

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

RESIDENT/HUMANITARIAN COORDINATOR

Subinay Nandy

REPORTING PROCESS AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY

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

AAR was conducted among the CERF recipient UN agencies in January 2015. This was mainly conducted as lessons learned for future possible applications to the CERF secretariat. During the AAR the CERF life-saving criteria and the time critical nature of the intervention were particularly discussed.

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

YES NO

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

YES NO

I. HUMANITARIAN CONTEXT

TABLE 1: EMERGENCY ALLOCATION OVERVIEW (US\$)		
Total amount required for the humanitarian response: 11,101,695		
Breakdown of total response funding received by source	Source	Amount
	CERF	2,052,680
	COMMON HUMANITARIAN FUND/ EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND (if applicable)	0
	OTHER (bilateral/multilateral)	4,503,686
	TOTAL	6,556,366

TABLE 2: CERF EMERGENCY FUNDING BY ALLOCATION AND PROJECT (US\$)			
Allocation 1 – date of official submission: 17-Jun-14			
Agency	Project code	Cluster/Sector	Amount
UNICEF	14-RR-CEF-090	WASH	94,204
FAO	14-RR-FAO-021	Food security	296,613
WFP	14-RR-WFP-039	Food security	1,661,863
TOTAL			2,052,680

TABLE 3: BREAKDOWN OF CERF FUNDS BY TYPE OF IMPLEMENTATION MODALITY (US\$)	
Type of implementation modality	Amount
Direct UN agencies/IOM implementation	1,664,628.38
Funds forwarded to NGOs for implementation	325,255.00
Funds forwarded to government partners	62,796.62
TOTAL	2,052,680

HUMANITARIAN NEEDS

Sri Lanka has been experiencing increased frequency and intensity of natural hazards and droughts have become a recurrent phenomenon during last three decades. Since 2010, erratic rainfall during the northeast monsoon characterized by flood/drought cycles has led to increased number of disaster-affected people in the Dry Zone of Sri Lanka. These were mostly the zones affected by the 2004 Tsunami and lengthy armed conflict which ended in May 2009. These affected communities were already highly vulnerable and struggling to achieve basic living standards, and had little or no resilience in the face of a third successive climatic crisis.

From the latter part of 2013 Sri Lanka experienced a prolonged drought period over 10 months across many districts. As most households in the affected areas engage in small-scale farming activities, their livelihoods were severely affected by destroyed or

very poor crops, and many families reported they have eaten the seed paddy they should have planted for the irrigated agriculture (Yala) season in 2014 due to continuous low level of food supply.

A multi-sector rapid assessment was conducted in April 2014 jointly by the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) and the Government of Sri Lanka (GoSL) in the 15 worst drought affected districts to assess the impact and target assistance to the most vulnerable people. The assessment revealed that the emergency was not an isolated event but rather the accumulation of impacts due to recurrent natural disasters over a period of three years. The number of food insecure people due to climate shocks has risen dramatically since 2010 as a consequence of a gradual erosion of coping strategies among the rural population to recurring natural disasters. In 2012, a similar drought condition affected food security of 360,000 people around the country with severe food insecurity in two districts in the Northern Province. In early 2013, over 430,000 people were affected in Northern and Eastern Provinces due to floods. In 2014, a total of 1.5million people were affected, out of which, 768,000 people were identified as food insecure with low coping capacity and 60,000 people were in urgent need of drinking water assistance. A total of 189,800¹ people were identified as severely food insecure and were in need of urgent external food security assistance in these districts. Out of the total of severely food insecure people, two percent were pregnant and lactating women and ten percent were children under the age of 5-years. Female headed households both divorced and war-widows represented more than ten percent of the total affected households. Over 765,000 people (50 percent) of the affected community were reported to use negative coping strategies such as limiting meal portions, restricting adult meal consumptions and reducing number of meals taken in a day. This indicates a low level of resilience capacity among the affected population. Over half of the surveyed households are spending more than 65 percent of their income on food: this proportion is even higher in Mullaitivu, Batticaloa, and Kilinochchi districts. The proportion of households with an inadequate diet was estimated to have tripled compared to the level of 2012: from six percent to 18 percent increase. This was particularly high in the Northern, Uva and Eastern Provinces.

The 2014 drought situation also caused water scarcity to 294,433 people in 11 districts while 80,000 persons in 5 districts were severely affected with heavy water shortages. SPHERE standards require average water use for drinking, cooking and personal hygiene in any household should be at least 15 liters per person per day. In addition the affected communities travelled more than 500 metres to access water which is above the distance limits for a potable water sources as per the SPHERE standards.

In addition to the drought-impact on food security through lack of income generation and loss of harvest, the poor households' secondary livelihood income generation activity of livestock has been severely affected through the spread of Foot-and-Mouth (FMD) disease in the above 15 districts. Livestock provides food (milk and meat) and is essential for ensuring a diversified diet both for adults and children. According to the Department of Animal Production and Health (DAPH), 160,000 households depending on the cattle, goat and swine keeping were directly affected by the FMD outbreak. Among them were the recently resettled people in the Northern and Eastern Provinces. They faced financial difficulties to treat their infected animals. FMD is endemic in Sri Lanka. During the past 10 years annually maximum of 6 Divisional Secretariat Divisions (DSDs) in Northern and Eastern Provinces were reported as affected by maximum of 200 animal deaths. In December 2013 FMD was reported only in 1 district (Jaffna) and as of May 2014 FMD has spread to 80 Divisional Secretary's Divisions (DSDs), in 18 districts in the country. According to the Statistics of the Department of Animal Production and Health (May 2014) of nearly 19,966 cases of FMD reported, 866 animals have died of FMD within 6 months (Dec 2013 – May 2014) and 2.2 million animals were susceptible. Out of the total animal deaths by FMD so far, 53 per cent of animal deaths were reported from the 12 drought-affected dry zone districts and 47 per cent from Gampaha district where the DAPH delayed the commencement of the vaccination process. These facts indicated the necessity for urgent and immediate preventive action.

II. FOCUS AREAS AND PRIORITIZATION

The agencies targeted pockets of severely food insecure people with the lowest coping capacity who were scattered within the 15 drought-affected districts as identified through the joint multi-sector rapid assessment. UNICEF aimed to provide drinking water to 5 severely drought-affected districts whereas WFP's food assistance covered pockets of severely food insecure people in all the 15 districts. FAO targeted the districts with the largest drought-affected human and animal population with higher risk of rapid and further spreading of the FMD and thereby at risk of further increases in food insecurity. In addition, FAO's strategic geographical coverage aimed to ensure maximizing usage of the CERF funds to cover larger number of animals vaccinated and minimum contamination of this transboundary disease to severely food insecure districts.

¹CERF proposal figure updated due to arithmetic error from 189,300 persons to 189,800.

²Comprehensive Food Security Assessment, GoSL and WFP Sri Lanka, March 2012

All the projects sought to support the most vulnerable groups of population, i.e. women headed households, families with elderly and persons with disabilities and children under 5 years.

Food security: The primary objective was the provision of essential food assistance to save the lives of severely food insecure people due to the 2013-2014 droughts in Sri Lanka with the expectation to increase their coping capacity to survive natural disasters especially during the upcoming lean season. In each district a further geographical targeting was done based on affected population by Divisional Secretariat ensuring that the assistance was targeted to people who were severely food insecure and had a low coping capacity.

In line with WFP strategic objectives 1, the CERF funds were used for one month of life-saving emergency general food distribution through which beneficiaries received a 525g ration (400g of rice, 100g of pulses and 25g of oil) or cash worth the value of the rations. The corresponding cash value (based on the actual cost of a 20 item basic food basket) in line with the WFP's voucher assistance programme for resettling IDPs and refugee returnees from India is equal to US\$15 per person for one month. The ration size was designed to provide 2015Kcal per adult per day.

WFP used cash modality as a tool of food assistance where food was available and markets were functional. This helped the beneficiaries to purchase a variety of locally produced foods, enabling them to access to a more diverse food basket. Due to high food prices in the local markets at two districts and on the request of preferences of beneficiaries, WFP changed assistance modality from cash distribution to food distribution option in two districts. WFP carried out a full review of its in-country food stocks at hand to prioritize the available resources for drought emergency response on loan basis. On receipt of food stocks WFP replenished the loaned stock.

Beneficiary selection was based on the following criteria:

Primary selection criteria: 2013-2014 drought affected and severely food insecure people with income below the poverty line, who were:

- depending on agriculture, or
- depending on inland fishing, or
- depending on casual agricultural labour.

Secondary selection criteria: (a) being the highest priority and (h) being the lowest priority:

- a) people with an income below 50 percent of the poverty line
- b) households headed by widows,
- c) households headed by widowers,
- d) households headed by women,
- e) elderly people,
- f) single family households,
- g) households with disabled family members,
- h) elders without family support

The secondary selection criteria was used in areas where the number of eligible people were far above the targeted number of beneficiaries. During the implementation process, the project assured gender equality through registering the name of women family members as the recipient where possible. This strategy is being used to maximize the efficient use of the funds provided by this project for the benefit of the family.

A variety of communication methods were employed by WFP and INGOs, such as the use of community posters and telephone calls to inform the beneficiaries of their entitlements/ beneficiary sensitization and the complaint procedures. Two beneficiary call centres at the country and field offices were established and are independently operated by WFP under the drought assistance. This gave an opportunity for beneficiaries, especially women, to voice their food preferences and act against issues of fraud, mismanagement of food assistance, quantity and quality issues or any food assistance related concerns. Save the Children, World Vision and Oxfam received distribution cost plus the voucher value for three districts while ChildFund received implementation cost for food distribution for two districts.

This project aimed at mitigating the spread of the FMD outbreak on food security by reinforcing the immediate response capacities of the DAPH in controlling the rapid spread of the disease. In particular, the project planned to provide support in implementing a strategic vaccination programme in 3 months. Rapid coverage of vaccination to control the spread of the disease

requires the vaccines in large quantity within a short time. The CERF funds were planned to be used to procure Monovalent “O” strain FMD vaccines to vaccinate 220,000 susceptible animals. A strategic vaccination plan was developed together by FAO and the DAPH. The DAPH agreed to engage its human resources, equipment and transport facilities to implement the vaccination programme within three months. CERF support was requested to ensure rapid supply of emergency stock of vaccines to minimize the spread of the disease. FAO planned to arrange the procurement of the required quantity of vaccines through international competitive bidding process and with the technical guidance of DAPH as there were no local suppliers for FMD vaccines and local procurement was not possible.

WASH: UNICEF prioritized targeting beneficiaries who were severely food insecure with more than 50 percent of negative coping capacity and those who spent over 65 per cent of their income on food. In addition, UNICEF also used data such as availability of water for irrigation (less than 50 per cent), access to water sources such as dug/tube wells, rural water schemes or pipe-borne water and the travelling distance to carry water for consumption. For each district, UNICEF used two benchmarks to rank the severity of drinking water situation, i.e., number of drought-affected people and the percentage of the affected people out of the total population. After selecting the priority geographical locations based on the above benchmark, UNICEF targeted to provide lifesaving water assistance to 80,000 severely food insecure drought-affected households within those districts.

Exclusion criteria: People who were benefitting from other assistance sources including the national poverty alleviation schemes were excluded from the CERF funded food security assistance. This was done in order to avoid overlapping assistance.

III. CERF PROCESS

The Government of Sri Lanka officially requested humanitarian assistance from the United Nations to minimize the increasing food insecurity situations in the drought-affected districts. In response, the HCT decided to seek financial assistance from possible donors including the CERF to cover the identified urgent humanitarian needs through a joint multi-sector assessment in April 2015. However, due to lack of 'emergency declaration' by the Government of Sri Lanka, many donors approached by the UN and I/NGOs expressed their inability to support the growing humanitarian food insecurity situation in the country. In addition, Sri Lanka does not maintain a country-based pooled fund (ERF or CHF).

The HCT members together with the Ministry of Disaster Management and the Ministry of Economic Development conducted a joint multi-sector rapid assessment in early April 2015 to ascertain the severity of drought-impact in the worst affected districts. Accordingly, the humanitarian needs which were highlighted in the CERF application were prioritized based on the results of the joint multi-sector assessment. The CERF application therefore, was not part of a Flash Appeal or a consolidated appeal process.

The agencies that requested CERF funding had bi-lateral discussions with the relevant GoSL line Ministries and INGOs in order to consolidate the request. UNICEF developed the proposal for CERF with relevant stakeholder inputs from the Ministry of Water Supply and Drainage (MWSD), the National Water Supply and Drainage Board (NWSDB) and the Assistant Commissioner for Local Governments (ACLG). This collaboration between sector partners contributed to improved coordination at both national and district level resulting in a more effective pooling of resources and development of a joint response plan. UNICEF also closely worked together with WASH sector partners- mainly the MWSD, and the NWSDB -to implement and monitor interventions, with special attention on the needs of women and children. During the placing of the water tanks it was ensured that the tanks were placed in common places, easily accessible by women and children.

All the projects ensured that gender concerns were duly addressed by the interventions. The targeted beneficiaries were selected with special preference to women-headed households and where there were elderly or persons with disabilities in the family. However, as the process was not part of a CAP or Flash Appeal, the gender-marker tool was not utilized.

IV. CERF RESULTS AND ADDED VALUE

TABLE 4: AFFECTED INDIVIDUALS AND REACHED DIRECT BENEFICIARIES BY SECTOR

Total number of individuals affected by the crisis: 1,533,125 persons				
The estimated total number of individuals directly supported through CERF funding by cluster/sector	Cluster/Sector	Female	Male	Total
	WASH	41,970	39,163	81,133
	Food security	95,499	84,688	180,187

BENEFICIARY ESTIMATION

During the response, WFP used Excel tables pre populated with locations up to lowest administration block; Grama Niladari Division (village clusters) with selection criterion built into the tables with self-checking targeting rules. The introduction of this Excel based semi-automated registration tool resulted in higher compliance with targeting criteria and helped avoid multiple registration and also made monitoring more efficient. In addition, WFP was able to collect complete individual beneficiary information with National Identification and contact information such as mobile/fixed phone numbers.

When training counterparts on beneficiary targeting and registration, WFP placed an emphasis on gender equality. This helped ensuring gender responsiveness and accountability in implementation of assistance activities to equally benefit men and women.

For FMD vaccination purposes, animals of Grama Niladari Divisions (GND) with 2km band zone around 5km radius were treated as infected farms/village and in each primary infected points around 12-15 GNS were planned to be covered. Thus a prophylactic vaccination programme was planned with the Department of Animal Production and Health (DAPH) Sri Lanka in the districts of Ampara, Kurunagale, Moneragala, Anuradhapura, Batticaloa and Trincomalee districts. FAO prioritized provision of emergency vaccination support to these districts that contain the largest drought-affected human and animal population with the highest risk of rapid and further spreading of the FMD and where the existing vaccination coverage was less than 20 percent. In the selected six districts, the population identified under the severe food insecurity situation were targeted to receive priority for the vaccination of their animals. Assuming an average of 5 cows/animals vaccinated from 1 beneficiary household, over 40,000 households targeted to benefit directly by vaccinating 220,000 animals.

TABLE 5: PLANNED AND REACHED DIRECT BENEFICIARIES THROUGH CERF FUNDING

	Planned	Estimated Reached
Female	215,380	137,469
Male	203,920	123,851
Total individuals (Female and male)	419,300	261,320
Of total, children <u>under</u> age 5	41,930	26,535

CERF RESULTS

WFP established partnership with INGOs to implement drought assistance to the affected people in ten additional districts not covered by the regular WFP Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation (PRRO) activities. These collaborations not only ensured effective and timely response but also effectively increased the geographical coverage. INGOs have added significant value through their field support in the implementation of cash transfers. Delivery of WFP's food and nutrition assistance was also further augmented by combining human resources and expertise with the NGOs.

In general, the project mostly reached the planned caseload. However, during project implementation, people who were benefiting from other assistance sources and persons who did not meet the project's primary and secondary selection criteria were excluded from registration for assistance. These reasons were attributable to marginal difference of the number of targeted beneficiaries planned and actual number of people reached.

The target communities for the provision of water by UNICEF through the CERF grant were mainly rural and consisted of females who play a critical role in fetching drinking water, cooking and baby-sitting. The drought compelled them to travel more than one to two kilo meters in search of water which resulted in spending less time on other life aspects. Supply of water within their reach helped these women to reduce the time they spent fetching water, thus allowing them to spend more time in caring for their children and other commitments. A total of 81,133 drought affected people in Ampara, Kilinochchi, Mullaitivu, Mannar and Moneragala gained access to adequate quantity of safe drinking water complying with national standards over the period of 3 months through the operation of 22 water bowsers. In addition 304 water tanks including the stands for placing of the water tanks were procured and distributed in the 5 target districts. During the placing of the water tanks special emphasis such as safe accessible locations for women and children were ensured. Furthermore, the timely provision of safe water for the related communities prevented an outbreak of water borne diseases in the drought affected areas³. Water tanks and stands supplied for the 2014 response have been kept as a stock by the related Government Agents to be used during a future emergency response.

FAO requested CERF rapid response funds with the objective to protect the lives of the animal population and the livelihoods of the poor households dependent on livestock sector in Ampara, Anuradhapura, Batticaloa and Trincomalee, Kurunegala and Moneragala and to ensure food security of the livestock keepers and the consumers in Sri Lanka. The anticipated outcome of the project was "restored livestock based livelihoods of the drought affected farmers in Ampara, Anuradhapura, Batticaloa, Trincomalee, Kurunegala and Moneragala".

FAO initiated action with the Department of Animal Production and Health (DAPH) to arrange the procurement of FMD vaccines as the procurement, delivery and administration of the FMD vaccines in the field were the main activities planned in the project. The DAPH was required to provide the technical specifications of the FMD vaccine and FAO was informed of DAPH's suspicion of a change of FMD virus strain. Therefore, fresh samples needed to be sent for laboratory analysis to identify and confirm the causal virus strain in order to procure the most effective vaccination. In the meantime, DAPH continued the field vaccinations with the last batch of vaccines that they received with government funds.

Fresh samples were sent to OIE UK laboratory in August 2014 and the lab reports were received only in October 2014, as there were many FMD samples waiting for analysis and the worst-hit countries were given preference. The DAPH subsequently provided the technical specifications based on the laboratory report, and this information was passed on to the FAO procurement unit after review and clearance of the technical specification by the FAO livestock consultant. Thereafter, the FAO procurement unit launched an international tender for which the closing date was 11 November 2014. The supplier requested six weeks to prepare and deliver the vaccines and therefore the delivery would be around mid-January 2015. The DAPH requested two months to complete the field vaccination and therefore the vaccination could only be completed by end of March 2015. One more month was required to follow up with the monitoring and completion of the project final report and closing of the project.

The NTE of the project was 30 December 2014, but, as outlined above, the project activities were not completed and an additional four months period were required to complete and close the project. Accordingly, FAO made a request in mid-December 2014 to the CERF secretariat for a no-cost project extension up to 30 April 2015 to complete and close the project. The no-cost project extension request was not approved by the CERF secretariat and thus FAO opted to close the project without any field level implementation and is in the process of returning the funds to the CERF secretariat.

³Source: PHI from the respective MOH areas

CERF's ADDED VALUE

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

YES PARTIALLY NO

The availability of CERF funds allowed the expeditious engagement of government agencies with disaster response expertise in the affected areas. This government assistance proved very valuable in providing assistance in the clusters. There was also the opportunity for the Development Officers at the Ministry of Economic Development to conduct registration at village level. The partnership between WFP and INGOs strengthened community reach, as well as, targeting, beneficiary verification, monitoring of distributions through the established beneficiary follow-up process.

Rapid allocation of CERF funds allowed the project to begin immediately once the needs had been identified and enabled UNICEF and its partners to rapidly respond to the water needs of drought affected communities in the 5 target districts. CERF funding played a critical role in enabling UNICEF and its partners to provide this life saving support during a time when the government resources were limitedly available to respond to the entire country requirement. In addition, given the scale of drought and the state of destruction in the area of agriculture and life stock resulting in food insecurity and limited access to water, CERF funds were highly valuable in enabling the provision of safe water. The availability of improved water in their locality encouraged the affected communities to stay in their localities and avoided displacement or ad hoc migration to other areas.

In addition, the provision of adequate drinking water avoided the emerging of the following risks:

- Increase of dehydration among children and vulnerable adults (e.g. Lactating and pregnant mothers)
- Increase of diarrhoea as people tend to use any source of water available
- Increased malnutrition among children
- Waste of food compromised by inadequacy of water to cook
- Public unrest due to conflict of water sharing from water available in pockets
- Exploitation of people by commercially driven water suppliers

b) Did CERF funds help respond to time critical needs⁴?

YES PARTIALLY NO

The provision of food/cash assistance was critical to save lives of affected population. The CERF funded assistance allowed for the deployment of INGOs as well as government agencies in a timely response. To minimise time between procurement and requirement at the field, WFP has carried out a full review of its in-country food stocks at hand to prioritize the available resources for drought emergency response on loan basis. On receipt of food stocks WFP replenished the loaned stock.

CERF funds helped support the Government in responding to critical gaps in the provision of safe water in 5 drought affected districts. CERF funds were critical given the limited resources of the Government and other agency funds, for example, the NWSDB could only fully cater the drinking water requirement of the 15 drought affected districts, while CERF funding was used to cover part of the actual running costs of water bowsers procurement of water tanks and water tank stands.

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

YES PARTIALLY NO

Humanitarian food assistance formed a backbone of the CERF supported relief activities, and became a lifeline to the affected population. The food assistance operations were closely coordinated with the government drought assistance and hence both benefited from the provision of assistance without duplication. The Government was able to distribute relief supplies procured by them.

The WASH sector did not receive any additional funds during 2014 for drought response.

d) Did CERF improve coordination amongst the humanitarian community?

YES PARTIALLY NO

⁴Time-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.).

The WFP, Government and INGO jointly rolled out the sector system for the drought response that contributed to a more coherent and well-coordinated response. It ensured the Ministry of Economic Development taking the lead for government actors and brought all field administration into a common information-sharing forum. All CERF activities were conducted in coordination with WFP as sector lead.

The proposal for CERF was jointly developed by UNICEF, with relevant stakeholder inputs from the MWSD, NWSDB and respective ACLGs. This collaboration between sector partners contributed to improved coordination at both national and district level resulting in more effective pooling of resources and development of a joint response plan. UNICEF also closely worked together with WASH sector partners to implement and monitor interventions, with special attention on the needs of women and children. Regular WASH sector meetings took place in the Ministry of Water Supply and Drainage to ensure effective coordination of activities.

V. LESSONS LEARNED

TABLE 6: OBSERVATIONS FOR THE CERF SECRETARIAT		
Lessons learned	Suggestion for follow-up/improvement	Responsible entity
Lack of baseline data.	Close coordination between all disaster risk management actors pre-disaster to identify critical baseline data gaps based on possible disaster scenarios and to develop strategies to address what is possible.	Government
District wise demarcation of drought areas was sensitive in managing community expectations since the selected DS divisions were bordering similarly affected villages belonging to other districts.	Flexibility in fund utilisation in bordering/adjoint districts of the target districts	CERF/OCHA
Definition of WASH life saving support needs to be revisited to appropriately accommodate “what is feasible yet also sustaining” in a drought context as existing strategy can hardly be defined when the situation is prolonged.	Improve the drought related proposal review for approval	CERF/OCHA
Well deepening and rehabilitation was one of the feasible and sustaining lifesaving activity in a drought situation which adds value to resilience as well. Thus, this needs to be considered as a lifesaving activity under WASH emergency response.	Life saving activities needs to be reviewed based on the context and social norms of the rights’ holders	CERF/OCHA
Conducting vaccination programmes from CERF funds is fine as long the vaccinations available for procurement locally	The vast availability of vaccines locally for procurement should be ensured	CERF

TABLE 7:OBSERVATIONS FOR COUNTRY TEAMS

Lessons learned	Suggestion for follow-up/improvement	Responsible entity
<p>Drought is a seasonal emergency and becoming more and more un predictable with climate change. Hence more investment on mapping of drought prone areas and resilience building by rehabilitating and maintaining existing tube wells in this area will be much effective since surface water and shallow well water becomes scarce in this zone.</p>	<p>Development of drought preparedness plan including mapping</p>	<p>WASH sector partners/Disaster Management Center facilitated by OCHA</p>
<p>Unlike in floods, interim water supply during a drought has the risk of creating expectation for unlimited continuity which contradicts with the standard fund utilization time period.</p>	<p>Exit strategy during reponse to seasonal emergencies needs to be better defined especially during a drought situation as the timeframe is unpredictable and agencies are allocated limited resources.</p>	<p>WASH sctor partners/ Disaster Management Center facilitated by OCHA</p>
<p>At the time of proposal submission, FAO assumed that the relevant technical specifications were available at the DAPH. However, that was not true and DAPH expressed that the spec should be decided only after laboratory analysis.</p>	<p>To be on safe side, the vaccines should be available for procurement locally.</p>	<p>Project development team</p>
<p>Gap of technical capacity to conduct in-depth emergency needs assessments by government.</p>	<p>Develop standard and agreed data collection tool for household data collection (floods and droughts)</p>	<p>Government, Lead agencies</p>

VI. PROJECT RESULTS

TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS			
CERF project information			
1. Agency:	UNICEF	5. CERF grant period:	16.07.14 – 16.01.15
2. CERF project code:	14-RR-CEF-090	6. Status of CERF grant:	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing
3. Cluster/Sector:	WASH		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded
4. Project title:	Emergency water assistance for drought affected people in Sri Lanka		
7. Funding	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 94,204	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$ 94,204	▪ NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent: US\$ 0
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 94,204	▪ Government Partners: US\$ 62,796.62
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	41,800	41,970	Resources were allocated based on the planned figures but actual number reached has a likelihood to fluctuate due to social and administrative dynamics. In this case it has been positive as more than planned number of people being able to benefit from the CERF support.
b. Male	38,200	39,163	
c. Total individuals (female + male):	80,000	81,133	
d. Of total, children <u>under</u> age 5	8,000	8,335	
9. Original project objective from approved CERF proposal			
To provide for lifesaving emergency water assistance for drought affected people in Sri Lanka			
10. Original expected outcomes from approved CERF proposal			
Expected Outputs			
1. Approximately 80,000 (female proportion is almost 52 percent) people in 5 drought affected districts will have access to adequate quantity of safe drinking water complying with national standards for over maximum 3months with bowesered water and rehabilitated wells. Attention will be paid to the different needs of girls, boys, women and men at all stages of the response. Sector coordinators will continuously advocate with all implementing partners for gender considerations, such as placement of water tanks in safe accessible locations for women and children.			
Indicators			
1. No. of people in drought affected areas with access to adequate quantity of safe drinking water complying with national standards			
11. Actual outcomes achieved with CERF funds			
A total of 81,133 drought affected people in Ampara, Killinochchi, Mullaitivu, Mannar and Moneragala gained access to adequate quantity of safe drinking water complying with national standards over the period of 3 months through the operation of 22 water bowsers. In addition 304 water tanks including the stands for placing water tanks were procured and distributed in the 5 target districts. During the placing of the water tanks special emphasis such as safe accessible locations for women and children were			

<p>ensured.</p> <p>All the target districts for the drought response were located in the dry zone. The target communities were mainly rural and consisted of females who play a critical role in fetching drinking water, cooking and baby-sitting. Drought compelled them to travel one to two kilo meters in search of water which resulted in spending less time on other life aspects. Supply of water within their reach helped these women reduce the time they spent fetching water, thus allowing them to spend more time in caring for their children and other commitments.</p> <p>Furthermore, the timely provision of safe water for the related communities prevented an outbreak of water borne diseases in the drought affected areas⁵.Water tanks and stands supplied for the 2014 response have been kept as a stock by the related Government Agents to be used during a future emergency response.</p>	
<p>12. In case of significant discrepancy between planned and actual outcomes, please describe reasons:</p>	
<p>Originally estimated number of tanks though the CERF funds were to cover the part of full requirement of the entire drought response. Since proposed staff cost could be covered with another funding source, it was decided to utilize this saving to procure additional water tanks to cater the requirement with the approval of CERF secretariat.</p>	
<p>13. Are the CERF funded activities part of a CAP project that applied an IASC Gender Marker code?</p>	<p>YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>If 'YES', what is the code (0, 1, 2a or 2b): Gender marker tool was not utilized as this project did not form part of a Flash Appeal or a CAP If 'NO' (or if GM score is 1 or 0): The CERF funded project specifically ensured that the children, young people, and pregnant and lactating women living in drought affected areas benefitted from the interventions while assuring that both males and females gained equal access to safe water through the related intervention..</p>	
<p>14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?</p>	<p>EVALUATION CARRIED OUT <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>The actions were integrated into the response of the national authorities and as such difficult to evaluate specifically. There is a need for qualitative review during 2015 to assess how communities perceived the intervention.</p>	<p>EVALUATION PENDING <input type="checkbox"/></p>
	<p>NO EVALUATION PLANNED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>

⁵Source: PHI from the respective MOH areas

TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS			
CERF project information			
1. Agency:	FAO	5. CERF grant period:	31.07.2014 – 31.01.2015
2. CERF project code:	14-RR-FAO-021	6. Status of CERF grant:	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing
3. Cluster/Sector:	Food security		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded
4. Project title:	Emergency control of Foot-and-Mouth Disease of livestock in Sri Lanka		
7. Funding	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 296,613	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$ 296,613	▪ NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent: US\$ 0
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 296,613	▪ 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	75,000	0	As outlined above, the project extension was required as there was a delay in finalizing the technical specification of the vaccines and this delayed all the follow-up activities, including international procurement, delivery, field vaccinations and closing of the project. However, the no-cost project extension was not granted and thus FAO opted to close the project without any field level implementation. As a result FAO was not able to reach the planned beneficiaries.
b. Male	75,000	0	
c. Total individuals (female + male):	150,000	0	
d. Of total, children <u>under</u> age 5	15,000	0	
9. Original project objective from approved CERF proposal			
To protect the lives of the animal population and the livelihoods of the poor households dependent on livestock sector in Ampara, Anuradhapura, Batticaloa and Trincomalee, Kurunegala and Moneragala and to ensure food security of the livestock keepers and the consumers in Sri Lanka.			
10. Original expected outcomes from approved CERF proposal			
Outcome 1: Restored livestock based livelihoods of the drought affected farmers in Ampara, Anuradhapura, Batticaloa, Trincomalee, Kurunegala and Moneragala			
Indicators			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of animals vaccinated Further spread of the FMD outbreak has minimized 			
11. Actual outcomes achieved with CERF funds			
As outlined above, the project extension was required as there was a delay in finalizing the technical specification of the vaccines and this delayed all the follow up activities, including the international procurement, delivery, field vaccinations and closing of the project. However, the no-cost project extension was not granted and thus FAO opted to close the project without any field level implementation and will hand over the funds back to the CERF secretariat.			
12. In case of significant discrepancy between planned and actual outcomes, please describe reasons:			

The planned outcomes were not achieved as the project was closed before completion of the procurement of vaccines which was the main activity.	
13. Are the CERF funded activities part of a CAP project that applied an IASC Gender Marker code?	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If 'YES', what is the code (0, 1, 2a or 2b): 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"/>
As the project was not implemented a project evaluation was not possible.	EVALUATION PENDING <input type="checkbox"/>
	NO EVALUATION PLANNED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS

CERF project information				
1. Agency:	WFP		5. CERF grant period:	17.07.14 – 17.01.2015
2. CERF project code:	14-RR-WFP-039		6. Status of CERF grant:	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded
3. Cluster/Sector:	Food security			
4. Project title:	Life- saving general food assistance to severely food insecure drought affected population in Sri Lanka			
7. Funding	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 6,900,000	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:	
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$ 3,300,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent:</i> US\$ 0.32 million ▪ <i>Government Partners:</i> US\$ 0 	
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 1,661,863		
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	98,580	95,499	In general, the project mostly reached the planned caseload. However, during project implementation, people who were benefiting from other assistance sources and persons who did not meet project's primary and secondary selection criteria were excluded from being registered as beneficiaries for assistance. These reasons resulted in marginal difference of persons planned against the beneficiaries reached.	
b. Male	90,720	84,688		
c. Total individuals (female + male):	189,300	180,187		
d. Of total, children <u>under</u> age 5	18,930	18,200		
9. Original project objective from approved CERF proposal				
The primary objective is the provision of essential food assistance to save the lives of severely food insecure people due to the 2013-2014 droughts in Sri Lanka, in order to increase their coping capacity to survive natural disasters especially during the upcoming lean season: July to August 2014.				
10. Original expected outcomes from approved CERF proposal				
It is expected that the affected households maintain or improve their food security status while reducing further use of negative coping strategies and at the same time building household capacity to withstand anticipated future natural disasters.				
Activity	Outcome indicator	Output indicator	Means of verification	
Life saving	% of beneficiaries achieving at least acceptable household food consumption score (A score above 42)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of beneficiaries reached • MT of food distributed • Cash distributed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emergency Food Security Assessment (EFSA) planned for September 2014 • Monthly report • Beneficiary contact monitoring • Activity monitoring • End report 	

11. Actual outcomes achieved with CERF funds	
Counterpart training on targeting, verification of registration lists to gather with post distribution monitoring indicate the project reached the severely food insecure population by saving their lives achieving its intended objective. The planned Emergency Food Security Assessment (EFSA) was not conducted due to very short duration of assistance.	
12. In case of significant discrepancy between planned and actual outcomes, please describe reasons:	
Not applicable.	
13. Are the CERF funded activities part of a CAP project that applied an IASC Gender Marker code?	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>If 'YES', what is the code (0, 1, 2a or 2b): Fill in Gender marker tool was not utilized as this project did not form part of a Flash Appeal or a CAP</p> <p>If 'NO' (or if GM score is 1 or 0): During the implementation process, a higher priority was given to households headed by widows, households headed by women, female elderly people, single-parent family households' especially targeting females and female elders without family support. The project also registered the name of women family members as the recipient of food assistance. Though the food assistance to a family ensured appropriate food intake for all family members, both male and female, this strategy was used to maximize the efficient use of the funds provided by this project for the benefit of the entire family.</p>	
14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?	EVALUATION CARRIED OUT <input type="checkbox"/>
Due to short duration of the intervention, no evaluation is planned.	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-WFP-039	Food Assistance	WFP	OXFAM	Yes	INGO	\$108,000	14-Sep-14	22-Jul-14	Cash transfer for food assistance
14-RR-WFP-039	Food Assistance	WFP	Save the Children	Yes	INGO	\$129,000	17-Sep-14	22-Jul-14	Cash transfer for food assistance
14-RR-WFP-039	Food Assistance	WFP	World Vision	Yes	INGO	\$76,482	18-Sep-14	22-Jul-14	Cash transfer for food assistance
14-RR-WFP-039	Food Assistance	WFP	ChildFund	Yes	INGO	\$11,753	8-Aug-14	22-Jul-14	Food distribution assistance
14-RR-CEF-090	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene	UNICEF	Government of Sri Lanka	Yes	GOV	\$62,797	15-Sep-14	1-Aug-14	3 Partners in 3 provinces. Reimbursements and Direct payments following the work done

ANNEX 2: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS (Alphabetical)

ACLG	Assistant Commitioner of Local Government
DAPH	Department of Animal Production and Health
GoSL	Government of Sri Lanka
HCT	Humanitarian Country Team
MOH	Medical Officer of Health
MWSD	Ministry of Water Supply and Drainage
NWS&DB	National Water Supply and Drainage Board
PHI	Public Health Inspectors
PRRO	Protracted Relief and Recovery Operations
WFP	World Food Programme