

## CERF Underfunded Emergency Window (UFE) Frequent Recipients of UFE Allocations

*CERF secretariat, April 2013*

### Introduction

During its October 2012 meeting, the Advisory Group (AG) expressed some concern that certain countries repeatedly received funding through the underfunded emergency (UFE) window. The AG asked the Secretariat to monitor this closely. Consequently, the CERF Secretariat prepared the following short note in an attempt to identify and document any trends in this regards. The note further explains how the country identification methodology for UFE rounds can lead to a country's repeated selection. The CERF secretariat will also outline actions taken to alleviate this situation.

The UFE window of the CERF aims to help even out funding disparities across humanitarian crises worldwide. These disparities can be the result of political dynamics that preclude a donor from contributing to a country or an affected country from accepting bilateral aid. In addition, donor and media attention may highlight some emergencies at the expense of others. Declining aid budgets may also force donors to concentrate funds on fewer emergencies. Similarly, donor fatigue can also play a role. In these situations, CERF acts as a neutral and independent source of funding that enables better coverage of needs or the continuation of life-saving activities.

On 18 March 2010 John Holmes, the Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC) at the time, approved a document entitled "CERF Underfunded Emergencies Window: Procedures and Criteria". This outlined how the UFE window would operate, including eligibility criteria and country selection procedures. The CERF secretariat employed the approved method for country selection beginning with the first round of 2010 and as of April 2013 seven UFE rounds have been carried out using this methodology.<sup>1</sup>

### Frequent Recipients

Since 2010, 34 countries have received UFE allocations. Of these, 24 have benefited from more than one allocation during the four year period. Seven countries have received allocations over three successive years (either 2010-2012 or 2011-2013)<sup>2</sup>. This paper will focus on these seven that can be considered "frequent recipients" of UFE allocations. They are: the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), Ethiopia, Chad, Colombia, Djibouti, Central African Republic (CAR), the Philippines (Mindanao).

*Table 1: Countries receiving multiple UFE allocations from 2010 to 2013 (in millions of US\$)*

Country	Number of Allocations	2010		2011		2012		2013	Total Period
		First Round	Second Round	First Round	Second Round	First Round	Second Round	First Round	
DPR Korea	5	8	5	51		11		7	36
Ethiopia	5	17		11	11		10	17	66

<sup>1</sup> The CERF secretariat is currently reviewing the Underfunded Emergencies guidelines following the Independent Review of the Underfunded Emergencies Window carried out in 2012. The updated guidelines will be drafted, approved by the ERC, and then operationalized for the 2014 First UFE Round which begins in November 2013.

<sup>2</sup> Nepal also received UFE allocations in three successive years; however, they were provided for different humanitarian emergencies (food insecurity in 2010, refugees in Bhutan in 2011, and drought and malnutrition in 2012). Therefore, the case should not be considered in the same category as the others.

Chad	4	7	8	8		8			\$31
Colombia	4	3		3	3		3		\$12
Djibouti	4		3	3		4		3	\$13
Eritrea	4	3	3			4		3	\$13
Afghanistan	3	11					10	17	\$38
Central African Rep.	3		3	5		6			\$14
DR Congo	3	16	8				12		\$36
Myanmar	3	4		3	2				9
Nepal	3		2		2	5			9
Philippines	3	3			4	4			11
Sri Lanka	3			5	5		2		12
Yemen	3	7	7					17	31
Burundi	2			4				3	7
Haiti	2					8		6	14
Kenya	2	10		6					16
Madagascar	2			4			2		6
Niger	2	6			6				12
Pakistan	2				10	15			25
Rep. of Congo	2		3			4			7
South Sudan	2				12	20			32
Sudan	2						14	17	31
Zimbabwe	2			5	6				11

### **Countries with a Consolidated Humanitarian Action Plan**

Emergencies with a Consolidated Humanitarian Action Plan (CHAP) are automatically considered in the UFE analysis. This is a result of the Humanitarian Country Team, the global Inter-Agency Standing Committee members and the Emergency Relief Coordinator having deemed the humanitarian situation grave enough to warrant a CHAP. The CERF secretariat then analyzes and compares the funding requirements and gaps of all the CHAPs to identify the most “underfunded”.

From the list of frequent recipients, the CAR, Chad, Djibouti and the Philippines (Mindanao) currently have appeals.

As part of the country selection process, the CERF secretariat consults with OCHA’s CHAP Section in Geneva for a global view of the humanitarian needs, priorities and requirements in the CHAPs. The CHAP Section describes the quality of the strategy and prioritization carried out by the HCTs as well as the nature of needs and the type of programming included in the CHAPs. For example, the appeals for Zimbabwe sometimes included more development-oriented projects labelled as humanitarian. This type of information is useful when selecting countries as it helps determine core humanitarian needs as part of the broader response activities. It may also foretell the type of activities that is likely to be proposed to the CERF for funding under the UFE window.

In recent rounds, the CERF secretariat has increasingly considered the nature of programming included in the CHAPs as well as the kind of projects proposed to the CERF in previous UFE applications when deciding whether to recommend a UFE allocation to a CHAP country. For

example, the 2012 CHAP for Cote d'Ivoire was the lowest funded CHAP in 2012 and it was automatically shortlisted for the first UFE round of 2013. However, the 2013 CHAP focused primarily on reintegration of returnees and medium-term objectives rather than urgent life-saving activities eligible for CERF funding. Moreover, the CERF had supported similar activities in the first UFE round of 2012. This was done to jumpstart activities and support the initial returns process with the understanding that the projects were time-critical at that moment but would not necessarily be eligible for additional CERF funding later.

A similar rationale was considered when considering an allocation for Chad in the first round of 2013. The 2012 UFE submission from Chad had included projects aimed at jumpstarting the IDP returns process in the East. Like in Cote d'Ivoire, the CERF approved activities owing to their time criticality. This was factored into the 2013 first round analysis and, ultimately, the ERC did not approve a UFE allocation for Chad in that round. The practice of analyzing the current CHAP activities and prior CERF UFE submissions will be formally integrated into the revised guidelines for the UFE window later this year.

### **Countries without a CHAP**

There are, however, numerous emergencies in the world without a CHAP. The absence of a CHAP does not mean that the situation is not a humanitarian crisis. There are several reasons why an emergency may not have a CHAP. These can include the reluctance of the affected country government to issue an appeal or the nature of the caseload requiring assistance by only a few aid organizations, such as a refugee operation in Nepal. To identify these emergencies, the CERF secretariat relies on the Underfunded Working Group (UFWG) composed of CERF focal points at United Nations agencies and IOM headquarters to jointly identify and prioritize underfunded emergencies.

From the list of frequent recipients, Colombia, the DPRK and Ethiopia fall under this category and were repeatedly recommended by the UFWG for allocations. A fourth country that is consistently recommended by the UFWG is Eritrea which received UFE allocations in 2010, 2011 and 2013. These four countries have been ranked high on the UFWG recommendation list nearly every round since 2010. Given the collaborative nature of the recommendation process, the CERF secretariat places significant weight on the UFWG's rankings.

Colombia, the DPRK and Eritrea are similar in that political sensitivities preclude the development and publication of a CHAP. Garnering donor attention and funding is, therefore, difficult. Additionally, the governments are reluctant to publicly recognize a humanitarian emergency and accept international aid. The CERF is a neutral and independent source of funding that is easier to accept. In the case of the DPRK, some CERF donors have expressed their endorsement of UFE allocations noting that they fulfil the mandate of the fund. The DPRK's Permanent Mission to the United Nations also regularly expresses its appreciation for the funds to the ERC.

In Ethiopia, on the other hand, the government and humanitarian partners collaborate on a joint Humanitarian Requirements Document. However, the needs are so great and varied that bilateral aid is simply not enough. Moreover, bilateral aid to Ethiopia tends focus on food assistance over other sectors resulting in funding disparities within the country. The HCT has utilized CERF UFE allocations to even out these disparities and fill priority gaps in life-saving sectors.

Djibouti has received a UFE allocation every year since 2010. The first two years the country was recommended by the UFWG through the non-CAP process while in 2012 and 2013 the selection was based on the level of funding of the previous years' CHAPs. UN agencies consistently note low donor attention to and funding for humanitarian activities in Djibouti, which suffers from chronic underdevelopment coupled with cyclical droughts and on-going refugee operations. The 2011 and

2012 CHAPs, which were developed to respond to the Horn of African drought, received limited support and remained below the overall CHAP funding average. The 2011 Independent Review of the Value Added of the CERF in Djibouti (conducted under the CERF Performance and Accountability Framework) highlighted the positive impact of CERF funding in the Djibouti context. The consultants noted how CERF funds filled critical gaps, leveraged funding, and served as the donor of last resort in a resource scarce environment. The consultants did point out that the low level of funding has made UN agencies dependent on CERF to sustain programmes and that they have come to expect an UFE allocation each year. However, they also state that “this has not though diminished efforts to mobilise other resources.”

## **Conclusion**

It is acknowledged that a number of countries benefit relatively frequently from UFE CERF allocations. However, it should be kept in mind that the country selection is based on sound and objective criteria designed to make the process unbiased and needs-based. Therefore, the fact that certain countries are “frequent recipients” should simply mean that they are the most appropriate ones to benefit from CERF funding due to on-going humanitarian needs and a chronic lack of adequate funding from regular donors.

However, the CERF secretariat is also aware that due to the limited availability of CERF UFE funding some underfunded emergencies may risk being passed over as a result of multiple and consecutive UFE allocations given to some frequent recipients that according to the analysis are in greater need of funding. In order to alleviate this situation, the CERF secretariat has decided not to recommend the same country for the first and second round of a year, except under very exceptional circumstances. This change has been introduced in 2012 and has yielded positive results and has received positive feed-back from the Agencies as it has opened the space for alternative and deserving recipient countries.

In conclusion the CERF secretariat finds that given the mandate of the CERF UFE window it is inevitable that certain countries will benefit relatively frequently from a UFE CERF allocation. At the same time, procedures have been put in place to ensure that this happens in a balanced and appropriate way.