has a sizable emergency reserve (20% in 2012) to deal with urgent needs not foreseen in the CAP.

- **A higher level of funding to national NGOs in comparison to comparably sized CHFs.** This is largely due to the severity of constraints on access for INGOs. In interviews for the CHF review, donors acknowledged the explicit transfer, to the CHF, of the risk inherent in dealing with small national organisations.

- **A relatively small average project size (approximately US$400,000).** This is linked to the use of NNGOs, who are often constrained in terms of operational capacity / reach.
Section 2: Inclusiveness and Transparency of the Allocation Processes and Support to Humanitarian Reform

The way in which coordination supports both strategy and then process is very important in looking at Somalia in 2011. The CAP (and CHAP) was largely constructed from individual cluster plans. When the crises response scaled up rapidly in mid-2011, the decision was taken to review the CAP and revise it upwards, rather than constructing a stand-alone appeal. Whilst the clusters have this central role in the creation and shaping of the overall response plan, they do not feature as heavily in the on-going management of the response at the highest level. The clusters are not represented at the HCT and do not participate in the higher level discussions on the strategic allocation of CERF funding.

Processes for the UFE and RR windows are distinct. For the RR window, clusters are not directly involved in either the construction or approval of requests to the CERF in the RR window. Nor do they play any role at the highest level of allocation, that of envelopes of funding by agency, geographical region or cluster for either window. Supporters of this model point to the heavy involvement of the clusters in the CAP construction and the need for top level allocation decisions to be taken quickly and in a direct, ‘managerial’ fashion by the HC and his immediate team. For the UFE window, the first step was reportedly a closed discussion between the HC, OCHA and latterly the OCHA FSU. In this instance, the strategic allocation, via an analysis of regional and sectoral gaps, was undertaken at the same time as the year’s first CHF round, in a completely complementary process. These funding envelopes; were subsequently announced at the HCT and then at cluster level. The extent to which the project level allocation was discussed in the clusters varied greatly and was greater overall for the UFE than for the RR.

Accordingly, interviewees for this study invariably described funding envelopes as being allocated to UN agencies, rather than to clusters or sectors. Although announced in the HCT meetings high level allocations were not reported to have been discussed in any forum which included non-UN actors. In this respect, therefore, process around high level allocations cannot be described as either transparent or inclusive.

For the rapid response, the high level allocation process was reported to have been further foreshortened, but much more inclusive of UN agencies. Much of the initial and critical discussion around the CERF application and primary allocations was acknowledged as having taken place in the UN Heads of Humanitarian Agencies meeting. The whole timeframe for the request, allocation and final decisions was in keeping with the sense of urgency surrounding the crisis and upscale in response (timing is covered in more detail in Section 3.)

Allocations at the project level were also made relatively quickly in respect of the RR window. The level of discussion in clusters was low. In most cases, UN agencies and partners described a process of expanding activities (either in terms of quantity of outputs or geographical area) through existing partners. Agencies stressed that the use of existing partners was taken in light of knowledge of priorities gleaned through their role as cluster leads. For example, UNICEF in its role as nutrition cluster lead was very clear that it acted both as a cluster lead and as a partner to most of the NGOS within the cluster. Its decision
to utilise the CERF RR window allocations predominantly for nutritional supplies in support of its NGO partners was very straightforward and did not require an open process. Although partners were unaware of UNICEF’s thinking at the time that allocations were made, they accepted the rationale.

That a primary factor in the allocation of CERF funds was the existing presence of UN led programmes or partners echoes the findings of other PAF reviews. The absence of an open and transparent process at the cluster level cuts across CERF guidance about the central role of clusters. For both rounds, staff of UN agencies at the operational / programme level also tended to be unaware of the higher levels of allocation process. One stated ‘We were told that there had been an allocation and we were told what our share was.’ This was typical of views expressed.

2.1 Relationship between the CERF and the CHF

As noted above, the CHF and the CERF shared only process component directly: the high level or strategic allocation phase of the UFE round. Overall, however, CHF processes, analysed in the Somalia CHF review in 2012, are instructive when considering the operation of the CERF in Somalia. The review notes a degree of tension around the use of clusters in allocation of funding. A common finding of country level pooled funds is that opinions are divided on the use of clusters to allocate pooled funds. Whilst the linkage of funding to coordination is generally held to be beneficial on balance, cluster meetings can become dominated by funding discussions and some lack the capacity to undertake this function in addition to basic coordination duties. The Somalia RTE and interviews for this study noted the same dynamic, exacerbated by the participation of large numbers of Somali NGOs in many clusters. UN cluster lead agencies noted the capacity constraints of clusters in this respect.

Over and above this common issue, the Somalia CHF review notes another significant tension around the role of the clusters in allocation of the pooled funding. In particular, the CHF review notes that clusters are not involved in the highest level of the allocation process, the decision of initial envelopes of funding to geographical regions; and that views are strongly divided as to whether this would improve the process. From their perspective, clusters argue that they should have greater input to this process. Others in management positions argue that clusters do not have the technical capacity or strategic overview to be more heavily involved. In keeping with the findings of the CHF review, the same range of views was evident in discussions on the role of the clusters in higher level CERF allocations (this issue is discussed further below in Section 3.2.1 ‘Relationship between the RR window and the UFE window').

As noted at the end of Section 1, the Somalia CHF has an Advisory Board, consisting of donors, NGO and UN representatives. This Board currently plays no role in respect of the CERF. The CHF review also notes that accountability (specifically project monitoring and evaluation), is an area of concern for the CHF and that systems need to be strengthened. Again, there is no current complementarity between the CERF and the CHF in this regard.
2.2 Stakeholder Perceptions

Perhaps unexpectedly, UN agencies tended to be supportive of the current approach to allocation for the CERF. The extent to which the CERF was described as ‘a UN instrument’, by UN agencies and NGOs alike, was striking. NGOs had some awareness of the CERF through announcements at the HCT meetings and, less frequently, in clusters. None recalled discussion at cluster level which was specifically related to CERF allocation. In interviews with CERF implementers, arranged by UN agencies for this study, a clear majority were unaware that they had implemented using CERF funds. As far as they were concerned, projects were undertaken as parts of on-going (or occasionally new) co-operation agreements. Donors tended to feel that they had basic information on CERF allocations via the HC and the donor HCT. They did not, however, tend to feel part of broader consultations on the CERF and, on balance, would welcome a greater degree of engagement / communication.
Section 3: Timeliness of CERF Funding

3.1 Speed of CERF processes

There was consistent praise in interviews for the speed of the CERF Secretariat’s work in processing allocations, especially for the RR grants. The CERF Secretariat came very close to meeting tight operational benchmarks for the timeliness of turnaround:

- The performance benchmarks for the UFE are: five working days between the final project submission and approval by the USG and two working days between the signature of a letter of understanding (LoU) and submission to the Programme, Planning and Budget Division (PPBD) for disbursal. In 2011, the average number of working days between final submission and USG approval was 5.7 (with a maximum of 8 days and a minimum of 2.) The average number of working days between the signing of a Letter of Understanding (LoU) and submission to PPBD was 2.6 days (with a maximum of 4 and a minimum of 1).

- The performance benchmarks for the Rapid Response window are: three working days between final project submission and approval by the USG and two working days between the LoU and submission to the PPBD. In 2011, the average number of days between final submission to USG approval was 1.9, with a maximum time of 8 days and a minimum of one day. The average time elapsed between the signing of an LOU and submission to PPBD was 2.9 (with a maximum of 9 days and a minimum of 1 day).

As noted above UN Agencies have, to a very great extent, used existing partners in implementing CERF grants A primary benefit of doing so is that no time is lost in opening new subcontracting arrangements.

3.2 Gap filling and timely, life-saving response

The extent to which the CERF made a timely contribution in Somalia and was able to fill gaps can only be analysed within the prevailing context. Figure13 below, provides a useful visual of the timing and relative inputs of the CERF and the CHF. The UFE round, allocated in a complementary fashion to the CHF allocation, makes a significant impact (in relative terms), to funding levels in March and through April.

Figure 13: 2011 CERF, CHF and Other Donors by Month
As noted in the funding section above: a combination of circumstances had created: a severe funding deficit by mid-2011, a shortfall that was felt across the UN-led system: emergency thresholds including nutrition had been breached in a number of areas; there was a complex mixture of access challenges.

Figure 13 also supports findings from interviews for this study on the issue of timing. When viewed against the critical shortage of funding throughout the first half of 2011 the CERF was perceived to arrive only marginally, but critically, ahead of the significant upswing in funding. In this sense, the CERF was perceived to have been very timely, allowing the UN led responses to scale up whilst other funds were lacking. Figure 14 represents the timing for ‘commitments and contributions’ from donors, as reported to FTS. It is important to note here, that the major upswing in July represents predominantly commitments to fund, rather than the arrival of funds. Given that the CERF was activated only very marginally ahead of other funding channels, the rapid processing of CERF requests, described above, is a defining factor in the perceived value of the RR funding.

There was a general consensus that with hindsight, the CERF request could and should have been made earlier. Two factors were consistently raised as rationale in this regard:

- As noted below, there was consensus that the UFE round in the first quarter of the year, acted as a deterrent to a quick RR request i.e. a perception that CERF would not respond favourably to a RR request, so soon after a UFE window allocation.
- The largest single reason given for the lack of a more rapid request was ‘risk aversion’. The Somalia RTE and other reports isolate a clear set of warning signs from data available during the crises. Staff present during the build-up to the crisis, however, described conflicting evidence, regional variations and a desire not to risk stepping ahead of the crowd in declaring a crisis, especially in the face of an apparent lack of donor support.
The question of the extent to which the CERF filled gaps in programming is a challenging one, because of the resource scarce environment at the time. Large gaps in programming were evident at this time for reasons of funding (and resource allocations) as well as access (related to expulsions as well as security).

The picture was especially tense for food (the context section notes the centrality of food as a relief commodity). WFP had been unable to access Al Shabaab areas, either directly or through partners since 2009, creating a significant shortfall in food delivery options. WFP also faced severe shortages in its operations in accessible areas of Somalia. ICRC was undertaking food distribution in Al Shabaab areas to the full extent of its resources. UNICEF was described as ‘taking up some of the slack’ in these areas, through a large scale supplementary feeding strategy, which required an unusually large (by UNICEF standards) Corn Soy Blend (CSB) pipeline.

The CERF allocation, coming at the time of the declaration of famine, after the revision of beneficiary numbers and before a significant upscale of funding, entered an environment characterised by very fierce competition for resources. Donors interviewed for this study were critical of WFP’s corporate fundraising stance during this period, citing a lack of transparency of both pipeline data, resource details and specifics on levels of access. Under these specific conditions, the large RR allocation to WFP was criticised by a number of interviewees for this study, on the basis of its proportion of the overall allocation and their lack of access to Al Shabaab areas. WFP puts forward the case that given its overall crisis of funding, the CERF funding was critical in enabling the continuation of its own priority programmes in Mogadishu and other parts of Somalia. WFP amongst others, also noted that for a short period coinciding with the RRW allocation, it appeared that access restrictions for WFP would be lifted. Allocations to UNICEF, including the extraordinary allocation for nutritional supplies were universally considered to have been critical and timely decisions. At the time of the allocation, UNICEF had a very short window in which to place an order in the global CSB supply chain.

In the case of both WFP and UNICEF, CERF allocations were used to fill gaps in pipeline, i.e. as part of on-going procurement processes through which specific commodities purchased with CERF funds would only arrive months later. WFP’s allocation was put towards an existing gap in programme funding, costs associated with the transportation and handling of an in kind donation of food from Brazil, a consignment which ultimately saw a significant delay. CSB purchased with CERF funds by UNICEF also arrived at the limit of the implementation window in CERF guidance. Both WFP and UNICEF put forward the case that these contributions improved the timeliness of response by filling gaps in longer pipelines and allowed resources ‘in hand’ to be used in an unrestricted (and un-rationed) manner. They also make the case that the funds were used to lever resources from others.

Particularly in respect of food aid, the question of whether CERF funds could have been allocated to partners with access to Al Shabaab areas is a valid one. On this point, CERF guidance is clear. Although only UN Agencies and IOM can receive funds directly, NGOs are expected to form part of a transparent and inclusive allocation process. Where access is

7 A key ingredient in supplementary feeding programmes.
8 It is not clear, however, that a clear process of prioritisation for resources with WFP was possible at this time.
challenging for UN agencies, as in Somalia, the ‘flexibility’ of NGOs in delivering is highlighted in CERF guidance. Given that Al Shabaab was sensitive to the use of WFP food in operations by partners during this period and no operational NGO could be seen to be associated with WFP operations, there was a general consensus that it would have been impossible to pass funds through WFP to any NGO during this period.

More generally, Section 3 notes the extent to which there was no cluster centred processed around allocation decisions. By and large, given the time pressure of the RR process, UN agencies largely programmed through existing partners. As such, they targeted critical gaps where partners, either national or international, were able to negotiate access, or had already done so. Under the specific conditions in Somalia in mid-2011, the extent to which the CERF would be an efficient mechanism of getting money to actors with no existing partnership with a UN agency is questionable.

Noting that the health response was chronically under-funded, WHO noted that CERF funding allowed WHO to fill basic but critical gaps, through the provision of vaccines, amongst others. FAO had existing working relationships with a number of local partners in key areas. Al Shabaab had been relatively supportive of the productive sector. CERF funding enabled the critical expansion of programmes. Both FAO and partners reported significant success in meeting key agricultural deadlines, which other funding would have missed.

There was consensus among the UN Agencies that CERF processes had been followed and that the life-saving criteria had been appropriately applied to the Somali context. An assessment of impact of CERF projects is beyond the scope of this report. Many respondents felt that interventions made with CERF resources had been life-saving, in terms of the life-saving criteria utilised by the CERF.

### 3.2.1 Relationship between the RR and the UFE window

A significant number of respondents felt that, with hindsight, the UFE round early in the year did have an impact on the timing of the request to the RR window. A number of respondents also questioned the use of the CERF UFE and RR windows in an interchangeable fashion. Some interviewees felt that the UFE, like the CHF, had been overly focused in responding to acute, urgent needs, especially in the final quarter of 2011 after the most critical phase of the emergency had passed. These arguments are in keeping with the recommendation from the PAF pilot in Kenya in 2010, that the CERF should address long and short term aspects of a humanitarian situation. This argument is raised most often in connection with the UFE and can be characterised as a discussion about the application of the life-saving criteria. Those who make the case for a longer term view, argue that the CAP, which has the full input from the clusters, is the appropriate vehicle for prioritisation of the response to recurrent and / or chronic humanitarian issues. These are the issues which, by and large, are included in the CAP, funding levels for which form the basis of the Under Funded round. In simple terms, this argument acknowledges that when the Rapid Response and Under Funded windows operate in the same country, RR allocations will always turn to the most urgent and immediate needs, while the allocation process for the UFE window should resist the temptation to do so automatically.

---

9 Via the most literal application of the life-saving criteria
Section 4: Reporting and Accountability

Given the extreme challenges of access in Somalia, many agencies cannot undertake first hand monitoring or evaluation of partners. This has arguably raised pressure from donors in terms of accountability. Agencies have responded to this challenge in a number of ways, including the extensive use of third party monitoring. As noted above, the CERF has primarily deepened UN programmes through existing partners. As a result, whilst there are a number of issues related to evaluation in Somalia, none of the respondents felt that the CERF had a significant impact in either monitoring or evaluation.

There is no current link between monitoring or evaluation of CHF and CERF projects. Monitoring and evaluation have long been acknowledged as a critical weakness in country level pooled funds. The Somalia CHF Review notes that although a draft framework exists for monitoring CHF projects, there is no active monitoring system in place. Ultimately, the review makes the following recommendations in relation to M+E:

- “The HC through the UN Country team should generate agreement from UN agencies to provide interim standardised reporting to the CHF on a twice yearly basis according to a format also used by NGOs including progress against planned activities, key indicators, expenditure levels and implementation.
- OCHA should create a CHF M&E officer position in Nairobi
- The M&E officer, with senior management support, should develop a detailed implementation plan for accountability
- Firmer functional links should be developed between FCU and the RCO risk management unit
- FCU and the inter-cluster working group should develop agreement on how to involve clusters in CHF monitoring
- FCU should develop stronger results reporting products, linking with CAP indicators and the strengthened M&E function”

As the FCU actively plans to follow up on these recommendations, it should explicitly look for ways to make concrete links to CERF projects, and to extend monitoring arrangements and evaluation plans where at all feasible.

4.1 Reporting

Given repeated experience of the CERF, most agencies were satisfied that they could construct reports to the CERF from their internal / existing monitoring and reporting systems and have not undertaken specific arrangements for CERF projects. During the annual reporting process, OCHA’s FCU collects and collates progress reports on behalf of the HC. The FCU is responsible for following up with the agencies on issues of quality control and acts as focal point for communication with the CERF secretariat. By and large, the FCU were happy with the quality and timeliness of agency reporting. As noted above, many partners were unaware that they were implementing with CERF funds. For the large majority of CERF projects, partners were not involved in the construction of reports to the CERF. In keeping with the very limited role of clusters in the CERF, there were no joint,
cluster led processes around reporting. There was no joint process in the HCT around reporting to the CERF and the report was not jointly discussed amongst UN agencies or with partners as part of the reporting process.

The CERF was perceived by UN agencies to have become more demanding in terms of reporting and more rigorous in its follow up on reporting issues. Given pressure on the CERF as a whole from its donors, it is essential that agencies report in a comprehensive fashion and that the CERF is not perceived as an easy option in this respect.
Section 5: Overarching conclusions / Recommendations

Somalia in 2011 was an extremely challenging environment for humanitarian actors. As set out in the funding and context section, evidence of a rapidly escalating crisis during the early part of the year sat in contrast with low levels of funding and engagement from significant donors.

Transparency and inclusivity of process: Previous PAF reports have noted the extent to which the CERF is viewed as an internal funding stream for the larger UN humanitarian Agencies. This perception was very apparent in Somalia and arguably to a greater extent than in other PAF review countries. A clear majority of actors felt that the CERF strengthened the hand of the HC but there was no sense that reform more broadly was strengthened directly by the CERF. As noted throughout, however, there is a clear sense that coordination in Somalia is strong overall and that participation in the clusters and the CAP, a prerequisite for access to the CHF, is high. That the CAP and the clusters provide the over-arching framework within which the CERF operates, is taken by some as evidence that the CERF supports reform indirectly. The role of the clusters is not strengthened directly by the CERF in because they have little or no role in the allocation of CERF funds. This finding is in keeping with the Somalia CHF review, which noted the lack of cluster involvement in strategic allocations. Placed in the context of Somalia in 2011, the need for a directive rather than consultative allocation is understandable, albeit against CERF guidance.

Timeliness of CERF: The use of the CERF in Somalia in 2011 has to be seen against the backdrop of a slow response on the part of the whole humanitarian system. In combination with the CHF, the UFE grant at the beginning of the year went some way to offsetting a critical funding shortfall. Funds from the RR window came marginally, but critically, ahead of a general upswing in funds, due largely to responsive and quick processing by the CERF Secretariat. There was an overall consensus that the request to the RR window could have been made earlier.10

Allocations from the UFE were made in conjunction with the CHF and as such, through a gap analysis. Allocations from both windows were perceived to have filled gaps, including the need for significant expansions, within the programmatic responses of UN agencies. The large allocations to WFP and UNICEF were used to fill large pipeline gaps caused, in part, by the large funding deficits at the time. Other CERF recipients, notably WHO and FAO were felt that they were able to use CERF funding from both windows to fill critical gaps.

Recommendations:

a. Complementarity between future CERF allocations (in particular UFE allocations) and the CHF should be formalised and continue to the fullest extent possible. This should include ensuring that any future UFE allocations take place at the same time as standard allocation rounds for the CHF.

10 The regional synthesis report looks at the issue of the CERF in ‘early response’
b. The Somalia CHF makes a number of specific recommendations. The management plan to follow up on these recommendations should explicitly review these recommendations and consider how each may be relevant to the CERF.

c. Special attention should be played by the FCU in extending enhanced monitoring and evaluation processes for the CHF to CERF projects where at all feasible.

d. By way of increasing transparency of CERF allocations, the role of the clusters in CERF allocations should be examined. Again, this should be undertaken alongside the examination of the clusters’ role in CHF allocations, recommended by the review.

e. By way of increasing transparency of CERF allocations, the CHF Advisory Board (which contains donors and NGO representatives) should formally review CERF allocations. The Board is a diverse group, including UN agency heads, donors and NGO representatives and already focussed on the issue of funding priorities for the CHF. The Board should consider the strategic justifications for the CERF allocations (geography, sector and responding agency) rather than the programmatic detail.
Annex A – Terms of Reference

INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF THE VALUE ADDED OF THE CENTRAL EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND (CERF) IN ETHIOPIA AND DJIBOUTI

Terms of Reference

1. Background to the CERF and Performance and Accountability Framework (PAF)

It is widely recognized that the key strengths of the CERF lie in its ability to respond quickly and in the relatively high degree of flexibility it affords users compared with other sources of humanitarian funding. Member States and private donors require appropriate assurances that the considerable funds involved are managed appropriately and meaningful results are being achieved. The ERC function is charged with a formal fiduciary responsibility over the proper use of CERF funds, and relies upon the CERF Secretariat to assist with the proper discharge of these responsibilities. In this context, the development of a PAF for the CERF is regarded as an effective tool.

Paragraph 19 of General Assembly Resolution 60/124 calls for “the establishment of an appropriate reporting and accountability mechanism to ensure that the funds allocated through the Fund are used in the most efficient, effective and transparent manner possible.” Consequently, the CERF Advisory Group at its meeting on 12 October 2006 called for the development of a Performance and Accountability Framework (PAF). In addition, the 2008 CERF Two-year Evaluation gave as Key Recommendation 4: “The multiple lines of accountability for CERF need to be clarified, in consultation with the UN Controller and the operational agencies, to specify the roles of each actor.” In response, the CERF Secretariat worked on developing a PAF, a first draft was circulated in 2009 and a PAF adopted in 2010.

The CERF PAF proposes, among other things, the introduction of independent reviews to be conducted annually within a sample of three to five countries as determined by the ERC. The CERF Advisory Group supported the inclusion of such an independent country-level mechanism. Following a pilot review conducted in Kenya in early 2010, the CERF AG met on 1 July and endorsed the PAF. Further studies took place in late 2010 in Chad, Mauritania and Sri Lanka and in 2011 in Colombia, Bolivia, Ethiopia and Zimbabwe.

2. Scope and Purpose

The main purpose of the present country-level reviews will be to assess the value added of CERF operations in Ethiopia and Djibouti during 2011 in the context of the overall CERF support to the Horn of Africa drought response. The reviews will also look at prioritization exercises in 2012 to the extent possible.

A major aim of the review will be to provide the ERC with an appropriate level of assurance around the achievement of key performance benchmarks and planned results for the CERF mechanism. The review will also include recommendations aimed at improving operational aspects of the CERF and may also identify relevant policy issues which need to be addressed at a global level.
3. Key issues

The critical overriding question on which assurance is sought by the ERC is: Have CERF operations in the country successfully added value to the broader humanitarian endeavor?

Using the PAF indicator sets, assurances will be sought around the following specific broad areas of concern to the ERC:

1. CERF processes are achieving key management benchmarks in that:
   - CERF submissions are based on an inclusive planning process and adhere to established quality criteria.
   - Transparent systems are in place for correct allocation, efficient flow and use of CERF by agencies.
   - Adequate monitoring and evaluation systems are in place at the agency level for measuring and reporting on results.

2. There are reasonable grounds to believe that CERF operations favour the following results:
   - CERF consolidates humanitarian reform by empowering the RC/HC and enhancing the quality of coordination within the cluster approach and across clusters.
   - CERF facilitates adequate coverage, eliminates gaps and facilitates an effective division of labour among humanitarian (especially smaller) actors.
   - CERF contributes to a more timely response to needs.
   - CERF favors the delivery of relevant life-saving actions at critical moments.

4. Review Methodology

During the PAF development process, UN agencies emphasized that the formal assessment of agency performance vis-a-vis CERF-funded activities remains the prerogative of recipient agencies via their own internal oversight procedures (internal performance reporting, audit and evaluation etc.). The review approach will therefore be designed in a manner which avoids duplication with such procedures and meets only the immediate assurance needs of the ERC in relation to the PAF.

Recognizing that CERF funds are often co-mingled with other donor funds by agencies and that the in-depth assessment of beneficiary-level impact is formally the charge of recipient agencies, the review will not attempt to link beneficiary-level changes to CERF activity, except where recipient agencies already have this data. The review mechanism will not seek to provide comprehensive coverage linked to detailed narratives and contextual analysis around how and why results are being achieved. Rather it will focus instead on providing an assurance around issues of the Fund’s operational impact.

Key components of the methodology will include a rapid desk review and field visits by the consultant to Ethiopia and Djibouti, including interviews with key stakeholders. The analytical approach will be deliberately kept rapid and light.

Prior to leaving each country, the Consultant will leave with the RC/HC a short analytical report consisting of a series of short observations and recommendations in relation to the key assurance issues identified above. The RC/HC, together with the HCT, will subsequently be requested to provide a “management response” to the recommendations contained in the report.
Desk review: A quantitative analysis will be conducted on the data, reports and files available at the HQ and Country level. These include:

- Funding data, including funding from sources other than the CERF (e.g. OCHA’s Financial Tracking System);
- Timelines on sums requested, allocated from CERF database;
- CERF country-level reports on context, needs, status of implementation, activities, results and lessons learned;
- CERF meeting minutes at HQ and country-level and notifications of application decisions;
- CERF Project files at HQ and country-level.

Semi-structured interviews at country level will include: RC/HC, Cluster leads, Heads of Agencies, I/NGO partner implementing CERF projects and those without access to CERF funds, host government, donors. Interviews will also take place with selected CERF Secretariat staff to get further background and perspective. UN Agencies and IOM will be asked to provide relevant documents and indicate interview partners to facilitate the review.

Select project site visits: These may be included as appropriate and time permitting to help provide some limited anecdotal information regarding the use of funding at the affected population level and can provide a field-level snapshot and some direct contact with affected populations.

In-Country briefings will be used as learning opportunities to discuss and validate the findings, explore possible recommendations and further refine the analytical approaches.

5. Proposed Consultants

It is anticipated that one consultant will be required to prepare the reviews for Ethiopia and Djibouti. The consultant will be independent and he/she has not been previously involved with any aspects of the country-level operations being reviewed. He/she should have the following skills:

- Expertise in UN humanitarian reform & financing and knowledge of the CAP and Flash Appeal process;
- Expertise and extensive experience in humanitarian evaluation;
- Expertise in analyzing financial data in tandem with other types of information;
- Expertise in project management and implementation;
- Knowledge, including field experience with a broad range of humanitarian actors, such as UN agencies, Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement, local government disaster response structures and systems, and NGOs;
- Fluency in written and spoken English
- Familiarity with complex emergency and natural disaster settings.

6. Management and Support

The review will be managed by the CERF Secretariat, who will identify country-level focal points to support the review mission. Their responsibilities will include:

- Provide necessary administrative, coordination and logistical support to the consultants;
- Facilitate the consultants' access to specific information or expertise necessary to perform the assessment;
- Monitor and assess the quality of the review and its process;
7. Deliverables

The main output will be two concise country reports in English to the ERC, through the CERF Secretariat, of no more than 20 pages each (excluding appendices) in an electronic version plus an Executive Summary (up to two pages). The consultant will also prepare a brief synthesis report placing the country findings in the context of the overall CERF response to the Horn of Africa drought. The reports will be structured in the form of short observations and conclusions around the different assurance concerns linked to the PAF. The reports will include, as appropriate, a set of specific, well targeted and action-oriented recommendations whose purpose should be to improve the performance of the CERF within the country or raising any policy issues. The annexes will include a brief description of the methods used and the tests performed and a list of persons interviewed.