



United Nations

**CENTRAL  
EMERGENCY  
RESPONSE FUND**



A SOUND HUMANITARIAN INVESTMENT

**RESIDENT / HUMANITARIAN COORDINATOR  
REPORT ON THE USE OF CERF FUNDS  
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH SUDAN  
RAPID RESPONSE  
CONFLICT-RELATED DISPLACEMENT**

**RESIDENT/HUMANITARIAN COORDINATOR**

**Mr. Toby Lanzer**

## REPORTING PROCESS AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY

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

The after action review was conducted through two different meetings. The first one held on 29 August 2014 was mainly focused on the reporting process (reporting schedule, understanding of the pre-populated template and reporting guidelines). The following organizations attended that meeting: International Organization for Migration (IOM), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Department of Safety & Security (UNDSS), United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), World Food Programme (WFP) and United Nations Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) (Humanitarian Financing Unit on behalf of the HC's office).

The second meeting was organized on 6 February 2015 to discuss issues related to the drafting of the CERF report, lessons learned, challenges encountered during implementation and recommendations on how to improve for future CERF grants. The meeting was attended by UNDP, UNDSS, WFP and OCHA (Humanitarian Financing Unit on behalf of HC's office).

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

YES  NO

The report has been reviewed and contributed to by the relevant cluster coordinators. It has not yet been formally tabled at an HCT or UNCT meeting though this will be considered for the future, possibly in conjunction with a discussion of other CERF allocations which are also to be reported on shortly.

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

YES  NO

The final draft of the report was shared with CERF recipient agencies and related clusters (cluster coordinators and co-coordinators) ahead of the AAR meeting held on 6 February 2015. The report was reviewed and discussed during that meeting and further inputs and feedback was accepted until 10 February 2015, after which this final version of the report was completed. It will be re-circulated to CERF recipient agencies, clusters and partners. Consideration of appropriate ways to share the report with government counterparts will be made and in view of the current operating context.

## I. HUMANITARIAN CONTEXT

TABLE 1: EMERGENCY ALLOCATION OVERVIEW (US\$)		
Total amount required for the humanitarian response: 209,000,000 <sup>1</sup>		
Breakdown of total response funding received by source	Source	Amount
	CERF <sup>2</sup>	15,314,820
	COMMON HUMANITARIAN FUND/ EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND (if applicable)	134,943,476
	OTHER (bilateral/multilateral)	1,285,726,872 <sup>3</sup>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,435,985,168<sup>4</sup></b>

TABLE 2: CERF EMERGENCY FUNDING BY ALLOCATION AND PROJECT (US\$)			
Allocation 1 – date of official submission: 14-Jan-14			
Agency	Project code	Cluster/Sector	Amount
IOM	14-RR-IOM-001	Camp Management	8,245,627
UNHCR	14-RR-HCR-001	Camp Management	754,320
WFP	14-RR-WFP-001	Logistics	4,621,119
UNDP	14-RR-UDP-001	Coordination and Common Services	706,037
WFP	14-RR-WFP-002	Coordination and Common Services	987,717
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>15,314,820</b>

TABLE 3: BREAKDOWN OF CERF FUNDS BY TYPE OF IMPLEMENTATION MODALITY (US\$)	
Type of implementation modality	Amount
Direct UN agencies/IOM implementation	13,870,600
Funds forwarded to NGOs for implementation	1,170,605
Funds forwarded to government partners	273,615
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>15,314,820</b>

<sup>1</sup> CRP 2014 funding requirements were revised upwards in the course of the year from initial US\$209 million for January-March period, to US\$1.27 billion for January-June period. This was again revised at the mid year review to US\$1.8 billion January-December period.

<sup>2</sup> There were other three subsequent rounds of CERF allocations to South Sudan.

<sup>3</sup> Amount includes US\$42,538,715 from three subsequent rounds of CERF allocations.

<sup>4</sup> CRP funding as of 31 December 2014.

## **HUMANITARIAN NEEDS**

The humanitarian crisis that prompted the CERF allocations resulted from the outbreak of hostilities between different elements of the South Sudan armed forces that started in Juba on the evening of 15 December 2013 and quickly spread across the country, affecting six of the country's ten states. Direct humanitarian consequences on the civil population were most significant in Central Equatoria, Jonglei, Unity and Upper Nile states, while Lakes and Warrap States were indirectly affected by the violence, mainly by the presence of internally displaced persons (IDPs) coming from neighbouring states. Several divisions within the South Sudan armed forces occurred, mainly into two different groups with the South Sudan People Liberation Army (SPLA) representing government forces, and the SPLA-In Opposition (SPLA-IO) representing opposition forces.

As of 14 January 2014 (at the time of developing the CERF funding request), the ongoing hostilities was posing major access constraints particularly in Jonglei, Upper Nile and Unity States. Active fighting restricted access and prevented humanitarian organizations from transporting relief supplies and personnel to conduct assessments and from mounting an appropriate emergency response. There was large-scale displacement: an estimated 413,000 people had been displaced with some 66,500 of them sheltering in UN peacekeeping bases (later referred to as Protection of Civilians (POC) sites). Many people suffered gunshot wounds, while thousands were killed.

Humanitarian partners identified significant gaps in the support and management of camps for internally displaced persons (wherever displaced persons were seeking refuge, whether inside or outside of UN peacekeeping bases); in air services for delivery of emergency supplies and personnel, as well as Medical Evacuation (MEDEVACs) of civilian casualties; and in ensuring robust security services and the facilitation of access negotiations with conflict parties.

By December 2014 the total number of IDPs stood at 1,504,768 spread across 185 locations. Some 186,493 of these IDPs were living in eight PoC sites. An estimated 236,922 people in 21 host community locations were in need of assistance. Though the aid response to civilians had been significantly scaled up, conditions remain dire for the displaced population - even for those living in the PoC sites in United Nations Missions in South Sudan (UNMISS) bases. While many IDPs were able to construct basic shelters with available materials, many still have little or no access to shelter. Furthermore, due to poor sanitation, over-crowding and limited supplies of clean water, a considerable risk of disease outbreaks remains. Water and sanitation services still fall well short of SPHERE standards in several locations, including Awerial County, Bentiu, Bor and Malakal. More generally, there is still an urgent need for improved site management to enhance security and safety, reduce tensions between displaced communities, improve public health and maximise the coverage and impact of critical services, such as healthcare, psychosocial support and sanitation.

## **II. FOCUS AREAS AND PRIORITIZATION**

Following the outbreak of violence in December 2013, an estimated 413,000 civilians sought physical protection in the PoC sites established in the bases of the UNMISS. Around 66,500 were temporarily settled in Juba, Bor, Bentiu and Malakal POC sites while 84,000 IDPs were found in spontaneous settlements such as Mingkaman, Awerial Count and Lakes state.

This large-scale displacement, where IDPs gathered in camp-like settings to flee conflict and/or seek physical protection, resulted in an urgent need to roll out the Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM) cluster to facilitate the effective and rapid provision of life-saving services to these displaced populations. After an inclusive and consultative process of prioritization, humanitarian support to internally displaced persons was identified as the major need by the whole humanitarian community in South Sudan. The priorities identified for the use of the CERF funding were then focused to support the immediate establishment of CCCM mechanisms, the establishment of the CCCM cluster, the provision of humanitarian air services, and the provision of security support to aid agencies.

While the CCCM cluster framework was already well established in South Sudan, the cluster was not activated in country until 25 December 2013, in response to the wide-scale displacement triggered by the crisis. There was a need to immediately set up the CCCM cluster coordination structure and initiate CCCM operations and response activities. CERF funding was essential in establishing the cluster coordination structure and supporting the start-up of CCCM partners' work during the first half of 2014. CERF funding was particularly vital as resources from other funding mechanisms were limited.

Under the agreed CCCM coordination structure in South Sudan, UNHCR was a designated focal point for Eastern Equatoria and Unity states and the disputed territory of Abyei. In Unity state alone, 1,556 dwellings were destroyed in Leer Town, 3,100 in Koch, and an unknown number in the rest of Rubkuai Payam. All schools, churches and market stalls were occupied by IDPs who lacked shelter to protect them from the rains, while food and medical assistance were in short supply. In Eastern Equatoria state, five Counties of Magwi, Torit, Lafon, Kapoeta South and Ikwoto received spontaneous arrivals of IDPs from various States estimated to be around 53,000 individuals (DTM update of May 17th). 9,208 IDPs settled in Magwi County at Nimule Payam and 4,370 at Melijo, located 19km from Nimule town. These people were assessed to be in need of health, food, shelter, agricultural seeds and tools, and hygiene and sanitation services. The Initial Rapid Needs Assessment of IDPs in Nimule was completed on 14 – 15 January 2014. The CCCM, FSL, NFI/ES and WASH clusters were represented. UNHCR, MSF, Plan, CARE, Merlin, and the IDPs took part. According to the head count on those

days, 34,840 individuals were present, and food, health and WASH needs were identified. Efforts to provide humanitarian assistance at Melijo were hampered by the extremely poor road conditions exasperated by heavy and torrential rains.

Along with \$2 million from the Common Humanitarian Fund (CHF) first standard allocation for 2014, the CERF contribution enabled IOM and UNHCR to set up coordination and information management structures and to start-up of CCCM operations through grants to partners and improvements to IDP sites including PoC sites. Efforts were made to strengthen the IDP communities' self-management mechanisms, building up and reinforcing the capacities of CCCM partners and officials to adopt CCCM best practices in order to create a platform for effective coordination for delivery of humanitarian services. NFIs were airlifted to Leer where a distribution was conducted covering 500 households. A forward operating base to provide space for humanitarian actors carrying out a response to the wider displaced populations in southern Unity state was established. In Nimule, camp management services included the rehabilitation of the 19km access road. Activities were undertaken to promote the peaceful coexistence of local communities through an improvement of health services for IDPs and host communities in Pariang, Yida, JamJang, Nyeel, Biu, Aliiny, Gumiriak, Panyang, Wunkur counties in northern part of Unity state.

Air assets were required to move humanitarian staff and supplies to areas not accessible by existing transport means and to provide civilian MEDEVAC possibilities. South Sudan's underdeveloped infrastructure and the poor state of road networks and airstrips frequently inhibit access to flashpoint areas and slow down vital pre-positioning and the flow of supplies to the field. Improved access was key to reaching people wherever they were, especially given a frequently changing political landscape. A robust security analysis was required to identify all actors (pro-government, opposition forces, or non-state armed actors) with influence over people in specific locations in order to enable humanitarian organisations to enter into negotiations to ensure humanitarian access. Support to WFP/UNHAS and UNDSS activities, including the provision of a dedicated aircraft, were prioritized under the CERF allocation.

### III. CERF PROCESS

The CERF process and consultation for prioritization involved relevant humanitarian entities. The gaps in the humanitarian response were first discussed at the Inter-Cluster Working Group (ICWG), which identified camp management as the main priority for response, due to the overcrowding in PoC sites, as in expectation of displacement to other areas outside of UNMISS bases which would require camps to be set up. Proper camp management was seen as essential to avoid the possible outbreak of cholera, measles and other diseases that might ensue as a consequence of poor and overcrowded living conditions. The need for additional air assets and further enhancement of UNDSS capacity were also identified as key enablers for the humanitarian response. Air assets were needed to scale up the capacity of the Logistics Cluster to quickly deliver relief supplies to displaced people. Further enhancement of UNDSS capacity was important to facilitate coordination with security counterparts on the ground and conduct MEDEVACs of wounded civilians.

The first step in the development of the CERF application was a donor mapping exercise undertaken by OCHA for consideration by the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT), which brings together NGOs, UN agencies, and donors. This enabled a strategy for the joint humanitarian response to be set out, and for decisions to be taken regarding the direction of the humanitarian operation. The mapping encompassed bilateral funding pledged by major donors to different priority sectors within the Crisis Response Plan, as well as the first standard allocation for 2014 from the CHF which was reprioritised to in view of the new emergency.

Each cluster prioritized activities through assessments and reports from the field, and through consultations with the humanitarian and beneficiary communities. Some of the assessment reports are listed below and are available online<sup>5</sup>. Needs and gaps were identified through coordination with partners and findings were presented, discussed and agreed during ICWG meetings to ensure a coherent approach. Further coordination with partners was made to avoid duplication of responses and to ensure that partners were capable of implementing in target locations.

	Title of Assessment Report	Location	Leading Organizations	Participating Organizations	Clusters/Sectors	Start date	End date	Population Types
1	Tricuster Assessment: Minkamman, Awerial County, Lakes State (13 - 15 January 2014)	Awerial: Minkamman	UNHCR	WFP	CCCM, NFI&ES, Logistics	13-Jan-14	15-Jan-14	IDPs
2	Joint Assessment: Don Bosco Gumbo Church, Juba County, Central Equatoria State (13 January 2014)	Juba: Don Bosco Gumbo Church	IOM	CRS, Medair, UNHCR	CCCM, NFI&ES, WASH	12-Jan-14	12-Jan-14	IDPs
3	RAPID SHELTER SECTOR ASSESSMENT	Juba	REACH Initiative		NFI&ES	12-Jan-14	12-Jan-14	Camp population
4	ACTED Assessment Report: Minkamman, Awerial County, Lakes State (10 - 13 January 2014)	Awerial: Minkamman	ACTED		CCCM	9-Jan-14	12-Jan-14	IDPs

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.humanitarianresponse.info/node/69/assessments>

5	Joint Assessment: Akobo County, Jonglei State (9 January 2014)	Akobo: Walgak, Yidit, Boung and Diror villages - Akobo West	Nile Hope	ACTED, Nonviolent Peaceforce, Plan International, Save The Children, UNHCR	FSL, Nutrition, Protection, NFI&ES, WASH	8-Jan-14	8-Jan-14	IDPs
6	Joint Assessment: IDP camp at UNMISS Compound, Yei County, Central Equatoria State (8 January 2014)	Yei UNMISS	UNHCR	Caritas International, Plan International, World Renew	FSL, Health, WASH.	8-Jan-14	8-Jan-14	IDPs
7	Joint Assessment: Kapoeta Counties, Eastern Equatoria State (8 January 2014)	Kapoeta East;Kapoeta North;Kapoeta South	Greater Kapoeta Development Organization		Education; FSL; Health; Protection	7-Jan-14	7-Jan-14	IDPs
8	Initial Rapid Needs Assessment Report: Yirol East, Yirol West, Rumbek Centre Counties, Lakes State (6 January 2014)	Rumbek East;Yirol East;Yirol West	OCHA		Education; NFI&ES; FSL; Health; Nutrition; Protection; WASH	6-Jan-14	6-Jan-14	Displaced population
9	Medair Assessment Report: Mahad Primary School, Juba County, Central Equatoria State (6 January 2014)	Juba: Mahad Primary School	Medair		NFI&ES; FSL; Health; Nutrition; WASH	6-Jan-14	6-Jan-14	IDPs
10	Initial Rapid Needs Assessment: IDP camp at UNMISS Compound Bentiu, Rubkona County, Unity State (5 - 6 January 2014)	Rubkona: Bentiu, UNMISS compound	OCHA		CCCM; Education; NFI&ES; FSL; Health; Logistics; Nutrition; Protection; WASH	5-Jan-14	6-Jan-14	Displaced population
11	Initial Rapid Needs Assessment: Twic County, Warrap State (3 January 2014)	Twic: Aweng, Turalei, and Man-Angui	OCHA	ACF-USA, FAO, GOAL, IOM, JAM, UNICEF, UNHCR, WHO	NFI&ES; FSL; Health; Logistics; Nutrition; Protection; WASH	2-Jan-14	2-Jan-14	Displaced population
12	Initial Rapid Needs Assessment: Awerial County, Lakes State (31 December 2013)	Awerial: Minkamman Village	OCHA	IOM, NPA, NRC, Oxfam GB, UNICEF, WFP, WHO.	CCS, NFI&ES, FSL, Health; Protection; WASH	30-Dec-13	30-Dec-13	Displaced population

In consideration of the fact that the re-prioritised CHF allocation supported core pipelines and NGOs partners in the delivery of key basic services, and that food assistance and the refugee programme had received some funding from bilateral donors, the HCT agreed that the most strategic use of CERF resources was to support (a) Camp Coordination and Camp Management, a critical gap to be addressed to respond to the new unfolding scenario; and (b) Logistics and Common Services as key enablers that would benefit the entire humanitarian community. The prioritized areas of intervention were endorsed by the Humanitarian Country Team, with selected UN agencies invited to develop project proposals with the support of OCHA, specifically the Humanitarian Financing Unit, which also oversaw the drafting of the chapeau and the entire submission on behalf of the Resident Coordinator/Humanitarian Coordinator (RC/HC).

#### IV. CERF RESULTS AND ADDED VALUE

TABLE 4: AFFECTED INDIVIDUALS AND REACHED DIRECT BENEFICIARIES BY SECTOR				
Total number of individuals affected by the crisis: 628,000				
The estimated total number of individuals directly supported through CERF funding by cluster/sector	Cluster/Sector	Female	Male	Total
	Camp Coordination and Camp Management	334,515	327,195	661,710
	Coordination and Common Services <sup>6</sup>	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
	Logistics <sup>7</sup>	3,638	3,638	7276

#### BENEFICIARY ESTIMATION

The beneficiary estimation provided in this report draws primarily on the methodology utilized by IOM and UNHCR for the Camp Coordination and Camp Management projects, including the approach used to disaggregate the number of beneficiaries by age and sex. The Coordination and Common Services and Logistics (CCS and Logs) projects are related to support services which facilitated the implementation of the humanitarian response by the wider community of humanitarian actors. These projects supported 663 and 7,236 humanitarian personnel respectively.

For the IOM project, beneficiary numbers are estimated from IOM's registration activities and Displacement Tracking Matrix. The use of these tools enables IOM to estimate with a high degree of accuracy the numbers of beneficiaries, taking all necessary precautions to avoid double counting including through the use of biometric registration. The project reached 376,510 people (203,315 females and 173,195 males). For UNHCR project, the estimated number of beneficiaries was derived from the caseload of IDPs in Unity (280,760) and Eastern Equatoria (4,470) States, giving a total of 285,200. It is assumed that all IDPs in both states benefitted from some or all of the CCCM activities. A baseline obtained in a registration exercise in one IDP site showed that 46per cent were females, 54per cent were males and 18per cent were children under five years of age. These percentages were then used to estimate the total number of beneficiaries disaggregated by age and gender: 154,008 males, 131,192 females and 51,300 children under five years of age.

TABLE 5: PLANNED AND REACHED DIRECT BENEFICIARIES THROUGH CERF FUNDING		
	Planned	Estimated Reached
Female	326,560	334,515
Male	301,440	327,195
Total individuals (Female and male)	628,000	661,710
Of total, children <u>under</u> age 5	131,880	134,132

<sup>6</sup> The CCS and Log activities came in support of other cluster activities particularly in ensuring the deployment and the relocation of 663 humanitarian personnel during the crisis. Those humanitarian personnel are not considered as direct beneficiaries.

<sup>7</sup> Similarly, the disaggregation of beneficiaries under the Logistics cluster was estimated on the basis that females and males equally benefited from the project.

## **CERF RESULTS**

The CERF allocation received in January 2014 enabled lives to be saved and acute suffering to be alleviated by setting-up a multi-sector humanitarian response operation coordinated from Juba. The Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM) cluster was activated to help manage and support the establishment of camps inside and outside of UNMISS bases. The humanitarian response focused mainly in the most crisis affected states of Central Equatoria, Jonglei, Lakes, Unity, Upper Nile and Warrap. CERF funds supported CCCM activities including setting up camp coordination at the national and state levels in line with identified needs, facilitating the establishment of camp management in IDP sites, and carrying out registration and monitoring of conditions in IDP sites.

As active hostilities constrained access to populations in rural areas, scaling up the response required: 1) enhancement of UNDSS services for facilitating expanded engagement of the humanitarian community to engage with all parties to the conflict and to negotiate humanitarian access and conduct MEDEVACs as required; and 2) increased air assets to deliver assistance wherever security allows. CERF funds supported the capacity of UNDSS to provide UN agencies and their participating partners with sustained updates on the security situation in the affected areas and to expand its air capacity to reach all areas to facilitate access negotiations. The outreach of the Logistics Cluster's air services was also expanded given the rapidly changing patterns of displacement and the need to scale up the response especially by increasing UNHAS capacity to support the delivery of the humanitarian response with urgency and flexibility.

### *(1) Camp Coordination and Camp Management*

Funds received from the CERF enabled the deployment of CCCM staff with expertise in camp management, site planning and information management; the provision of information management tools for the establishment of the CCCM coordination structure at the national and state levels; the undertaking of assessments in displacement locations; the deployment of infrastructure; and the distribution of essential relief items. The following results have been achieved:

- 661,710 beneficiaries reached.
- Camp committees established in 17 sites.
- CCCM management teams supported 21 sites.
- CCCM cluster activated, including coordination structures at national and state levels and the deployment Cluster Coordinators, State Focal Points and Site Managers.
- Capacity building programme rolled out in priority states and Juba for CCCM actors (humanitarian workers, government representatives, UNMISS personnel, IDP leaders).
- Information management tools developed and rolled out at national, state and site levels.
- Grants disbursed to 10 partners to carry out CCCM strategies and establish site management structures in priority states.
- Good working relationship established between the co-leads for the CCCM cluster (IOM, UNHCR and ACTED).
- Humanitarian hubs established in Bentiu, Bor and Malakal.
- PoC sites improved and expanded (Bentiu, Bor, Juba and Malakal) and IDPs relocated to improve service delivery towards SPHERE standards.
- Outreach activities outside of PoC sites expanded in Eastern Equatoria (Nimule and Melijo) and Unity (Pariang and Leer) States.

The humanitarian situation has remained tense and fragile. This CERF funding enabled start-up and significant progress in the implementation of CCCM activities, however further programming is needed. The fluidity of displacement, as well as ongoing insecurity and access constraints, has been a considerable challenge to setting up the needed CCCM mechanisms outside of PoC sites. In PoC sites, expansion and site development require greater investment. At the beginning of this project around 150,000 IDPs were identified in the largest IDP sites (66,500 in PoC sites and 84,000 in Mingkaman - the largest spontaneous settlement) but the total has now risen to some 183,000 (86,000 in PoC sites and 97,000 in Mingkaman).

### *(2) Coordination and Common Services*

Funds received from CERF enabled UNDSS to respond in a timely and appropriate way to the requirements of emergency operations, and to develop security mitigation measures to support the deployment of humanitarian actors and the scale up of the wider humanitarian response. Some 663 humanitarian personnel from around 180 humanitarian organizations including UN and NGOs were supported. The following results have been achieved:

- 663 humanitarian personnel from around 180 organisations have been supported.
- 146 Security Risk Assessments (SRAs) have been conducted.



- Security briefings provided at 24 routine Security Management Team meetings, Security Cell meetings (and emergency meetings as required) and 12 Diplomatic Security Briefings.
- 221 security briefings were conducted during the reporting period: 34 Security Management Team (SMT) briefings, 34 Security Cell briefings, 68 (Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) security briefings and 68 Inter-Cluster Working Group security briefings along with 17 Diplomatic security briefings.
- Security coverage increased through enhanced capacity to gather and analyse information related to remote locations – with timely and reliable advisories and alerts provided to the HC, HCT, and operational organisations.
- An average of 3 weekly security risk assessment missions conducted in challenging locations in Jonglei, Unity and Upper Nile States, in addition to ongoing surveillance of the country as a whole.
- Seven airstrip security assessments conducted.

The assessments and advisory services enabled operational organisations to access different locations and deliver humanitarian assistance, while employing appropriate mitigation measures.

### (3) Logistics

Funds received from CERF supported the UNHAS helicopter operation to achieve its objectives by facilitating the movement of humanitarian personnel as well as cargo (mostly medical supplies) to locations critically affected by the ongoing crisis. The following results have been achieved:

- 217 humanitarian organisations supported.
- 39 locations reached, and 22 special missions facilitated.
- 100 per cent of all requests (41) for medical and security evacuations responded to.
- 7,236 passengers transported at an average of 1,034 passengers a month.
- 276 metric tonnes of humanitarian supplies transported.

With the deteriorating security situation in the country and the corresponding increase in humanitarian presence and programmes, the utilisation of the air assets within the country was overstretched in accommodating requests for air movement of humanitarian workers. As a result, all aircraft contracted performed an average of 131 per cent utilisation of contracted hours.

## **CERF's ADDED VALUE**

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

YES  PARTIALLY  NO

CERF funds enabled IOM to improve surge capacity and deploy required staff to the field very quickly to set up the CCCM Cluster and implement life-saving interventions, while in parallel funding from other sources was being sought. Furthermore, the CERF contribution ensured that the CCCM cluster could operate at the level needed to respond to sector-specific gaps and at the same pace as the other clusters that already had cluster coordination and response arrangements in place prior to the crisis. The establishment and rollout of the CCCM cluster enabled effective outreach and delivery of services to the displaced population.

CERF funds also enabled the implementation of a large number of timely Security Risk Assessments (SRAs) by Field Security Coordination Officers (FSCOs) which paved way for the general scale up of activities across the wider humanitarian community. The deployment of UNHAS helicopters to service locations critically affected by the crisis expedited delivery of assistance to beneficiaries in far-flung locations, inaccessible through surface transport and unserviceable by fixed wing aircraft.

### **b) Did CERF funds help respond to time critical needs<sup>8</sup>?**

YES  PARTIALLY  NO

The crisis evolved at a speed that required an immediate response to save lives. The disbursement of CERF funding was immediate and enabled fast deployment of staff and resources to facilitate the immediate implementation of CCCM activities, with cluster partners quickly delivering services. Where CCCM (and other) actors conducted needs assessments the Logistics cluster facilitated the

---

<sup>8</sup> 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.).

delivery of required items in a timely manner, while the SRAs carried out by UNDSS helped open up new locations where assistance could be provided. Overall, the CERF funding was critical to the timely response provided by the humanitarian community.

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

YES  PARTIALLY  NO

CERF funding enabled the start-up of CCCM activities for IOM. Once the structures were in place, IOM was able to demonstrate its capacity to assume the role of cluster lead and carry out CCCM specific operations. Other donors recognised IOM's value as a CCCM co-lead, and bi-lateral funding was provided in the following months. Canada, European Commission Humanitarian Office (ECHO), and USA contributed US\$4.9 million to IOM's CCCM project activities. For UNDSS, airstrips assessments assisted in opening or rehabilitating airstrips that had not been used recently by the humanitarian community, catalysing the mobilisation of more funds so as to reach more disadvantaged communities. As a result of the success of the helicopter operation, UNHAS was able to secure complementary funding of US\$2.25 million from the CHF to continue the operation beyond July 2014. Canada, ECHO, Japan, UK, and USA contributed US\$17.2 million to UNHAS project activities within the first four months of 2014.

**d) Did CERF improve coordination amongst the humanitarian community?**

YES  PARTIALLY  NO

CERF funds supported the establishment of the Camp Coordination and Camp Management Cluster which enabled agencies and NGOs to effectively coordinate responses in IDP sites. They also supported the establishment and rollout of the CCCM cluster activities, discharging its role of ensuring a coordinated approach among service providers especially at a site level. UNDSS was able to conduct SRAs which were shared with a wide range of stakeholders including donors and operational organisations, in support of a concerted and coordinated overall response. Through proper coordination with UNOCHA, the donor community, the User Group and the Steering Committee, UNHAS was able to maximise the use of the assets in line with identified priorities. This enhanced the coordination of activities amongst humanitarian stakeholders.

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

CERF funding has enabled the establishment of CCCM structures in IDP sites to facilitate access to services and improve living conditions, where possible, for IDP populations. The CCCM cluster led site development work that helped to decongest overcrowded PoC sites and promoted protection and health services, and continues to advocate for longer term solutions.

The CERF funds greatly assisted UNDSS to respond on time to critical needs such as medical evacuations and relocation of staff in high risk areas, as well as to conduct SRAs around the country. In this way the CERF funds increased the confidence of operational organisations to carry out and expand their operations, in the knowledge that contingencies were in place should the security situation rapidly deteriorate in any given location.

## V. LESSONS LEARNED

<b>TABLE 6: OBSERVATIONS FOR THE <u>CERF SECRETARIAT</u></b>		
<b>Lessons learned</b>	<b>Suggestion for follow-up/improvement</b>	<b>Responsible entity</b>
The CERF rapid response funding mechanism was vital in establishing new cluster such as the CCCM Cluster in South Sudan.	Maintain current Rapid Response allocation process and speed of disbursement	CERF Secretariat
With continuous turn-over of humanitarian staff within UN agencies and NGO partners implicated in implementation of CERF projects, it would be beneficial if the reporting cycle could be launched just after the CERF funding is approved, by sharing pre-populated templates and other documents with respective UN recipient agencies CERF focal points.	CERF supporting documents for reporting (pre-populated template, guidelines for reporting and annexes for reporting) should be disseminated as quickly as possible after the approval of the proposals	CERF Secretariat

<b>TABLE 7: OBSERVATIONS FOR <u>COUNTRY TEAMS</u></b>		
<b>Lessons learned</b>	<b>Suggestion for follow-up/improvement</b>	<b>Responsible entity</b>
Clear roles and commitments for UNMISS and humanitarian partners when working in PoC sites inside UNMISS bases could enhance the effectiveness of the overall response.	Clear definition of roles and responsibilities need to be agreed on and stakeholders should be held accountable in the event that responsibilities are not met	UNMISS and HCT
Analysed security related reports are important to support the formulation of mitigation measures.	Continued analysis of reports / share information on 'need to know' basis	UNDSS
Humanitarian flights were able to provide services to enable humanitarian organisations to reach affected and vulnerable populations as a result of the cooperation, information sharing and an understanding of needs and capacities among all stakeholders.	UNHAS should mobilise additional support to facilitate and enhance the delivery of the humanitarian response in South Sudan	UNHAS
Timely funding was critical to address urgent humanitarian needs and support effective humanitarian response after the outbreak of the crisis in December 2013	The prioritisation process could be further enhanced by engaging a wider range of humanitarian actors and stakeholders at state and county level	HC with the support of OCHA and clusters
Further coordination and collaboration is needed between different UN recipient agencies and NGO partners not only for the prioritization process but also to strengthen the constructive collaboration during the implementation	Schedule regular CERF meetings (preferably on quarterly basis) at country level to discuss issues related to implementation and reporting on any CERF grantce received	HC's office with the support of OCHA

## VI. PROJECT RESULTS

**TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS**

TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS			
CERF project information			
1. Agency:	UNDP WFP	5. CERF grant period:	30 Jan. 2014 – 30 Nov 2014 (NCE approved)
2. CERF project code:	14-RR-UDP-001 14-RR-WFP-002	6. Status of CERF grant:	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded
3. Cluster/Sector:	Coordination and Common Services		
4. Project title:	Security Support to UN and Implementing Partners Operating in South Sudan		
7. Funding	a. Total project budget:	US\$1,736,570	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$ 45,791,873 (UNDSS- 706,037, WFP – 45,085,836)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent: US\$ 0</li> </ul>
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 1,693,754 (UNDSS - 706,037; WFP – 987,717)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Government Partners: US\$ 0</li> </ul>
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	N/A	N/A	<p>Through this project, UNDSS was targeting to support around 10 UN agencies and affiliated organisations and 170 non-governmental organisations operating in South Sudan. At the planning stage, it was not easy to estimate the number of beneficiaries in terms of individuals.</p> <p>During project implementation, an estimated to 663 individuals were supported, these being humanitarian workers from across 180 humanitarian organisations in South Sudan (UN agencies and NGOs).</p>
b. Male	N/A	N/A	
c. Total individuals (female + male):	N/A	N/A	
d. Of total, children <u>under</u> age 5	N/A	N/A	
9. Original project objective from approved CERF proposal			
To provide dedicated security support for humanitarian operations in South Sudan from January to June 2014.			
10. Original expected outcomes from approved CERF proposal			
<p>The gathering of security related information in order to provide comprehensive security analysis to understand the South Sudan context will be implemented on a regular basis. Security Risk Assessments (SRAs) will be undertaken with a view to facilitate an enabling environment for humanitarian actors to deliver relief assistance or conduct access negotiations with government authorities and opposition forces and non-state armed actors.</p> <p>The CERF-funded UNDSS team and the security plane aimed to achieve the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct 120 location and/or operation specific Security Risk Assessments,</li> <li>• Inform DSS security briefings at 24 routine Security Management Team meetings, Security Cell meetings (and emergency meetings as required) and 12 Diplomatic Security Briefings (and more during emergencies),</li> </ul>			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the security coverage and information gathering and analysis capacity for remote locations - to permit enhanced (timely and reliable) security advisories &amp; alerts to be provided to the RC/HC, AFPs .and NGOs.</li> <li>• Assessment of security conditions at open airstrips for humanitarian operations as needed.</li> </ul>	
11. Actual outcomes achieved with CERF funds	
<p><b>Conduct 120 location and/or operation specific Security Risk Assessments</b>  A total of 146 SRA missions were conducted until 30 November 2014. These missions opened up new locations for humanitarian access with appropriate security measures.</p> <p><b>Inform DSS security briefings at 24 routine Security Management Team meetings, Security Cell meetings (and emergency meetings as required) and 12 Diplomatic Security Briefings (and more during emergencies)</b>  A total of 221 security briefings were conducted during the reporting period: 34 Security Management Team (SMT) briefings, 34 Security Cell briefings, 68 (Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) security briefings and 68 Inter-Cluster Working Group security briefings along with 17 Diplomatic security briefings.</p> <p><b>Increase the security coverage and information gathering and analysis capacity for remote locations - to permit enhanced (timely and reliable) security advisories &amp; alerts to be provided to the RC/HC, AFPs .and NGOs.</b>  An average of three weekly security risk assessment missions were conducted in the main conflict affected states of Jonglei, Unity and Upper Nile. Ongoing surveillance of the entire country was made. The assessments paved the way for humanitarian actors to scale up their operations, employing appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p><b>Assessment of security conditions at open airstrips for humanitarian operations as needed</b>  Seven airstrip security assessments were conducted.</p>	
12. In case of significant discrepancy between planned and actual outcomes, please describe reasons:	
<p>There are no significant discrepancies between planned and actual outcomes.</p> <p>The CERF no-cost extension and reprogramming, approved in July 2014, enabled UNDSS to use the CERF grant in a more efficient and effective manner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The no-cost extension improved UNDSS capacity to cover more humanitarian operations for a longer period. Given the volatile security conditions prevailing in South Sudan, even after the signature of the peace agreement on May 9, 2014, there was a need to perform SRAs, assess new locations and provide recommendations to humanitarian operations.</li> <li>- The redeployment of funds expanded UNDSS capacity to address security needs in a higher number of locations as per the evolving security situation on the ground, redeploying budget lines initially allocated for international staff in order to increase flight operations while using more local staff.</li> </ul>	
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): Code 0  If 'NO' (or if GM score is 1 or 0): UNDSS Serves all and there is special consideration for gender balance aspects in all its operations.</p>	
14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?	EVALUATION CARRIED OUT <input type="checkbox"/>
No evaluation is planned; however UNDSS will be willing to conduct an evaluation of the project if required by the CERF.	EVALUATION PENDING <input type="checkbox"/>
	NO EVALUATION PLANNED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS**

CERF project information			
1. Agency:	UNHCR	5. CERF grant period:	01.01.2014 – 30.06.2014
2. CERF project code:	14-RR-HCR-001	6. Status of CERF grant:	<input type="checkbox"/> On-going
3. Cluster/Sector:	Camp Management		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded
4. Project title:	Establishment and Roll out of Camp Coordination and Camp Management Cluster <sup>9</sup>		
7. Funding	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 3,270,051	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$ 754,320	▪ <i>NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent:</i> US\$ 0
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 754,320	▪ <i>Government Partners:</i> 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. <i>Female</i>	92,000	131,200	The discrepancy in the number of beneficiaries can be explained as follows: after the approval of the project by the CERF Secretariat, the number of IDPs was increasing on daily basis due to the volatile security situation. This led to an increased number of people in need of assistance especially in the PoC sites, and the need to increase delivery of humanitarian assistance to IDPs in Juba, Bentiu, Bor and Malakal.
b. <i>Male</i>	108,000	154,000	
c. <i>Total individuals (female + male):</i>	200,000	285,200	
d. <i>Of total, children under age 5</i>	36,000	51,300	
9. Original project objective from approved CERF proposal			
To rapidly roll out the CCCM Cluster and ensure camp coordination support to facilitate the effective delivery of services to IDPs in camps and camp-like settlements.			
10. Original expected outcomes from approved CERF proposal			
Cluster coordination mechanism and camp coordination in place to facilitate effective service delivery for displaced persons in camps and camp like settings Number of meetings of CCCM; Number of sites with organized camp management;  CCCM strategy developed and adopted by the actors: One strategy developed and available for all actors;  Site planning, camp management and information management established and functioning: Number of experts of specified profile deployed;  Special arrangements in place for women and men, children and persons with specific needs number of camps/sites with adopted arrangements for women, children and persons with specific needs to access the sites, assistance and services;  Community participation mainstreamed in the camp management response			

<sup>9</sup> At mid-year review of 2014 CRP, project title was changed to "Republic of South Sudan, Camp Coordination and Camp Management Cluster Coordination".

Number of camps with community participation in the decision making process	
11. Actual outcomes achieved with CERF funds	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengthening of the national cluster led through the deployment of a cluster coordinator to ensure appropriate cross-sectoral coordination with other related clusters such as WASH, Shelter, Protection and others.</li> <li>• Six international staff members were deployed and were provided with working space, accommodation facilities, communication equipment (computers and printers, photocopy machines, UPS, VHF Handsets, cell phones and Thuraya satellite phones).</li> <li>• Establishment of coordination mechanisms which allow CCCM actors to meet on either weekly/bi-weekly basis to ensure a coordinated and transparent approach to services provision.</li> <li>• Site planning was done for PoC sites 2 and 3 (UN House) in Juba, as well as PoC site 4 in Bentiu.</li> <li>• Development and operationalization of a strategy aimed at providing cluster members and other stakeholders with a framework for the coordination of humanitarian assistance targeted to displaced populations residing in formal or informal sites. The strategy has provided the cluster with a mechanism through which to address current and newly identified needs by setting up camp coordination structures at the national and, where necessary, state levels, facilitating the establishment of effective camp management in IDP sites, and carrying out registration and monitoring of conditions in IDP sites.</li> <li>• Deployment of two state focal points for Unity and Eastern Equatoria states who have worked to establish and strengthen leadership structures, complaints/referral mechanisms in the IDPs and host Communities aimed at facilitating effective and targeted delivery and monitoring of services to IDPs.</li> <li>• An Information Management Officer and a Physical Planner have been deployed to support the cluster within their respective expertise.</li> <li>• Missions to the field in order to reach IDPs including in hard to reach areas where needs assessments resulting to provision of responses were conducted.</li> <li>• Working with existing partners in Eastern Equatoria (Nimule and Melijo) and Unity (Paryang), mechanisms have been put in place to ensure the most vulnerable get access to assistance through community centres or referral system that enables vulnerable communities and persons with specific needs gets informed of available assistance and the applicable eligibility or distribution criteria.</li> <li>• A targeted response to the needs of the displaced population in Unity and Eastern Equatoria implemented.</li> </ul>	
12. In case of significant discrepancy between planned and actual outcomes, please describe reasons:	
The outcomes of the project were as expected with no significant discrepancies.	
13. Are the CERF funded activities part of a CAP project that applied an IASC Gender Marker code?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
If 'YES', what is the code (0, 1, 2a or 2b): 2a If 'NO' (or if GM score is 1 or 0):	
14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?	EVALUATION CARRIED OUT <input type="checkbox"/>
Due to number of competing priorities the planned project evaluation has been delayed. UNHCR is planning to conduct the evaluation soon and share the report latest by mid-March, 2015.	EVALUATION PENDING <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	NO EVALUATION PLANNED <input type="checkbox"/>

**TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS**

TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS			
CERF project information			
1. Agency:	IOM	5. CERF grant period:	[15.12.13 – 14.06.14]
2. CERF project code:	14-RR-IOM-001	6. Status of CERF grant:	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing
3. Cluster/Sector:	Camp Management		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded
4. Project title:	Immediate establishment of Camp Coordination and Camp Management mechanisms to facilitate the rapid delivery of services to IDPs in camps and camp-like settlements		
7. Funding	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 23,031,662 <sup>10</sup>	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:
	b. Total funding received for the project <sup>11</sup> :	US\$ 32,011,990	▪ NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent: US\$ 1,170,605
	c. Amount received from CERF <sup>12</sup> :	US\$ 8,245,627	▪ Government Partners: US\$ 273,613
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	not available	203,315	The displacement patterns remained highly fluid throughout project implementation. The significant increase in numbers reached is due to the continued increase of IDPs as a result of continued insecurities throughout the project timeframe.
b. Male	Not available	173,195	
c. Total individuals (female + male):	200,000	376,510	
d. Of total, children <u>under age 5</u>	not available	82,832	
9. Original project objective from approved CERF proposal			
To ensure the efficient and immediate delivery of multi-sectoral, life-saving response in camp-like settings through the establishment of a coordination mechanism (the CCCM Cluster) and the immediate deployment of camp management teams to priority sites.			
10. Original expected outcomes from approved CERF proposal			
Note the below outcomes reflect revisions approved by CERF through a realignment request submitted by IOM in May 2014. <b>Outcome:</b> Provision of humanitarian response within camp-like settings is carried out in an efficient and coordinated manner <b>Indicator:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of sites meeting sector-established standards for service provision (sectors include: Food, Health, Protection and WASH);</li> <li>• Number of CCCM reports providing sector-specific information on the current status of the response and urgent gaps distributed on a regular basis;</li> <li>• Number of IDPs provided with transport support for relocation to other sites</li> <li>• Number of sites expanded or established with support from the CCCM Cluster</li> </ul>			

<sup>10</sup> This adjusted figure is representative of the three project budgets in the CRP following the mid-year review in May/June 2014. When the CERF proposal was developed in January there were only two projects in the CRP.

<sup>11</sup> SSD-14/CSS/65078; SSD-14/CSS/65079; and SSD-14/CSS/69588

<sup>12</sup> SSD-14/CSS/65078 - \$2,245,627; SSD-14/CSS/65079 - \$6,000,000



**Outcome 2:** Onsite camp management mechanisms in place to ensure the urgent needs of the displaced population are immediately identified and the appropriate life-saving response is provided by Cluster partners.

**Indicator:**

- Number of counties with camp management teams in place
- Number of sites with camp committees in place
- Number of sites where sector-specific needs are identified, information shared and response coordinated through CCCM partners.

11. Actual outcomes achieved with CERF funds

**Outcome 1: Provision of humanitarian response within camp-like settings is carried out in an efficient and coordinated manner**

**Progress against indicators:**

**Indicator 1: Number of sites meeting sector-established standards for service provision (sectors include: Health, WASH, Protection, Food).**

40 sites assessed and monitored through Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM). Though not all emergency standards are met, improvement in access to services is observed particularly in the largest sites and sites with dedicated camp management agencies. The DTM is the main CCCM cluster tool used to gather information on IDP displacement patterns and access to services in IDP sites. DTM reports were released on a bi-monthly schedule from January to June 2014. The DTM assessed conditions in 40 sites gathering, analysing and sharing data on access to services and gaps in these sites.

Sites assessed through the DTM included all the PoC sites that were hosting IDPs within the project timeframe and Mingkaman (the biggest spontaneous settlement). All 40 sites that were assessed through DTM were found to have some degree of access to services though the need to improve access was evident for most sectors and most sites. Gaps were identified in Food, Health, NFI, Shelter, WASH, Education, and Protection sectors. Sector specific gaps identified through the DTM were brought to the attention of state level CCCM coordination teams and shared with relevant clusters and different service providers. Following reports of gaps, partners were able to improve response improve basic services in these locations. In particular, WASH services (improved ratios for latrines per person and litres of water per person per day were observed when comparing the first DTM report with succeeding DTM reports), set-up of health centres (e.g. Cholera Treatment Centre) and establishment of camp management structures inside the sites have contributed to improved services.

DTM reports can be accessed on: <https://southsudan.humanitarianresponse.info/clusters/camp-coordination-and-camp-management-cccm>

***Indicator 2: Number of CCCM reports providing sector-specific information on the current status of the response and urgent gaps distributed on a regular basis.***

Two CCCM reporting formats were developed: CCCM Site Reports and DTM. A total of 291 reports (288 CCCM site reports and 3 DTM consolidated reports) were shared during this reporting period.

CCCM Site Reports: 288 CCCM Site Reports are produced from 7 states on a weekly basis to capture the living conditions of the IDP population. Site Reports are collected by CCCM Site Managers who are deployed in different PoC sites, spontaneous settlements, and collective centres. These reports feed into planning and facilitating assistance for each site. Information from these reports are collated and disseminated to the CCCM Cluster members and the Inter-Cluster Working Group (ICWG) composed of different cluster coordinators.

The CCCM Site Reports are composed of the following tools:

- Site Reports: analysis of sectoral needs, gaps and responses in sites including tracking of population.
- Site Preparation Matrix: updates on the site planning and site preparation activities in the PoC sites in Juba, Malakal, Bentiu, Bor, and Wau, and in the spontaneous site in Mingkaman.
- Resource and Gap Mapping (RGM): a site specific information matrix used to reconcile number of sites identified by OCHA and CCCM, identify areas where CCCM activities are needed and areas that CCCM has not yet covered.
- 4Ws: information gathered on Who, What, When, Where of CCCM activities in each site.

List of Sites where CCCM Site Reports have been provided regularly:

STATE	Central Equatoria State	Eastern Equatoria State	Jonglei State	Lakes State	Unity State	Upper Nile State	Warrap State	Western Bahrgazal State
Location	Tong Ping	Nimule	Bor	Awerial	Bentiu	Malakal	Agany	Wau
	UN House	Kapoeta			Pariang	Melut	Mananguei	
	Mahad	Torit				Dethoma	Manawan	Pagai

Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM): 3 Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) reports were produced and shared to all partners and stakeholders. The DTM is an information management tool used by the CCCM Cluster to gather baseline information on displaced populations and the conditions in the areas where they have temporarily settled.

The following are findings from the DTM Round III for assessments conducted between May and June 2014:

Thematic Area	Recent Findings
Population Tracking	- Out of the 254,975 IDPs represented in DTM round III, 61% are located in spontaneous settlements, 37% in PoC sites and 2% in collective centres.
	-In 76% of sites IDPs are unclear as to when they will be able to depart the site.
	-In 68% of sites the majority of IDPs, when able, intend to return to their place of origin <sup>13</sup> ; 15% plan to return to their place of habitual residence.
	-62% of all sites expect IDP influxes in the coming weeks.
CCCM	-30% of sites are overcrowded.
	-38% of sites have no formal site managers.
	-16% of sites report that minority communities do not have representatives in leadership roles.
Health	-22% of sites have no access to health services.
	-Top 3 health problems measured across all sites were diarrhoea (36.6%) malaria (34.9%), and respiratory tract infections (14.7%).
NFI/Shelter	-The main forms of shelter in IDP sites are self-made structures (32.2%), community buildings (19.9%), and rakoobas <sup>14</sup> (17.2%).
	-Priority needs for NFI/Shelter items reported in sites are plastic sheets (24.3%) sleeping mats (19.8%), and blankets (18.6%).
WASH	-Average person per latrine stands at 70 to 1 in PoC areas; 126 to 1 for spontaneous settlements; and 67 to 1 for collective centres.
	-22% of all sites report that available water supply is insufficient.
	-38% of sites use 'unimproved' and surface water sources. Of these, only 21% of 'unsafe' sources are treated before consumption.
Education	-In 51% of all sites children do not attend school.
	-Of those sites where children are attending school, 61% receive schooling within the site, 33% attend nearby government schools and 6% attend private school (provided by the church).
Protection	-In 41% percent of sites women report feeling unsafe compared with 32% of sites for men.
	-Of those sites deemed 'unsafe' by men and women, 73% cite the presence of armed elements as a main concern.

**Indicator 3: Number of IDPs provided with transport support for relocation to other sites.**

Progress: Zero IDPs provided with transport support for relocation to other sites. This activity was removed during the realignment request submitted to and approved by CERF in May 2014. Relocation activities were carried out after the end date of this CERF project. The realignment removed funds for this activity as they would not be necessary over the length of the project.

**Indicator 4: Number of sites expanded or established with support from the CCCM Cluster.**

This contribution enabled site expansion works to begin in 4 sites: UNMISS Malakal, UNMISS Bor and UNMISS UN House, Juba and UNMISS Bentiu. Site expansion and improvement was prioritized within UNMISS bases because these sites were the most

<sup>13</sup> 'Place of origin' is defined as the place of birth of the individual. This differentiates from the 'place of habitual residence' which is defined as the last place of habitation including either an established residence or temporary dwelling.

<sup>14</sup> Rakoobas are straw shelters usually covered with a plastic sheet.

congested and it was anticipated that these sites were likely to remain for a longer period of time. As part of site expansion, this project enabled the start-up of the humanitarian hubs in these same locations. The establishment of the hubs was essential to ensuring that humanitarians were able to operate in these areas and provide life-saving assistance to the IDPs in and around the UNMISS bases. CERF funds enabled the start-up of these activities; resources from other donors were later received to facilitate their completion.

### **Site Expansion and Improvement**

**Bor:** By then end of the project, 60% of overall site works were completed. The new site will have the capacity to host 8,000 people which includes the entire IDP population in the Bor PoC site (an estimated 4,123 IDPs as of June 2014) plus a contingency space in the event of renewed fighting and an influx of more IDPs. At the end of the project, site works continue to be carried out through other resources. Relocation into the new site was anticipated to begin in September. This site expansion will provide IDPs with improved living conditions, and humanitarian partners will be able to provide life-saving services more effectively.

**Juba: UN House PoC site 3:** 90% of site preparation works were achieved at the end of the project. Most of the remaining works were related to external drainage and finalization of the site perimeter. The site was originally designed to host 10,000 IDPs. However, upon the request of UNMISS; discussions are ongoing regarding the possibility of reconfiguring the site to enable a larger population to accommodate the space. The site opened on 7 June and relocation of IDPs from Tongping began shortly after. By the end of June the process for relocation had begun for the first 395 IDPs had relocated into the site. Relocation operations continued after the project end date.

**New PoC Site Malakal:** Overall site works were 75% complete at the end of the project. At the end of the project, IOM was able to complete site preparation works in Sectors 1, 2, 3 of the new PoC site. Ground filling, levelling and compacting in Sectors 1, 2 and 3 are fully completed. The Cholera Treatment Centre (CTC) is also completed including construction of various facilities inside the CTC. IOM brought additional machinery to the site to implement site preparation works, including pitching 645 tents.

<b>Following the site preparation works, these services were established at the new PoC:</b>	
<b>645 tents installed in all three sectors (61% of overall target)</b>	Concertina wire perimeter security fencing around Sectors 1, 2 and 3 almost fully completed
<b>Four water tap stands and apron constructed and installed (33% of overall target)</b>	1 temporary learning centre constructed
<b>10 communal latrines constructed (43% of overall target) in Sector 1 (3 units) and Sector 3 (7 units)</b>	1 child friendly space constructed
<b>30 bathing facilities constructed</b>	1 health and nutrition centre constructed
<b>Four temporary platforms for water bladders and storage tanks installed</b>	1 camp management office constructed
<b>Two storage tanks installed</b>	

### **Humanitarian Hubs**

CERF funding also contributed to the start-up of the humanitarian hubs in priority locations. The establishment of the humanitarian hubs was necessary to facilitate site expansion and improvement and ensure the provision of life-saving services in these locations. Prior to the establishment of the hubs, there was no living and working space available for humanitarian workers in these locations. Continued insecurities outside of the UNMISS bases meant that humanitarian staff were unable to operate from their offices, which were mostly looted and destroyed during the conflict. A temporary living and working space needed to be set up inside the UNMISS base to enable humanitarians to operate in these locations. The hubs have provided an immediate solution to a lack of accommodation options available to humanitarian workers. The hubs have enabled and increase in the number of aid workers who can be based in these key locations facilitating continued site expansion and improvement activities which ultimately provides IDPs with continued targeted service delivery and camps that are overseen on a regular basis by agencies.

**Bor:** The hub in Bor is functional with a maximum capacity of 100 persons. IOM has installed 10 temporary accommodation and working areas for humanitarian workers. These are necessary for continued site management and improvements. Without these available spaces humanitarian workers would not be able to work effectively. Other agencies have installed 10 structures for offices. The humanitarian hub in Bentiu will continue to provide common workspaces and lodging for partners and actors working in areas with limited facilities. This will continue provided there remains a need for humanitarian presence, and funding is secured for necessary upgrades.

**Malakal:** The Malakal hub is operational with projected capacity of 200 individuals. The hub is continually being upgraded to have

more permanent facilities such as containers and installation of services. Currently, IOM has installed 26 temporary accommodation and working spaces for humanitarian workers. Other agencies have installed 35 structures for office and accommodation to augment the capacity of the hub. IOM installed the electricity and construction of water and sewage connections is ongoing. UNMISS has provided ablution containers and toilet containers, but there is a planned installation of 25 ablution containers, 30 toilet containers and 4 self-contained containers for services. IOM, as the hub management agency, deployed a fulltime hub manager to oversee all hub activities such as maintenance, set-up, common services and coordination with UNMISS. The humanitarian hub in Malakal will continue to provide common workspaces and lodging for partners and actors working in areas with limited facilities, provided there remains a need for humanitarian presence and that funding is secured for necessary upgrades.

**Bentiu:** IOM has installed 16 temporary accommodation and working spaces for humanitarian workers. Agencies have installed 16 structures for accommodation, and 3 for office space, also to augment the capacity of the hub. Electricity is 50% completed through 2x150 KVA generators provided by IOM. Water and sewage connections are still ongoing. Logistical constraints (inaccessible roads) in Bentiu have delayed the delivery of materials to complete the set-up. The humanitarian hub in Bentiu will continue to provide common workspaces and lodging for partners and actors working in areas with limited facilities provided there remains a need for humanitarian presence and funding is secured for necessary upgrades.

**Outcome 2: On-site camp management mechanisms in place to ensure the urgent needs of the displaced population are immediately identified and the appropriate life-saving response is provided by Cluster partners.**

**Indicator 1: Number of counties with CCCM teams in place.**

A total of 22 counties had CCCM teams in place at the end of the project. By June 2014, 41 counties were reported as having IDPs; CCCM coverage reached 50% of counties hosting displaced populations. In addition, it is of interest to highlight that the biggest IDP sites (sites hosting more than 10,000 IDPs) including PoC sites all have dedicated camp managers in place.

Counties Covered by CCCM Teams		
State	County	Agency
Eastern Equatoria	Magwi	UNHCR
	Ikotos	Healthlink
	Kapoeta South	Healthlink
	Budi	Healthlink
	Torit	UNHCR
	Kapoeta North	Healthlink
	Lafon	Healthlink
	Kapoeta East	Healthlink
Lakes	Awerial	ACTED
Unity	Mayendit	Concern Worldwide
	Leer	Concern Worldwide
	Koch	Concern Worldwide
	Guit	Deutsche Welthungerhilfe / German Agro-Action
	Rubkona	DRC
	Pariang	UNHCR/African Humanitarian Action (AHA)
Warrap	Twic	IOM
WBeG	Wau	IOM
Jonglei	Bor South	IOM
Upper Nile	Malakal	DRC
	Melut	DRC
	Renk	IOM
Central Equatoria	Juba	ACTED

**Indicator 2: Number of sites with camp committees in place.**

According to the DTM Round III, 18 sites have recognized camp committees in place. While the communities usually have pre-existing leadership structures or representatives in leadership roles, the camp committees are established inside IDP sites to

encourage IDP participation in site governance and ensure IDP representation in decision and activities inside the camp.

List of sites with camp committees in place:

Site Name	County	State
Agany	Twic	Warrap
Dethoma 1	Melut	Upper Nile
Dethoma 2	Melut	Upper Nile
South Sudan Don Bosco	Juba	Central Equatoria
Mahad School	Juba	Central Equatoria
Man Anguei	Twic	Warrap
Man Awan	Twic	Warrap
Meligo	Magwi	Eastern Equatoria
Mingkaman	Awerial	Lakes
Pagai	Twic	Warrap
Torit	Torit	Eastern Equatoria
UNMISS Bentiu POC	Rubkona	Unity
UNMISS Bor POC	Bor South	Jonglei
UNMISS Juba 3 POC	Juba	Central Equatoria
UNMISS Malakal POC	Malakal	Upper Nile
UNMISS Melut PoC	Melut	Upper Nile
UNMISS Topping POC	Juba	Central Equatoria
UNMISS Wau POC	Wau	Western Bahr el Ghazal

**Indicator 3: Number of sites where sector-specific needs are identified, information shared and response coordinated through CCCM partners.**

40 sites assessed and monitored through DTM. Though not all emergency standards are met, improvement in access to services is observed particularly in the largest sites and sites with dedicated camp management agencies.

**Additional Indicator: number of meetings with Cluster partners to address daily issues to address needs of vulnerable populations**

21 CCCM Cluster Meetings were conducted in Juba with all CCCM partners and stakeholders to discuss and updates issues on camp coordination and camp management in all existing IDP sites. The meetings were chaired by the cluster leads, IOM/UNHCR/ACTED. CCCM partners represented were: OCHA, AHA, Concern Worldwide, DRC, ECHO, GAA, Health Link, SSOPO, the Shelter Cluster Team, WASH Cluster, UNMISS, OFDA, Internews, Intersos, WHH, PIN, Help Age, NRC.

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

With delays encountered in expansion and improvement of the sites, IDP relocation has not yet taken place as previously envisaged. The reprogramming request has allowed using funds originally allocated for transport of IDP relocation to undertake further site expansion and improvement of the PoC sites and accommodate a higher number of IDPs. Then the relocation of IDPs was supported by other contributions and is about to take place at the time of the completion of this CERF funded project.

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): 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

The magnitude of response throughout the IDP sites and the heightened mobility of the displaced population have limited the cluster in implementing an evaluation during this project timeframe. However, a planned evaluation in the next three months (before the year ends) will be carried out where the cluster leads from IOM, UNHCR, and ACTED with a monitoring team will visit the IDP sites to evaluate the cluster coordination structure that was established at the

EVALUATION PENDING

NO EVALUATION PLANNED

<p>onset of the crisis, and the camp management activities implemented inside the sites. In addition, IOM plans to roll out a real time evaluation of IOM's Cluster Coordination role. The evaluation aims to provide a series of lessons learned and recommendations based on the perceptions of cluster partners and IOM staff from January to September 2014. Lessons learned from the evaluation will be carried out to feed into future CCCM responses.</p>	
--	--

**TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS**

CERF project information			
1. Agency:	WFP	5. CERF grant period:	08.01.2014-07.07.2014
2. CERF project code:	14-RR-WFP-001	6. Status of CERF grant:	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing
3. Cluster/Sector:	Logistics		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded
4. Project title:	Provision of Humanitarian Air Services in The Republic of South Sudan		
7. Funding	a. Total project budget <sup>15</sup> :	US\$42,848,653 <sup>16</sup> US\$32,106,890	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:
	b. Total funding received for the project <sup>17</sup> :	US\$ 45,085,836	▪ NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent: US\$ 0
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 4,621,119	▪ 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	Not available	3,638	As the crisis in South Sudan continued, the number of affected and displaced population grew leading to a corresponding increase in the movement of humanitarian staff, relief items and most importantly medical supplies to hard-to-reach locations. The initial project duration was three months but ended in six months. At the end of the project, UNHAS had moved 7,236 passengers, 276 mt of humanitarian supplies, carried out 16 medical evacuations, 25 security evacuations and facilitated 22 special missions. As at the end of the project in July, UNHAS had transported 25 per cent more than the projected number of passengers.
b. Male	Not available	3,638	
c. Total individuals (female + male):	2700	7,276	
d. Of total, children <u>under</u> age 5	Not available	Not available <sup>18</sup>	
9. Original project objective from approved CERF proposal			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To provide timely response to the humanitarian crisis in South Sudan, where surface transport and/or access by fixed wing aircraft is impossible. (UNHAS)</li> <li>To transport urgent lifesaving relief items and medical supplies for the civilian population affected by hostilities. (UNHAS)</li> <li>To transport health cluster personnel and humanitarian actors where access by fixed wing aircraft is impossible. (UNHAS)</li> <li>To provide both medical and security evacuations for humanitarian aid actors in those locations where access by fixed wing aircraft is impossible. (UNHAS)</li> </ul>			
10. Original expected outcomes from approved CERF proposal			
<p>UNHAS helicopters:</p> <p>Assistance will be delivered in remote locations to people in need. The helicopters will facilitate access to the locations cut off by insecurity.</p> <p>The operation will be monitored in line with the following key performance indicators:</p>			

<sup>15</sup> FTS as of 9 December 2014

<sup>16</sup> The project requirements were reviewed upwards at the mid year review of the CRP

<sup>17</sup> FTS as of 9 December 2014

<sup>18</sup> Figures for children under age 5 are not available

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100 per cent response to medical and security evacuations;</li> <li>• Number of passengers transported against planned (target: 900 passengers per month);</li> <li>• Non-food relief items transported against requested or planned quantities (target: 100mt per month);</li> <li>• 100 per cent utilization of contracted hours;</li> <li>• Number of United Nations agencies and other humanitarian organizations utilizing the service; and</li> <li>• Number of locations served (target: 10 locations).</li> </ul>	
11. Actual outcomes achieved with CERF funds	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100 per cent of the requested medical and security evacuations were performed (38 cases)</li> <li>• Number of passengers transported per month was 1,034, which represents 115 percent of the planned 900 passengers.</li> <li>• Non-food relief items transported per month amount to 39.4 per cent of the target of 100mt.</li> <li>• All aircraft contracted performed average of 131 per cent utilization of the contracted hours.</li> <li>• 217 humanitarian agencies benefitted from the project</li> <li>• UNHAS served 39 locations against 10 locations initially targeted.</li> </ul>	
12. In case of significant discrepancy between planned and actual outcomes, please describe reasons:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impact of the security situation in South Sudan deteriorated after the project inception leading to an increased need for sustained humanitarian air service. This resulted in overutilization of the three helicopters contracted to execute the operation both in terms of the hours flown and passengers transported.</li> <li>• The emergency response areas and locations requiring air service increased due to rapid movement of the affected population and an increase in insecurity in other parts of the country especially in Jonglei, Upper Nile and Unity states. From 10 locations initially planned, the helicopters were able to service 39 locations all over the country.</li> <li>• Passenger transport was prioritised as the Logistics Cluster was complementing UNHAS cargo movement with their air assets. This resulted in far less cargo moved compared to the target of 100 mt per month.</li> </ul>	
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"/>
<b>If 'YES', what is the code (0, 1, 2a or 2b):</b> 4 - Not applicable <b>If 'NO' (or if GM score is 1 or 0):</b>	
14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?	EVALUATION CARRIED OUT <input type="checkbox"/>
No formal evaluation has been carried out for this project. However, UNHAS constantly evaluates project performance and periodically report back to the Steering Committee and the User Group Meetings.	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
14-RR-IOM-001	Camp Management	IOM	INTERSOS	Yes	INGO	\$197,432	26-Mar-14	1-Feb-14	IOM received the counter signed approval letter from CERF and signed by the HC and IOM DG on 15 January 2014. From that moment we as an organisation we move forward to start implementation and coordination activities. In order for us to implement activities through implementing partners (IPs) we have an agreement that they start implementing as soon as possible. Organisations can begin implementation straight away, or they may wait until payments are authorised and passed on. Generally all IPS start implementing right away and receive instalments based on payment structures approved in mutually approved contracts. IOM immediately begins the process for channelling funds through IPs from when contracts and agreements are signed. The process of providing first instalments can take anything up to 6 weeks to process depending on bilateral. We can provide contracts agreed with these IPS at your earliest convenience to show example payment structures.
14-RR-IOM-001	Camp Management	IOM	CONCERN	Yes	INGO	\$305,051	27-Mar-14	14-Feb-14	
14-RR-IOM-001	Camp Management	IOM	DRC	Yes	GOV	\$273,615	14-Apr-14	1-Mar-14	
14-RR-IOM-001	Camp Management	IOM	PIN	Yes	INGO	\$56,073	2-Apr-14	1-Mar-14	
14-RR-IOM-001	Camp Management	IOM	WELTHUNGER HILFE	Yes	INGO	\$16,015	18-Apr-14	1-Mar-14	
14-RR-IOM-001	Camp Management	IOM	HEALTHLINK	Yes	NNGO	\$393,190	31-Mar-14	1-Mar-14	
14-RR-IOM-001	Camp Management	IOM	AFRICA HUMANITARIAN ACTION	Yes	INGO	\$202,844	2-Apr-14	1-Mar-14	

## ANNEX 2: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS (Alphabetical)

AAR	After Action Review
ACTED	Agency for Technical Cooperation and Development
AFPs	Agencies, Funds and Programmes
AHA	Africa Humanitarian Action
CCCM	Camp Coordination and Camp Management
CERF	Central Emergency Response Fund
CHF	Common Humanitarian Fund
CTC	Cholera Treatment Centre
DRC	Danish Refugee Council
DTM	Displacement Tracking Matrix
ECHO	European Commission Humanitarian Office
FSCO	Field Security Coordination Officer
FTS	Financial Tracking Service (an online tracking database)
HCT	Humanitarian Country Team
IASC	Inter-Agency Standing Committee
ICWG	Inter Cluster Working Group
IDP	Internal Displaced Person
IOM	International Organisation for Migration
MEDEVAC	Medical Evacuation
NFI	Non Food Items
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NRC	Norwegian Refugee Council
NRC	Norwegian Refugee Council
OCHA	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
OFDA	Office of US Foreign Disaster Assistance
PIN	People In Need
PoC	Protection of Civilian
RC/HC	Resident Coordinator/Humanitarian Coordinator
SMT	Security Management Team
SPHERE	Refers to standards in The Sphere Handbook: Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Response,
SPLA	South Sudan People Liberation Army
SPLA-IO	South Sudan People Liberation Army – In Opposition
SRA	Security Risk Assessment
SSOPO	South Sudan Older People's Organization
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Programme for Development
UNDSS	United Nations Department of Safety and Security