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UN General Assembly Resolution 60/124 sets the objective of the upgraded CERF “to ensure a more predictable and timely response to humanitarian emergencies, with the objectives of promoting early action and response to reduce loss of life, enhancing response to time-critical requirements and strengthening core elements of humanitarian response in underfunded crises, based on demonstrable needs and on priorities identified in consultation with the affected State as appropriate”
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# ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>Consolidated Appeals Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERF</td>
<td>Central Emergency Response Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHF</td>
<td>Common Humanitarian Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Development Assistance Committee (of the OECD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>Department for International Development (of the UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERC</td>
<td>Emergency Relief Coordinator (the head of OCHA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF</td>
<td>Emergency Response Fund or Expanded Humanitarian Response Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMU</td>
<td>Fund Management Unit (UNDP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTS</td>
<td>Financial Tracking Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>General Assembly (of the United Nations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHD</td>
<td>Good Humanitarian Donorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>Humanitarian Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCT</td>
<td>Humanitarian Country Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI</td>
<td>Human Development Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDPT</td>
<td>Humanitarian and Development Partnership Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>Head Quarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRF</td>
<td>Humanitarian Response Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Internally Displaced People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IASC</td>
<td>Inter-Agency Standing Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>International Non Governmental Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDTF</td>
<td>Multi Donor Trust Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non Governmental Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNGO</td>
<td>National Non Governmental Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAF</td>
<td>Performance and Accountability Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBF</td>
<td>Peace Building Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Resident Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>Rapid Response (CERF funding window)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UFE</td>
<td>Under-funded emergency (CERF funding window)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCT</td>
<td>United Nations Country Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHAS</td>
<td>United Nations Humanitarian Air Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOPS</td>
<td>United Nations Office for Project Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD</td>
<td>United States Dollar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>Water Sanitation and Hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>United Nations World Food Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

1. This country report provides an analysis of the Central Emergency Fund’s disbursements in response humanitarian crises in the Philippines from 2006 to 2010. It is one of 16 case studies conducted to inform the 5-year Evaluation of the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF). Mandated by the UN General Assembly, the 5-year Evaluation of the CERF is managed by OCHA’s Evaluation and Guidance Section (EGS), and conducted by Channel Research.

CERF

2. The Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) is a US$500 million fund established to support rapid response and address critical humanitarian needs in underfunded emergencies. The CERF is managed by the UN’s Under Secretary General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC), and supported by a secretariat and by other branches of the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). CERF funding includes a US$450 million grant element and a US$50 million loan mechanism. The grant component is comprised of two windows: one for rapid response and one for underfunded crises. The loan facility is a revolving fund which serves as a cash-flow mechanism for eligible humanitarian organizations. Only UN agencies and the International Organization for Migration (IOM) are eligible.

Methodology

Document review

3. Key reference documents were reviewed, including the annual reports from the Resident/Humanitarian Coordinator on the use of the CERF grants, humanitarian appeal documents, and the CHF evaluation in the Philippines (see annex VI). Numerical data from the CERF Secretariat, the CERF Website, and the UN Financial Tracking Service (FTS) was also analysed to establish the pattern for CERF use and the differences between CERF allocations for the Philippines and the other 78 CERF recipients. Please note that the team defined the year of the grant based on the disbursement date rather than the approval date (which the CERF secretariat uses as reference). This was done to facilitate comparison with other funding.

4. Of the 44 projects funded by the CERF in the Philippines (see annex IV), the team examined 21 randomly selected proposals for funding (see annex V) submitted to the CERF Secretariat from the country, and examined the extent to which the proposals paid attention to gender, vulnerability, and cross cutting issues.\(^1\)

---

\(^1\) The gender markers were piloted in 2010 and were not launched officially until 2011 after the CERF evaluation period was concluded. Even though the CERF application template was only revised in 2010 in order to obtain this type of information, the evaluation team has used the markers as a framework for analytical purpose. The vulnerability marker was designed by Channel for this evaluation.
Interviews

5. Two team members visited Philippines in March 2011, and interviewed key informants (see annex II). Informants reflected views from a range of CERF stakeholders: the HC, OCHA staff, UN agency and NGO staff, humanitarian donor representatives, as well as the director of Social Affairs, in charge of the State cluster’s management. The interviews were structured around a standard list of questions.

Analysis

6. The analysis for this study employed the CERF’s Performance and Accountability Framework (PAF), which defines a set of indicators at each level according to a logic model approach as a means of clarifying accountability and performance expectations around a core set of agree CERF outputs, outcomes and impacts.2

Reporting

7. The drafting of this report benefitted from comments made by the steering and reference groups on the first country study, as well as more specific comments on this specific country report. Comments were received on the draft “working paper” from donors, NGOs, individual agency offices in the field and desk personnel, OCHA and the CERF Secretariat.

Key definitions

8. The case study is concerned with assessing the following:3:

- **Relevance/appropriateness**: Relevance is concerned with assessing whether the project is in line with local needs and priorities (as well as donor policy). Appropriateness is the tailoring of humanitarian activities to local needs, increasing ownership, accountability and cost-effectiveness accordingly.

- **Effectiveness**: Effectiveness measures the extent to which an activity achieves its purpose, or whether this can be expected to happen on the basis of the outputs. Implicit within the criterion of effectiveness is timeliness.

- **Efficiency**: Efficiency measures the outputs – qualitative and quantitative – achieved as a result of inputs. This generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving an output, to see whether the most efficient approach has been used.

---

2 OCHA, Performance and Accountability Framework for the Central Emergency Response Fund (OCHA, August 2010)

3 These criteria are defined by Beck, T. (2006); *Evaluating humanitarian action using the OECD/DAC criteria for humanitarian agencies: An ALNAP guide for humanitarian agencies.* (Overseas Development Institute: London, March 2006)
Overview

The report is structured as follows:

• **Context**: A description of the humanitarian context of the country, and how the CERF was used.

• **Processes**: A description and analysis of the submission process for the CERF, and the prioritisation and selection of projects.

• **Outputs**: An analysis of the CERF’s overall contribution to the country programme, its timeliness (timeframes), level of donor support, and interaction with other funds.

• **Outcomes**: An analysis of the outcomes of the CERF process, including the extent to which CERF projects addressed gender, vulnerability, and cross-cutting issues.

• **Contribution**: An analysis of the CERF’s contribution to meeting time-critical life-saving needs, including evidence for the extent to which the CERF contributed to this objective set by the General Assembly.

• **Conclusions**: An outline of conclusions reached by the evaluation team.
1. CONTEXT

**Humanitarian context**

10. **Natural disasters:** Natural disasters have a strong humanitarian impact in the Philippines. The country lies on the pathway of most Tropical Cyclones, is often subject to earthquakes, and has 23 active volcanoes, although none of them have caused a major disaster since 2006. Recent typhoons include a series of typhoons in late 2009 that affected 10 million people, destroying 154,000 houses and damaging an additional 78,000. Before that, in 2006, typhoons Durian and Utor affected 7 million people, and led to the displacement of 300,000 people. The Philippines ranked 97 in 2010 on the UNDP Human Development Index.

11. **Armed conflict:** A recent upsurge in armed conflict in Muslim-dominated southern parts of the country led to the displacement of over 700,000 people in 2008. The armed conflict is largely confined to one part of the country, but it has had a strong impact in terms of population displacement and humanitarian access in some areas. The conflict has continued since the 1970s, when the Moro National Liberation Front (MNLF) began a separatist war during the dictatorship of Ferdinand Marcos. A 1996 peace agreement resulted in creation of the Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao. Presently, splinter factions of the MNLF and two other armed groups with political agendas remain active. One is the communist New People’s Army (NPA), which has carried out a countrywide campaign against the Government since 1968. Another is the Islamist Abu Sayyaf Group (ASG), linked to Al-Qaeda and Jemaah Islamiyah, which is responsible for acts of violence and kidnappings in South-West Mindanao.

![Figure 1: The degree of exposure to different natural hazards and the proportion of the Philippines that this is subject to that hazard. (Provention.com)](Image)

*Source: Munich Re Geo Risks Research, Last update: 4/21/2006*

Humanitarian response

12. Clusters were introduced in the Philippines in late December 2006. The UN Disaster Management Team became the IASC CT (Inter Agency Standing Committee Country Team) thereafter, including private sector representatives as well as the usual representatives of the humanitarian community.

13. There are two parallel cluster systems in the Philippines: one consisting of Government authorities, known as the Cabinet Cluster System; and the other comprising members of the humanitarian community, led by the UN, and co-chaired by the Government. The two systems do not share the same level of specialization, and the UN cluster system is covered by four of the eight government clusters. Disaster response is coordinated by the National Disaster Risk Reduction Management Council (NDRRMC).

14. Flash appeals were made by the Philippines for US$49 million in December 2006, for US$16 million in July 2007, and for US$143 million in 2009. Respectively, these were funded at 14.8 per cent,5 fully funded, and covered up to 43 per cent. A Humanitarian Action Plan (HAP) for the conflict-affected provinces of Mindanao was drafted in 2011 for US$34.5 million.

Request to CERF

15. The Philippines was the 28th largest recipient of the CERF with US$20.5 million in April 2011, less than occupied Palestinian territories or Colombia, but more than Indonesia or Angola.

Table 1: CERF Envelopes for the Philippines (Note: disbursements for most of the projects in the December 2006 envelope took place in 2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approximate date</th>
<th>Crisis</th>
<th>US$ mn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 2006</td>
<td>Tropical Cyclone Durian</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2007</td>
<td>Follow-up to Tropical Cyclone Durian</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2008</td>
<td>IDPs from armed conflict</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2009</td>
<td>Response to Conflict in Mindanao</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2009</td>
<td>Follow-up to conflict in Mindanao</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2010</td>
<td>UFE Round 1, 2010</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. The average size of the grant was US$460,000 over the period 2006-2010, whereas the global average size of CERF grants was US$840,000. The smallest grant was US$47,000 in 2007 for WHO and the largest was US$2.26 million for WFP in 2009. The Philippines was allocated Rapid Response funding every year between 2006 and 2009, mainly in response to typhoons and in support of IDPs. It received funding from the UFE window in 2010 for the first round of allocation. Allocations to the Philippines have been relatively limited, amounting to less than US$3 million a year – except in 2009, when the Rapid Response grants totalled nearly US$12 million.

5 http://fts.unocha.org
Table 2: CERF Grants by agency, window and year of disbursement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Window</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>404,580</td>
<td>359,104</td>
<td>990,208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.753,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>785,505</td>
<td>619,448</td>
<td>4,612,145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,017,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>543,418</td>
<td>3,558,477</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,901,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>243,255</td>
<td>82,371</td>
<td>158,324</td>
<td>357,080</td>
<td></td>
<td>841,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>207,484</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>557,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>520,808</td>
<td>399,998</td>
<td>2,215,538</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,386,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>593,255</td>
<td>2,943,264</td>
<td>2,080,292</td>
<td>11,940,932</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,557,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UFE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>288,552</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>288,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>713,032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>713,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>788,871</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>788,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>101,082</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>101,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>147,462</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>147,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>747,577</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>747,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>210,536</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>210,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UFE Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>593,255</td>
<td>2,943,264</td>
<td>2,080,292</td>
<td>11,940,932</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,997,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>593,255</td>
<td>2,943,264</td>
<td>2,080,292</td>
<td>11,940,932</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,997,112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data differs from data from the CERF Website as this table uses the year of disbursement rather than the year of approval.

There is no Consolidated Appeal Process in the Philippines, but considering the level of funding in the appeals, the country’s humanitarian responses seem to be rather underfunded. However, the Government has a relatively strong capacity and assists affected populations, and such government expenditure is not shown on the FTS system as humanitarian assistance.

Table 3: Average value of CERF grants by window, agency, and year for Philippines (US$mn)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Window</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR Overall Average</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UFE Overall Average</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Windows Overall Average</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data differs from data from the CERF Website as this table uses the year of disbursement rather than the year of approval.
As the number of grants per agency is relatively limited, it is not really possible to generalise trends in allocations by agencies per year. Obviously, there are linkages between the size of grants, the capacity of agencies, and sectoral prioritization in post-disaster contexts.

Table 4: Number of grants approved by year of disbursement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Window</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| UFE    | WHO    |      |      |      | 1    |      | 1     |
|        | WFP    |      |      |      | 1    |      | 1     |
|        | UNICEF |      |      |      | 1    |      | 1     |
|        | UNHCR  |      |      |      | 1    |      | 1     |
|        | UNFPA  |      |      |      | 1    |      | 1     |
|        | IOM    |      |      |      | 2    |      | 2     |
|        | FAO    |      |      |      | 1    |      | 1     |
| UFE Total |       |      |      |      | 8    |      | 8     |
| Grand Total |       | 3    | 9    | 6    | 18   |      | 44    |

Note: Data differs from data from the CERF Website as this table uses the year of disbursement rather than the year of approval.

WFP’s share, as noted above, included US$2.6 million for UNHAS, as well as a project of US$187,000 for telecommunications services and US$44,000 for road rehabilitation. If these common services are not counted, WFP only received US$400,000 more than IOM.

The CERF allocation to the Philippines is representative of the global distribution of the CERF between agencies; however UNHCR was not operationally present in the country, and assistance to IDPs was provided through IOM. In addition, FAO’s share is comparatively small, while UNFPA received CERF funding for six projects.

The allocation to WFP was almost the same amount as IOM for support to IDPs. Both allocations were for conflict-affected Mindanao, where government mechanisms are extremely weak due to the conflict situation and the existence of the Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao which is not under the national government.
The diagram below shows the percentage of the CERF budget allocated to each sector at a global level and in the Philippines. The vertical scale mentions the different sectors with the share that Philippines allocations represent of the global allocation by sector.

The different levels of sectoral allocation indicate the importance of the support to IDPs, to the disaster affected population, and victims of conflict.
2. PROCESS

2.1 Appropriateness/Relevance

24. The CERF Guidelines on how agencies should coordinate themselves once CERF funds are made available, are quite broad regarding the process and therefore leave room for ad hoc decisions and selections of sectors to apply to. This means that HCs have the scope to make strategic choices. However, this scope is not always welcome as it can place the HC under a lot of pressure from agencies keen to get funding. This is a broader issue of humanitarian leadership highlighted by the CERF process.

25. There are different views on the life-saving criteria. Those responsible for coordinating proposals tended to regard them as providing too little guidance, but agencies who found their areas of intervention excluded, regarded them as being too restrictive.

26. The CERF process has been driven by field-level analysis conducted by the country offices of UN agencies, and not by their headquarters. This is seen as a very positive point, ensuring that interventions are tailored to the context and coordinated. Some needs assessments were undertaken after disasters; for instance, residual relief needs assessments in 2007, joint rapid needs assessments in 2008 and in September 2009 after tropical storm Ondoy.

27. There is no clear method for calculating the amounts needed in any particular response. In the Philippines, it is the Government rather than the international humanitarian community that provides for the bulk of the response. Although clusters have so far functioned well, there is scope for them to play a larger role in the CERF allocation process to ensure that allocations take into account the full implementation capacity of different agencies.

28. Responses used to be rather ad hoc and agency-specific, but this has improved with joint analyses and exchanges during the different consultation groups, such as IASC, HCT, and the Government’s NRRMC. This has had an impact on the way CERF projects are drafted and submitted.

29. The drafting of a HAP for Mindanao in 2011, after many months of work, has been a step towards developing an integrated approach to disaster relief. However, the HAP focuses on early recovery and cannot be used to assess eligibility for UFE.

30. Mindanao is a politically sensitive crisis for the Government. However, the Government approved the HAP and received several letters of support from different ministries,

---

6 ph.one.un.org/.../Tropical%20Storm%20Ondoy%20-%20Rapid%20Needs%20Assessment%20-%20Final%2009

7 2006 HC country report on the CERF allocations is not part of the documentation basis available for the evaluation.
including The Departments of National Defence, of Health, and of Social Welfare and Development. Mutual understanding of needs in the region is increasing between humanitarian agencies and the Government.

### 2.2 Effectiveness

31. For the UFE, the HCT was told in advance by the CERF Secretariat that the Philippines was considered an eligible beneficiary, and an estimated envelope was also mentioned at this stage.

32. Bilateral donors tend to support individual agencies, but the CERF allows a more systematic approach in support of priorities identified across all sectors. CERF funding contributed to building management systems within clusters and to increasing communication. Needs assessment takes time, and there is always a trade-off between speed and the quality of the assessment. However, all clusters now have contingency plans for emergency response which helps to trigger the assessment and response.

33. During the application process, some budgets were cut on the basis of how much could realistically be expected in terms of funding. The cuts were made by imposing a percentage decrease for application by all agencies. This is contrary to the policy of the CERF Secretariat, which provides for budget changes on the basis of assessed priorities rather than a “cake-slicing” approach.

34. There seems to be little awareness of CERF at the NGO level, although the IASC has opened space for NGOs in discussions about the coordination of humanitarian assistance. NGOs are involved in the process as funding is available to them through cluster leads, and they are requested to submit project proposals to the cluster leads.

35. NGOs can also submit proposals to the cluster lead agency or to an individual agency. In 2009, there were cases of proposals submitted by NGOs in February that only received funding in June, although the whole application process and disbursement of funds by the CERF Secretariat is reported to have taken 19 days. Given such a delay in passing funding onto partners, there must be a question about how far the receiving UN agencies enable the CERF to meet time-critical needs.8

36. As the Government is relatively strong and the Philippine context is one of longer-term development rather than humanitarian needs, there are also government programmes and government coordination systems that implement assistance, and in some cases with the support of the private sector. However, most of the allocations were for conflict-affected Mindanao where government mechanisms are extremely weak due to the conflict situation and the existence of an Autonomous Region in Mindanao. All agencies collaborate with the

---

8 The question of the speed with which UN agencies sub-grant funds on to implementing partners applies to all funding that UN agencies sub-grant whether it is from the CERF or other funding sources such as bilateral donors or multilateral donors like ECHO. It is a particularly critical issue for the CERF because unlike ECHO or bilateral donors, the CERF can only fund UN agencies and cannot fund the implementing partners directly as do ECHO and the bilateral donors.
national Government, local authorities, and in some cases, with the autonomous regional government -- taking into account the political challenges that this represents. UN agencies recognize that using NGO partners enables them to avoid the problems of working through local government in an environment where local Government is subject to elite capture. The Government is for instance involved in cross-checking identification of beneficiary communities and of the most vulnerable community members. The Government also deals with the particular issue of IDPs, in addition to general humanitarian assistance.

37. The application and reporting process is referred to as being relatively simple, having evolved since the launch of CERF in its current form in 2006. The proposal format, which in 2006 consisted of one page, has been better developed to include some indications of the number and types of beneficiaries, funding already received, and amount transferred to NGOs. This change of the proposal format, reflects the application of learning by the CERF secretariat. Such learning is also reflected in changes to the reporting format and the issuance of guidance notes on different topics.

2.3 Efficiency

38. OCHA opened an office in the Philippines in 2008, but before that staff in the regional office in Thailand facilitated CERF applications. The role of OCHA has also been significant in facilitating the process, by offering initial screening of applications and indicating funding levels that could be requested. The rationale for budget ceilings appears unclear, and no explanations are provided for reductions in the overall submission envelope. This requested reduction led to reductions in project budgets.

![Average durations for the CERF process in Philippines (2006-2010) by year (both windows)](image)

Figure 4: Time components of grant processing, showing that (except for the non-time-critical UFE grants in 2010), the bulk of the time for processing is taken up by processes after the approval by the USG.
39. Some interviewees suggested that better communication by the CERF secretariat would improve CERF applications and that updates could be provided on the status of the application throughout the process. However, as Figure 4 shows, the bulk of the CERF process is taken up by the wait for the signing of the LoU and of disbursement. These are processes controlled by the UN Secretariat rather than by the CERF Secretariat. At the country level, agencies are fully aware of the status of the submission up to final submission as there is a constant traffic of queries back to the agencies.

40. The preparation of a joint application to the CERF can take time at the country level. This is inherent in any collaborative process.

41. It seems that the application forms for both the CERF and Flash Appeal could be more compatible, in order to make both processes more efficient. Although Flash Appeal proposals can contain very specific indicators that are not required in CERF application forms, agencies would rather have a common format for both types of requests based on the simplest denominator. Some interviewees also suggested that simplifying the process would limit the need to train people on CERF processes and requirements.

42. Training sessions are reported to have helped improve the process overall. For instance, simulation exercises facilitated understanding of the Secretariat and its thinking. Yet staff turnover in the field, within the Government, OCHA and the UN, remains a concern for the success and quality of implementation.

43. In terms of the general process there is a big difference between what the CERF asks of the UN agencies that it funds and what those UN agencies then ask of NGO partners for sub grants. While the CERF only requires relatively simple and straightforward annual reports on CERF funding from UN agencies, the UN agencies require their NGO implementing partners to submit progress reports on a monthly basis. Thus the gains in efficiency, offered by the CERF’s light and simple process, are not transferred at the field level.

---

9 However, it should be noted that this conflicts with the reported experience in other study countries, which generally gives the CERF Secretariat top marks for communication.
3. OUTPUTS

3.1 Appropriateness/Relevance

Some agencies are not present in Mindanao, which is the key area of humanitarian interventions and for which the 2011 HAP was developed. This limits the relevance of CERF allocations to those agencies. However, if they have good partners working in Mindanao they may still be able to play a useful role.

Furthermore, as needs change over time, agencies would prefer is CERF funding were not allocated against a fixed budget but was granted in a more flexible way. While this is the case with CERF loans, where agency decides how it spends the CERF loan it cannot be the case for CERF grants as the CERF Secretariat needs to ensure that expenditures are in accordance with the CERF guidelines. This issue is closely related to the timeliness of the CERF allocation, as well as to synergies with other sources of funding.

3.2 Effectiveness

Results

As detailed below, it is estimated in HC country reports that NGOs received around 15 per cent of the CERF funding, almost the same amount as the Government. However, even though the bulk of funding is not channelled through NGOs and the Government as cash, interviewees confirmed that it is channelled through them as food and other relief items.

Table 5: Share of the CERF funding transferred as cash to NGOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>UN/IOM</th>
<th>NGOs</th>
<th>Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>938,652</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,891,399.07</td>
<td>188,892.93</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>9,348,671</td>
<td>1,240,442</td>
<td>1,351,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Currency: USD

As mentioned earlier, projects were often implemented in partnership with the local authorities. This can be an issue in the Philippines where local authorities may be controlled by local elites. Collaborations with social workers in the field, even in conflict areas, was seen as a necessary compromise of neutrality. The Government also benefitted from the CERF as an implementing partner.

---

10 This table uses the data of the HC reports which use year of application, whereas the other tables use the year of disbursement.
Interviewees reported that in some cases CERF money was not spent because of agency delays, caused by constraints in recruitment, for instance. Such issues are broader issues about agency procedures and performance rather than issues about the performance of the CERF process. However, a lack of clear monitoring does not allow for detailed analysis of the extent of this issue in all implemented projects.

CERF funding has allowed a certain flexibility to adapt to the changing situations of those displaced by conflict or natural disasters, who may return quite rapidly. Such displacements are frequent in the Philippines, and this has to be taken into account for project implementation. In addition, some IDPs seek refuge with their families and relatives, so some aspects of the humanitarian situation relating to displacement may be less visible. Finally, despite increased coverage due to CERF funding, humanitarian assistance has been insufficient in some cases, and some migration has even occurred because farmers in conflict areas did not receive sufficient funding.

Food supplies were organised by the Government with limited resources, and complemented by WFP. This was crucial considering that the Philippines, as a major importer of food, is particularly vulnerable to changes in prices.

For the nutrition component, the use of CERF funding to pilot the use of the Community Management for Acute Malnutrition was a particularly interesting outcome from the use of CERF funding. It is recognized as an innovative and successful practice.

The Philippines is a disaster-prone country with seen several tropical cyclones making landfall every year, in addition to floods and other events. Risk reduction beforehand can be a more effective approach to saving lives in such circumstance, but the CERF live saving criteria exclude this. This raises the question about whether the CEFF life-saving Some types of intervention, such as disease surveillance and risk reduction, could not be funded by the CERF even though their potential for saving lives is greater than post-disaster relief. This focus on the response phase only, rather than on the most effective intervention raises questions about the “life-saving” criteria.

Some training was funded, including the training of national authority staff. One issue is that partners are trained when there is already an emergency taking place, so it would be useful if CERF funding served to preposition skills among partners, as a key element to support life-saving action in emergency contexts.

The chart below shows that reports of the UN agencies on their programme indicate that a significant number of persons have benefitted from CERF programmes, especially considering that in 2008, the number of IDPs was estimated to be 500,000. As CERF funding is used to complement other funding, agencies recognize that there are some limitations in attributing results to a specific fund.

Table 6: Estimated number of beneficiaries reached by CERF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N° of beneficiaries reached by CERF</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>303,135</td>
<td>861,940</td>
<td>1,250,00</td>
<td>522,744</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Country Report: The Philippines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Under 5 years</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>101,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>99,710</td>
<td>617,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>202,250</td>
<td>22,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HC country reports 2007, 2008, 2009

Timeliness

55. CERF is recognised as a “fast” fund, the first one available in emergencies, and often the most reliable source of funding. Once funding has been approved, the money usually comes very quickly.

56. Some agencies mentioned that time required to prepare the proposals improved over time, as they acquired experience. Whereas this task would initially have taken a week, it now takes only a few hours.

57. The UFE process is perceived to take longer, and the sole UFE grant did take longer than the average duration of the RR process. However, the fact that there has only been one UFE allocation in the Philippines does not allow for the generalization of this finding in here. In the UFE case, the situation changed during the 24 days taken to process the application. Displaced people had already started to return home.

58. The fact that every level of the Government had to approve the process, for some agencies, may in some cases have delayed the final approval of the grant.

59. Agency procedures improved over time, to adapt to the critical timing of the projects; for instance, the procurement ceiling for country offices is higher than before; and there are now frameworks contracts with suppliers, as well as accelerated emergency procurement procedures. However, some agencies impose internal administrative constraints: for instance, the clearance required by technical staff for specific procurement procedures can take time, and the technical requirements of the project may also affect the timeframe.

60. Figure 5 below shows the average timeframe (in calendar days) for submission approval, by agency. However, it should be pointed out that the number of proposals per agency (shown in brackets after the agency name) is relatively small for some agencies, preventing any inter-agency comparisons.

Figure 5: Rapid Response proposal review times by agency.
Timeline for CERF Funding for The Philippines - The upright lines show the decision date on the grant, and the lines on either side show the time from the first formal application to the eventual disbursement. RR grants above the line and UFE grants below.
Interactions with other funds

The CERF has shown complementarity with the other funds, most of which support development goals. For instance, the CERF allows financing for emergency shelters, while ECHO funds transitional shelters, and USAID funds permanent shelters.

The Philippines benefits from UNDP’s Thematic Trust Fund, and the World Bank has established a Mindanao Trust Fund for the Reconstruction and Development Program. These complement the CERF funding with a longer-term approach.

3.3 Efficiency

In terms of transaction costs, the CERF appears to be the lightest of all funds. In some cases, the CERF has been even quicker than the internal loan mechanisms of some smaller agencies; hence it provided great added value to the emergency response. Figure 7 shows that the average processing time for RR grants was 24 days from application to disbursement, and it was 33 days for UFE grants. Although UFE grants are not time-critical, the time taken to process these grants is used as a benchmark against which RR grants may be compared.

Average CERF timings (2006-2010) in calendar days from submission to disbursement for Philippines

![Figure 7: Average timelines for CERF in the Philippines](image)

As always, the shortest element in the time line was the part which is wholly under the control of the CERF Secretariat and the ERC; that is the time from final submission to approval. This was just over two and a half days for RR grants and four days for UFE grants.

A significant number of no-cost extensions were required for the grants disbursed, and the extension to 6 months of the rapid response project was welcomed by the UN agencies. Interviewees stated that the three month timeframe is suited for some types of activities such as shelter distribution or non-food items item distribution. However, it is less suitable for other types of project, where setting up takes longer, or procurement is more difficult.

Every year, the Philippines endures typhoons, which trigger the same type of emergency response. This limits somewhat the productivity and efficiency of CERF funding. Indeed, it

---

11 This understates the actual values for UFE grants because some intermediate points for one project were missing from the data supplied by the CERF Secretariat. When these data are included, the average rises to 26 calendar days for rapid response funding.
would make more sense to have a long term planning of disaster response and disaster risk mitigation, with some components on preparedness or local capacity building. This may not be the core role of CERF, but the lack of other funding mechanisms to tackle this kind of issue impacts the efficiency of the CERF.

Agencies recognize that a large part of the success of CERF-funded projects stems from the involvement of effective NGOs, providing linkages with communities, generating trust, and engaging local knowledge.

In some agencies, the technical support received from regional offices is included in the project’s budget. This is seen as having a strong added value but does not refer directly to project costs and should possibly be included in the overhead costs, as this relates more to an institutional process for fund management than project costs.
4. OUTCOMES

4.1 Appropriateness/Relevance

Interviewees highlighted that disaster preparedness is particularly relevant in the Philippines given the country’s location in the path of tropical cyclones. The definition of humanitarian action in the Good Humanitarian Donorship principles\(^\text{12}\) suggests that action to reduce the impact of future disasters is integral to humanitarian action. However, the life-saving criteria specifically exclude preparedness.

Other interviewees were concerned that opening the CERF to funding disaster risk reduction might dilute the principle purpose of the fund. This is a contentious issue. The most cost-effective way to save lives in areas subject to tropical cyclone is most probably through preparedness. This is possibly a question for the next CERF evaluation in another five years; by then the CERF will have repeatedly contributed to responding to numerous cyclones in the Philippines, and the question about the potential cost effectiveness of preparedness will be much more sharply defined.

4.2 Effectiveness

**Humanitarian reform and architecture**

The CERF played a big role in supporting and reinforcing the cluster system. This supports the appeal and shows that the UN is serious and consistent about what it says regarding needs. It is particularly important with regards to the Government and other donors.

The CERF supports the cluster system, which is functioning better and better. Cluster members need to attend cluster meetings for targeting services to beneficiaries and other cluster decision making. The clusters have clearly brought change due to the increase in communication and coordination; a pertinent example is the standardising of kits and voucher systems implemented by three agencies. It has been said that it would now be hard to imagine a big response without clusters now that Standard Operating Procedures for coordination already exist.

Some limitations are linked to the characteristics of humanitarian reform. Indeed, the cluster system as a basis for pooled funding allocation can to a certain extent reinforce a culture of silos and put people in “boxes” with limited interaction between them. There may be a need for more cross-cluster discussions to compensate for this, along with exchanges on more open and flexible joint programming.

---

\(^\text{12}\) Good Humanitarian Donorship. (2003). *Principles and Good Practice of Humanitarian Donorship*. Stockholm: Germany, Australia, Belgium, Canada, the European Commission, Denmark, the United States, Finland, France, Ireland, Japan, Luxembourg, Norway, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Sweden and Switzerland.
The CERF contributed to reinforcing partnerships in the sense that it allowed the mobilisation of partners quite rapidly in emergency contexts, and it reinforced exchanges and discussions in some clusters.

Quality of the response

There is no specific way of measuring effectiveness and impact of CERF projects. There are furthermore limited standardised indicators across agencies, whether in terms of processes or of technical content, apart from internal monitoring and evaluation systems of the agencies. This could be something to develop further in the next CERF allocations.

CERF projects do not usually differ from other projects implemented by the agencies, and their enhanced quality mainly stems from the rapidity of implementation, or the degree to which they are discussed and endorsed by the cluster, as well as through national coordination mechanisms. The CERF response is better when it promotes an integrated response to emergencies.

The CERF can play a role in identifying best practices and innovative approaches at the global level by sector. However, as the CERF Secretariat is not composed of specialists, technical improvements of the project would mainly lie at the IASC and HCT levels, or in the related support provided by OCHA.

The CERF also improved the coverage of the response, by adding some components to general programmes of the agencies, in terms of number of beneficiaries, areas covered, or technical inputs, for instance by allowing a storm evacuation tracking centre.

As there is quite a high level of decentralisation in the Philippines, there can in some cases be challenges to the uniformity of the response in relation to local authorities. These challenges are not due then to CERF particularly, but induced by the requirement of coordination with local authorities.

The CERF makes a difference compare to other funding sources considering the political challenges. The Government is less eager to request funding from bilateral donors for conflict areas to avoid raising the profile of the conflict at a global level and potentially internationalising the conflict. Therefore, the CERF made a difference in Mindanao, especially as this is a politicised and very sensitive emergency to which donors were reluctant to respond. The CERF does not raise any flag, and was thus particularly appropriate in its intervention. It allowed everybody to gear up without getting into politics, and action “below the radar”. This is however not related to core characteristics of the CERF, timeliness and life-saving criteria.

Gender, vulnerability and cross-cutting issues

Gender issues are addressed in some programmes. Agencies mentioned that most relief items are distributed to female spouses as the heads of household. In other cases, such as the distribution of vouchers for shelter repairs, attention is paid to ensuring that both women and men are included. Female-headed households are also considered a priority.
Gender markers have so far not been used at country level, and most of the agencies had not heard about these.

Table 7: Gender, Vulnerability, and Cross-cutting scores for CERF-funded projects in the Philippines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross Cutting marker</th>
<th>Vulnerability Marker</th>
<th>Gender Marker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The team did an analysis of 20 randomly selected CERF-funded projects. A further two projects were selected but were not analysed, as they were for common services. The analysis looked at the extent to which gender, vulnerability and cross-cutting issues were mainstreamed into the needs assessment, planning of activities and output components. This showed that a significant number of projects included a vulnerable group component, mainly as they targeted IDPs, either solely or as a significant part of the programme.

A gender approach was almost never included, except in terms of support to women when they were the only beneficiaries of the project. Some 40 per cent of the projects paid no attention to gender, and another 40 per cent made some contribution to gender. The other 20 per cent of projects either made a significant contribution to gender, or had gender as their principle purpose. Cross cutting issues were almost never mentioned, except if one considers that partnership/coordination with the government is part of this. However, there was never a mention of local coping mechanisms and level of resilience, nor specific social and economic analyses in relation to the project.

4.3 Efficiency

Efficiency of the process could be improved with support specifically tailored to the leadership part of the humanitarian reform—the HC. More exchanges and experience sharing, about CERF details and possibilities, between the HC and the CERF Secretariat would help to overcome some functional challenges in CERF management, especially regarding their interdependence with the UN agencies. However this is a broader issue than just for the CERF.

In order to maximise CERF allocations, there is a need for documentation that clearly defines responsibilities and roles of each agency in the humanitarian response. Mitigation measures also need to be better identified.

The CERF plays a role in securing funding and in increasing the capacity of the humanitarian response after an emergency, at a time when there are many competing
priorities. It sends a strong signal to the donors, and has a leverage effect on other funding sources.

88. As in other countries, OCHA does not have a mandate to follow up on projects, and there is no monitoring and evaluation system; this affects the CERF’s accountability, and possibly its efficiency. The CERF Secretariat had developed and is testing a Programme Accountability Framework, but it is too early to assess if this will lead to increased accountability. In addition, it is difficult to ascertain that funds are spent in a timely manner.

89. CERF recipients are required, under the Letters of Understanding that they sign, to provide data to the RC/HC. However, the gaps in the data seen (only 7 out of 19 grants in 2009 and 2010 have any data on amounts forwarded to NGOs for example) suggest that agencies do not take this responsibility very seriously.

90. At the OCHA level, procedures for human resources management do not allow for hand over in cases of staff turnover. An important issue is to ensure capitalisation of experience, and transfer of competencies and information on the status of different projects.
5. CONTRIBUTION

The CERF contribution to responding to life-saving needs is seen mainly from the perspective of funding projects lacking seed money, and which could not have been funded otherwise, for instance nutrition projects. The team was impressed by the way in which CERF funding had helped to “kick-start” the introduction of a community managed acute malnutrition approach in the Philippines.

It also allowed agencies to expand activities, cover a higher number of beneficiaries, and fill funding gaps in emergency contexts -- most notably in terms of support to IDPs from natural disasters and conflicts. The sequential compatibility of project contents funded by different donors is noteworthy, for instance, between the different types of shelter provided. In this case, the CERF is particularly fulfilling its role as first response to most critical needs, and supplying temporary assistance.

The CERF certainly contributed to alleviating suffering and saving lives by its interventions in health, nutrition, food security, protection, WASH, agriculture and common services essentially. Inclusion of education projects was also particularly important in the context of conflict in the south, for its role in supporting social cohesion.

The CERF is seen as strategic funding, allowing agencies to gear up and increase capacity in emergency contexts. It contributed to a more coordinated and integrated approach to emergencies, which in turn increased the efficiency of funding, and maximized results in terms of beneficiary numbers and funds available.

The CERF is typically the first external funding available to UN agencies. However, it still takes over three weeks, on average, from the first application to disbursement. The duration from the final application to approval by the ERC is less than three days. Most of this time (over two weeks) is consumed by the signing of the letter of agreement.

Considering the predictability of disasters in the Philippines, the life-saving potential of any funding would also imply funding of preparedness activities and support to local capacity building. This would increase local resilience and strengthen local protection mechanisms as an immediate response to disasters before any international funding.
6. CONCLUSIONS

97. The impact of the CERF in the Philippines has been twofold: First, it provided UN agencies with additional funding in the context of emergencies or underfunded humanitarian crises. Second, it supported UN humanitarian assistance reform, reinforcing the role of the UN in the humanitarian response. It has also supported humanitarian reform by contributing to building management systems within clusters, increasing communication, and involving agencies in a system with standardised procedures applicable to all actors.

98. The fact that CERF supported the Humanitarian Action Plan shows that the UN is serious and consistent about what it says regarding need. This is particularly important with regards to the Government and other donors. Thus, CERF sends a strong signal to the humanitarian donor community and has a leveraging effect on other funding sources.

99. The CERF showed a high level of inclusiveness towards the Government. Although CERF funding was used in politically sensitive areas, there was a good level of collaboration and support from the Government for the different sectors.

100. With regards to the CERF’s inclusiveness of NGOs, there is room for improvement. Currently NGOs are not directly involved in the CERF process, although they can submit project proposals for funding through the clusters. The timeframe for fund transfers to NGOs can take up to three times longer than the application process in some cases. For NGOs, transaction costs in terms of reporting are no different for CERF funding compared to other UN funds. However, the fact that agency processes are so slow negates part of the advantage offered by a light and fast CERF processes.

101. Some efforts were conducted to submit applications based on needs assessments, including through the Joint Rapid Assessment Team that was used for the appeals. However, there is still a lack of common indicators and methodologies to allow the comparison of needs across different countries for a more rational allocation of assistance.

102. In relation to this, applications for appeals and for CERF funding have been driven to a significant extent by an understanding of what amounts could reasonably be expected. Budget cuts occurred in a systematic way across sectors, which had different effects depending on the size of the organisation and the sector. These systematic cuts could be revised if there is stronger support for streamlining the process.

103. More precise guidelines on the process and a global methodology for needs assessment and threshold indicators to trigger humanitarian assistance would help the HC to arbitrate between the different projects submitted by the agencies/clusters. More exchanges and experience sharing about CERF details and partnership possibilities between HC and the CERF Secretariat would help to overcome some functional challenges in the CERF management, especially regarding their interdependence with the UN agencies.

104. The exclusion of some activities, such as preparedness, under the life-saving criteria remain problematic in a context like the Philippines.
Some agencies complained about the three-month timeframe for project expenditure, although some others acknowledged this made sense for efficiency purposes, since the longer a project lasts the greater are the administrative and personnel costs. However, a significant part of the projects benefitted from no cost extensions and the changes of LoU in 2010 was prolonged to six months.
ANNEX I. LINKS TO THE TERMS OF REFERENCE AND THE INCEPTION REPORT.

The Terms of Reference and the Inception Report are not annexed here due to their length. They can be found at:

Terms of reference:
http://www.channelresearch.com/file_download/294/CERF_5YREVAL_Final_TOR_07.11.2010.pdf
http://www.channelresearch.com/file_download/294/CERF_5YREVAL_Final_TOR_Appendix_V_07.11.pdf

Inception report:
ANNEX II. CERF PROCESS DESCRIPTION

RAPID RESPONSE GRANT PROCESS
B1. Although there is a preference for applications from a country team, a UN agency can make a request for CERF rapid response window funding at any time (e.g. WFP did so in December 2009 in Kenya). The only requirement, checked by the CERF Secretariat, is that the request be endorsed by the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) or the Resident Coordinator (RC) in the absence of an HC. Such one-off requests are relatively rare, and the bulk of CERF rapid response funding goes to joint requests by several UN agencies.

B2. The Emergency Relief Coordinator may also take the initiative of suggesting to the HC or RC the possibility of requesting CERF rapid response funding (OCHA 2006; 2011). This happens only rarely, for example after the 2010 earthquake in Haiti when many UN staff, including top ranking ones, died and most UN buildings were destroyed, in Pakistan at the onset of the 2010 floods, and in DRC for Equateur Province in 2010.

B3. If requested by the UN country team, an informal indication may be given by the CERF Secretariat as to the likely scale of the CERF envelope for the particular crisis. There is normally a maximum limit of US$30 million for any one emergency or crisis (United Nations Secretariat, Secretary-General’s bulletin, 2006, 2010) but it is extremely rare that the full amount is allocated. The 2010 Pakistan floods are an example. Three RR allocations were made, the first two of which at the initiative of the ERC in August 2010. The initial allocation, at the onset of the floods, was revised up from an initial US$10 million to US$16.6 million in consultation with the HC and rapidly followed by a second one of US$13.4 million (i.e. a total of US$30 million). The CERF finally provided close to US$42 million for the response to the floods.

B4. The CERF Secretariat prefers to see a draft request prior to agreeing informally on an envelope. At a minimum, the CERF Secretariat has to be aware of the beneficiary numbers, justification, funding levels, and types of projects, before discussing the size of a submission. The CERF Secretariat often consults with the ERC on potential envelopes.

B5. Joint applications are prepared by the country team with the UN agencies discussing the amount to be allocated to each cluster (or agencies where clusters do not exist), and each cluster lead agency preparing proposals in consultation with cluster members. The level of formality of this process varies a lot, depending on how the HC manages the prioritisation process.

B6. The CERF Secretariat reviews the proposals, frequently leading to adjustments relating to budget issues. The CERF can make substantive comments, but it is assumed that the HC and HCT/clusters have the technical expertise to determine what the urgent needs are as well as the capacities of the agencies on the ground. Once the Secretariat signs off, the grants are reviewed and authorised by the Emergency Relief Coordinator and the agency in question signs a Letter of Understanding with the UN Secretariat for the release of the funds.

13 From second quarter of 2011 an umbrella LoU has been introduced and agencies will counter-sign an approval letter from the ERC, instead of signing a LoU for each grant.
UNDERFUNDED EMERGENCY GRANT PROCESS

87. Allocations from the CERF underfunded emergencies window (UFE) are made twice a year, and the two rounds coincide with the global Consolidated Appeal Process (CAP) launch and the CAP mid-year review. Allocations are made to both CAP and non-CAP countries with no predefined division between these. The criteria for selection of countries for UFE funding are the degree of funding shortfall, the severity of humanitarian needs, and type of activities and the implementation capacity. The ERC selects between 17 and 24 countries a year for underfunded emergency support with the bulk of funds (typically two thirds) allocated during the first round.

88. For CAP countries, the CERF Secretariat undertakes an analysis of humanitarian indicators combined with an analysis of the level of funding support for the CAP (analysis at sector level for each CAP). For the first underfunded round the previous year’s CAP funding data is used for the analysis whereas the funding levels at the CAP mid-year review serve as reference for the second allocation.

89. For non-CAP countries, UN agencies’ headquarters are invited to vote on which non-CAP emergencies they regard as the most underfunded. The voting process is supplemented with details from each agency on their ongoing humanitarian programmes in the proposed countries and the funding levels of these.

90. The CERF Secretariat combines analysis of CAP and non-CAP countries and, based on the UFE criteria, prepares a ranked list of country candidates for the ERC’s consideration and decision. The ERC decides of the list of countries for inclusions and on the funding envelope for each. The selected countries and proposed allocation envelopes are discussed with agency headquarter focal points.

91. The amount decided by the ERC is notified to the RC/HC in a letter in which the ERC may direct the allocation, or parts of it, to particular underfunded sectors or regions in order to facilitate prioritisation and speed up the process. The RC/HC will have to confirm that the funds are needed and can be implemented according to the stipulated timeline and against the proposed activities.

92. At the country level, the allocation process is similar for the preparation of a rapid response allocation. The only other differences for underfunded emergencies is that the grants for the first annual round must be implemented by 31 December of the same calendar year and for the second annual round by 30 June of the next calendar year (OCHA 2010). Again, agencies can ask for a no-cost extension.
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## ANNEX IV. LIST OF PERSONS MET

### Summary of Interviews by category of person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of person interviewed</th>
<th>Cat</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>as %</th>
<th>of which♀ as %</th>
<th>of which♂ as %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other OCHA Staff</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC/HC and head of agency</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other UN staff</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs and Red Cross</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Government Officials</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector/Cluster leads</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of Interview Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of interview method</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>as %</th>
<th>of which♀ as %</th>
<th>of which♂ as %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General meeting</td>
<td>gm</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-structured Interview (Individual interviewee)</td>
<td>ssi</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-structured Interview (Group - two or more interviewees)</td>
<td>ssg</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief Discussion (less than ten minutes on one or more topics)</td>
<td>bd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Surname, Forenames, Org. and function, Method, Cat, Place, Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname, Forenames</th>
<th>Org. and function</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Cat</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addawe, Joseph</td>
<td>OCHA, Information Management Analyst</td>
<td>gm</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Makati City</td>
<td>Mon 28 Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aduna, Alberto</td>
<td>FAO, Emergency Coordination Officer</td>
<td>gm</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Makati City</td>
<td>Fri 04 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aguin, Jose</td>
<td>UNFPA, Junior Professional Officer</td>
<td>gm</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Makati City</td>
<td>Fri 04 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Stephen</td>
<td>WFP, Country Director</td>
<td>gm</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Makati City</td>
<td>Fri 04 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquino, Arlynn</td>
<td>ECHO</td>
<td>ssg</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Makati City</td>
<td>Thu 03 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashby, Stephen E.</td>
<td>Save the Children, Country Director</td>
<td>ssg</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Makati City</td>
<td>Wed 02 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacatan, Elmira</td>
<td>Oxfam, Partnership Program Manager Emergency Response</td>
<td>ssg</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Makati City</td>
<td>Wed 02 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badcock, Jacqui</td>
<td>United Nations, Resident Coordinator</td>
<td>ssi</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Makati City</td>
<td>Mon 28 Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrameda, Maria</td>
<td>WHO, Emergency and Humanitarian Action Programme Officer</td>
<td>ssg</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Manila City</td>
<td>Thu 03 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bercasio, Dave</td>
<td>IOM, Emergency Programme Coordinator</td>
<td>ssi</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Makati City</td>
<td>Fri 04 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capadocia-Yanco, Celia</td>
<td>Department of Social Welfare and Development, Undersecretary</td>
<td>ssg</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Quezon City</td>
<td>Thu 03 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casedo, Rodeliza</td>
<td>UNICEF, Child Protection Cluster</td>
<td>ssg</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Makati City</td>
<td>Tue 01 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castillo, Aimee Rose</td>
<td>Department of Social Welfare and Development, Programme Staff</td>
<td>ssg</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Quezon City</td>
<td>Thu 03 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinnici, Philip</td>
<td>OCHA Philippines, Information Management Officer</td>
<td>gm</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Makati City</td>
<td>Fri 04 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniels, Ugochi</td>
<td>United Nations Population Fund, Country Representative</td>
<td>ssg</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Makati City</td>
<td>Tue 01 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vera, Lulay</td>
<td>UNICEF, Education Cluster</td>
<td>ssg</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Makati City</td>
<td>Tue 01 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djuraskovic, Dragoslav</td>
<td>UN WFP, Head of Logistics</td>
<td>ssg</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Makati City</td>
<td>Mon 28 Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grieve, Tim</td>
<td>UNICEF, Chief of WASH Philippine Country Office</td>
<td>ssg</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Makati City</td>
<td>Tue 01 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habib, Sheikh</td>
<td>UNDSS, Head of Agency</td>
<td>bd</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Makati City</td>
<td>Tue 01 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernandez, Vladimir Arcilla</td>
<td>CFSI, Director for Philippine Programme</td>
<td>ssg</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Makati City</td>
<td>Wed 02 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javier, Alwynn C.</td>
<td>Christian Aid, Senior Programme Officer</td>
<td>ssg</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Makati City</td>
<td>Wed 02 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerblat, Bernard</td>
<td>UNHCR, Head of Agency &amp; Lead Cluster-Protection</td>
<td>ssi</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Makati City</td>
<td>Tue 01 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumanog, Joseph</td>
<td>CFSI, Executive Assistant</td>
<td>ssg</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Makati City</td>
<td>Wed 02 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization/Position</td>
<td>Initials</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manalansan, Edgardo</td>
<td>OCHA, Finance and Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>gm</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Makati City</td>
<td>Mon 28 Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina, Gerardo, MD</td>
<td>WHO, Field Operations Officer</td>
<td>ssg</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Manila City</td>
<td>Thu 03 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitra, Titon</td>
<td>AusAID, Senior Programme Officer for DRM-CC-Env</td>
<td>ssg</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Makati City</td>
<td>Thu 03 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orquiza, Anne</td>
<td>WHO, Emergency and Humanitarian Action Technical Officer</td>
<td>ssg</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Manila City</td>
<td>Thu 03 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palacio, Maria Agnes</td>
<td>OCHA, National Disaster Response Advisor</td>
<td>gm</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Makati City</td>
<td>Mon 28 Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesigan, Arturo, MD</td>
<td>WHO, Emergency and Humanitarian Action Technical Officer</td>
<td>ssg</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Makati City</td>
<td>Mon 28 Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rayco-Solon, Pura</td>
<td>UNICEF, Nutrition Specialist Health and Nutrition Section</td>
<td>ssg</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Makati City</td>
<td>Tue 01 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steains, Cate</td>
<td>OCHA Philippines, Head of Agency</td>
<td>ssi</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Makati City</td>
<td>Tue 01 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, Nick</td>
<td>ECHO</td>
<td>ssg</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Makati City</td>
<td>Thu 03 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tayzon, Florence</td>
<td>United Nations Population Fund, Assistant Representative</td>
<td>ssg</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Makati City</td>
<td>Tue 01 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobin, Vanessa J.</td>
<td>UNICEF, Representative Philippine Country Office</td>
<td>ssi</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Makati City</td>
<td>Tue 01 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsurumi, Kazuyuki</td>
<td>FAO Representative</td>
<td>ssg</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Makati City</td>
<td>Mon 28 Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villas, Rommel</td>
<td>UNFPA, Mindanao Operations Officer</td>
<td>ssg</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Makati City</td>
<td>Tue 01 Mar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANEX V. COUNTRY PROJECT SUMMARIES

Typographic errors in the database entries have not been corrected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF - RR - Water and sanitation</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Emergency Relief Assistance to Victims of Typhoon Durian - Nutrition, Water Sanitation and Hygiene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>642</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Emergency Relief Assistance to Victims of Typhoon Durian - Emergency Family Care and Support Packages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>644</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Emergency Relief Assistance to Victims of Typhoon Durian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>645</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Emergency Relief Assistance to Victims of Typhoon Durian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>646</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Emergency Relief Assistance to Victims of Typhoon Durian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>649</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Reproductive Health Support for Residual Relief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>650</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Building of Temporary Shelters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>651</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Food Aid for Displaced People Affected by Typhoon Reming (Duran)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>652</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Sustained Health Sector Response to the Typhoon's Disaster of 2006 in the Bicol Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>653</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Ensuring the Safety and Unity of Displaced Families and Providing Psycho-social Rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CERF 5-Year Evaluation
Country Report: The Philippines
Support to Mothers and their Children

UNICEF - RR - Water and sanitation - US$330,630 (09-CEF-072-B) -
2008 654

WASH - Emergency Relief Assistance to Victims of Complex Emergency in Central Mindanao

Children, women and their families in evacuation centers have access to safe drinking water and sanitation facilities (safe means of excreta disposal) Reduced risk of prevalence of water and excreta related diseases

Gaps on WASH needs addressed

UNFPA - RR - Health - US$156,324 (09-FPA-024) -
2008 655

Reproductive Health Support for Conflict-displaced Populations in Mindanao

Reduced maternal and neonatal morbidity and mortality of affected population Indicator: Decrease in maternal and neonatal deaths Addressed GBV Indicator: Proportion of reported GBV cases managed Reduced STI incidence Indicator: Reduced number of STI cases

UNICEF - RR - Health - Nutrition - US$399,998 (09-CEF-035-A) -
2008 659

Emergency Nutrition Response for Mindanao Armed Conflict Areas

1 Prevent micronutrient deficiencies in children (6-24 months) through supplementation with MNPs and vitamin A supplementation 2 Reduced mortality rate of severely malnourished children 3 Severely malnourished children cured with appropriate treatment 4 Diarrhoea cases treated appropriately to reduce duration and severity

UNICEF - RR - Water and sanitation - US$180,289 (09-CEF-035-B) -
2009 660

WASH - Emergency Relief Assistance to Victims of Complex Emergency in Central Mindanao

Children, women and their families in IDP camps and host families have access to safe drinking water and sanitation facilities (safe means of excreta disposal) and practice proper hygiene practices, specially hand washing Reduced risk of prevalence of water and excreta related diseases

Gaps on WASH needs addressed

UNICEF - RR - Protection of Children - Rights - US$313,424 (08-CEF-003-C) -
2008 661

Protection of Displaced Children

Community-based child protection committees are organized and functional in 60 evacuation centers/IDP camps 60,000 displaced girls and boys are in a safe place and have access to basic services 30,000 displaced girls and boys are participating in group activities and structured play in child-friendly spaces

UNICEF - RR - Education - US$208,527 (06-CEF-035-D) -
2009 662

Emergency Educational Assistance to Children in Complex Emergencies

40 safe temporary learning centres in evacuation centres are created and accessible to children

These should be placed in safe, conducive and near or within IDP communities About 4000 internally displaced children re-integrated to ECCD learning centres/schools or attending education sessions in temporary learning spaces About 160 teachers, day care workers and volunteers provided with references on MSEE and teaching materials for alternative education delivery modes

Water and sanitation facilities in the 40 temporary learning centres are accessible to children

UNICEF - RR - Water and sanitation - US$1,093,540 (09-CEF-054-A) -
2009 663

Emergency WASH support for victims of Ketsana Typhoon

Water supply in relocation camps is adequate and regular (Liters/capita day available) Sanitation in relocation centres is adequate (number of used toilets/pixel) Displaced families (% of displaced families that access soap and hygiene items) Returning Families have the means of clean and disinfect the premises (% families who received a sanitation kit) Flooded areas will be drained and no more stagnating water will be present

Schools that re-open, and temporary learning spaces have adequate WASH in place (% of children accessing adequate WASH in schools)

UNICEF - RR - Shelter and NFI - US$735,884 (06-CEF-054-B) -
2009 664

NFI for Women and Children affected by the flood

Water supply in relocation camps is adequate and regular (Liters/capita day available) Sanitation in relocation centres is adequate (number of used toilets/pixel) Displaced families (% of displaced families that access soap and hygiene items) Returning Families have the means of clean and disinfect the premises (% families who received a sanitation kit) Flooded areas will be drained and no more stagnating water will be present

Schools that re-open, and temporary learning spaces have adequate WASH in place (% of children accessing adequate WASH in schools)

UNFPA - RR - Health - US$173,233 (09-FPA-019) -
2009 665

Addressing the Reproductive Health Needs of the IDPs in Mindanao

Reduced maternal and neonatal mortality in the camps Indicator: Decrease in maternal and neonatal deaths Reduced unplanned pregnancies and unmet need Indicators: Increase in new acceptors and continuing users of family planning Decrease in teenage pregnancies Reduced STI incidence Indicator: Reduced number of STI cases Addressed GBV Indicator: Number of GBV cases reported, filed and settled

UNFPA - RR - Health - US$183,847 (09-FPA-028) -
2009 666

Reproductive Health Care for Women of Reproductive Age

Zero maternal and neonatal mortality in the evacuation centers Indicator: No maternal and neonatal deaths Restore access to family planning services Indicator: No of continuing users provided with FP commodities Addressed GBV Indicator: Number of GBV cases reported, filed and settled

UNICEF - RR - Multi-sector - US$991,743 (09-OM-019) -
2009 667

Multi-sectoral Emergency Support for Mobile and Vulnerable Populations in Mindanao

Immediate provision of emergency basic sustains through the distribution of up to 15,000 NFI packages Immediate provision of temporary shelter support towards the improvement of living conditions, through the distribution of up to 9,000 emergency shelter kits Contributed to the achievement of minimum WASH standards in emergency situations through the construction of up to 56 latrines and 37 bathing cubicles, the installation of 19 water point systems, the distribution of 7,500 hygiene kits, and convening of hygiene/sanitation/health-promotion capacity building activities in four (4) affected provinces
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Last Updated</th>
<th>Year Evaluation</th>
<th>Expected Result/Outcome</th>
<th>Expected Outcome</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IOM - RR - Shelter and NFI -</td>
<td>US$776,693 (09/IOM-025) -</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>IOM Emergency Shelter Support and NFI Augmentation Project</td>
<td>Immediate provision of basic utensils through the distribution of up to 4,000 NFI packages</td>
<td>Immediate provision of temporary shelter NFI support towards the improvement of living conditions, through the distribution of up to 4,000 emergency shelter NFI kits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM - RR - Shelter and NFI -</td>
<td>US$447,102 (09/IOM-026) -</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>Camp Coordination and Camp Management Support</td>
<td>Three mobile camp management liaison teams deployed across Metro Manila and Region IV-A Camp management committees established in evacuation centres anticipating accommodating IDPs for an extended length of time IDP figures validated in coordination with DSWD and Referrals of urgent needs and gaps directed to relevant government and IASC cluster leads to up to 150 evacuation centres rehabilitated to ensure basic public health and safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP - RR - Security -</td>
<td>US$207,484 (09/UNDP-007) -</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>Expansion and upgrade of Emergency Communications System (ECS) in Mindanao</td>
<td>The results to be achieved include: Expansion of the ECS coverage area to allow all staff to communicate during routine programme delivery operations and in event of emergencies Improved staff and programme security through reliable communications allowing staff to be warned of security threats, to call for assistance and respond in event of emergencies Support to other NGOs in the region with provision of access to the ECS under an agreed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP - RR - Food -</td>
<td>US$1,616,042 (09/WFP-040) -</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>Immediate Support to Conflict Affected Populations in Mindanao</td>
<td>Expected result/Outcome 1: Improved food consumption over assistance period for targeted emergency-affected households Expected result/Outcome 2: Reduced or stabilized acute malnutrition in children under 5 in targeted, emergency-affected populations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP - RR - Food -</td>
<td>US$2,269,103 (09/WFP-061) -</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>Emergency Operation: Food Assistance to Tropical Storm Ketsana-Affected Populations in Northern Philippines</td>
<td>At the end of the CERF period an anticipated that 2065 MT of food will have been purchased, delivered, and distributed to 1 million beneficiaries The following indicators will be used to measured impact of the food assistance: 1 MT of food commodities distributed 2 Number of beneficiaries who received a ration, taking into special consideration the involvement of women 3 Maintenance of nutritional status of children under 5 among population targeted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP - RR - CS - Telecomms -</td>
<td>US$226,000 (09/WFP-062) -</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>Logistics and Emergency Telecommunication Cluster activities in support of the Government of the Philippines and the Humanitarian community’s response to Tropical Storm Ketsana</td>
<td>Uninterrupted supply of life-saving relief items to the most affected population in the Philippines Emergency relief items requested by the government timely purchased and airlifted Minimum required logistics coordination and information related tools, services and set up available to the humanitarian community Logistics information shared for identification and response to gaps and bottlenecks Logistics Cluster dedicated website to share related information to cover the operation with bulletins, snapshots, meeting minutes, maps and SOPs Availability of inter-agency telecommunications infrastructure and services Cost-effective IT MOSS compliant communication services in place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP - RR - CS - UNHAS -</td>
<td>US$500,000 (09/WFP-063) -</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>Air Support to the Humanitarian Response (Provision of Air Services in support to the Humanitarian Community’s response to Tropical Storm Ketsana)</td>
<td>??? to be updated when project is approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO - RR - Health -</td>
<td>US$433,147 (09/WHO-033) -</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>Emergency Relief Assistance to Victims of Armed Conflict in Central Mindanao</td>
<td>Essential health services are made available to 80,000 families living in the evacuation centres and in the community Outbreaks of communicable diseases are prevented and controlled Further morbidity and mortality are prevented Indicators Number of health facilities with available medicines and medical supplies Immune response rates Mortality and mortality rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO - RR - Health -</td>
<td>US$567,061 (09/WHO-056) -</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>Provision of health care to tropical storm affected persons</td>
<td>- 40% of evacuation centers have been provided health care service through mobile outreach teams - Measles vaccination with vitamin A supplementation conducted for children 6-59 month of age - Critical gap medical supplies and drugs procured and delivered - Referral for emergency cases facilitated through referral to functional health facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF - UFE - Multi-sector -</td>
<td>US$788,871 (10-CEF-017) -</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>Multi-cluster Humanitarian response to the Protracted Mindanao Emergency</td>
<td>WASH Major and minor repairs and improvement of existing water and sanitation facilities especially those in highly critical evacuation centres and relocation sites Installation of additional shallow-water well pumps across the 15 target sites (generally 3 units/site) Installation of deep-water wells in some 5 house-based settings where installation of shallow-water pumps are virtually impossible because of geographic characteristics Construction of additional communal latrines across the 15 target sites (generally 5 units/site, each unit with two bowls) Provision of maintenance tools for WASH facilities to camp managers and IDP leaders Facilitation of advanced public health training for community health volunteers, including barangay health workers, recruited and initially trained in the previous two responses to support the conduct of more health and hygiene promotion campaigns at the community level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO - UFE - Agriculture -</td>
<td>US$210,536 (10-FAO-014) -</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>Livelihood Restoration and Improved Food Security of Internally Displaced People in Conflict-Affected Communities of Mindanao</td>
<td>Some 43,500 rural IDPs (7,250 households) improve their food security, nutritional status and income generation by the end of the 2010 wet cropping season, i.e. 750 male corn and rice farmers (cultivating 375 hectares of uplands and lowlands), 6,000 male and female vegetable producers (cultivating 1,500 hectares of gardens), 500 capture fisheries and their wives (who catch and process fisheries products), and 29,800 children of the aforementioned families 1,500 metric tonnes (MT) of corn and paddy rice, 7,500 MT of vegetables and 120 MT of fish harvested by the Component’s beneficiaries during 2010 Increased family incomes to support other basic household needs through the sale of surplus produce and processed commodities during 2010 Strengthened technical knowledge and skills of the beneficiary families and their extended communities through improved cropping and fisheries practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA - UFE - Multi-sector -</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>Reproductive Health Care for the IDPs in Mindanao</td>
<td>By the end of 2010: -Reduced maternal and neonatal mortality Indicator: Decrease in maternal mortality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
US$147,462 (10-FPA-013)

Mindanao

- and neonatal deaths by 10%
- Unwanted pregnancies and unplanned families prevented

Indicator: A 20% increase in new acceptors and continuing users of family planning (FP)
- Early marriage discouraged and teenage pregnancies prevented

Indicator: Decrease in the number of early marriages by 10%
- Reduced STI/HIV/AIDS transmission

Indicator: A 20% decrease in the number of syphilis cases among pregnant women
- GBV prevented or addressed

Indicators: Number of clusters integrating gender and GBV considerations

UNHCR - LIFE - Protection Rights - US$101,082 (10-HCR-016)

2010 680 Assistance to Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) in Mindanao area

1) Over 100,000 IDPs are better protected through improved polices towards forced displacement and promotion/adherence to the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement;
2) Contribute assistance to be extended to the most critical needs of some 1,000 Extremely Vulnerable Individuals;
3) Capacity of over 5,000 Local Government officials covering two provinces are strengthened through participation in Protection and CCCM workshops;
4) Over 100,000 IDPs benefit from establishment of community based monitoring for the protection of IDPs in places of return;
5) CCCM issues better addressed through involvement of expert National consultant

IOM - LIFE - Camp Management - US$373,568 (10-IOM-009)

2010 681 Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM) and Protection Support to Vulnerable Families in Conflict Affected Areas in Central Mindanao

Strategy for sustainable return developed and implemented in IDP sites
- Referral mechanisms clearly established and socialized in IDP sites, relocation sites and return communities
- 400 NFI return kits distributed to vulnerable populations leaving IDP sites or IDP families remaining in identified evacuation centres and relocation sites
- Communication boards established in IDP sites, relocation sites and return communities
- Camp management structures clearly established in IDP sites
- Immediate small scale repair of basic facilities in communities of high return
- Regular gap analysis and protection reports produced and disseminated

IOM - LIFE - Shelter and NFI - US$374,009 (10-IOM-010)

2010 682 Transitional Shelter Assistance for IDP families in Maguindanao

- a Immediate provision of 250 transitional shelter units in Maguindanao;
- b Immediate provision of 101 communal facilities in IDP sites and/or relocation sites in Maguindanao;
- c Start-up livelihood assistance packages provided for at least 250 vulnerable families

WFP - LIFE - Food - US$713,032 (10-WFP-022)

2010 683 Immediate Support to Conflict Affected Populations in Mindanao

- Improved food consumption over assistance period for targeted emergency-affected households;
- Reduced or stabilized acute malnutrition in children under 5 in targeted, emergency-affected populations

WHO - LIFE - Health - US$288,052 (10-WHO-017)

2010 684 Emergency health assistance to the affected populations of the complex emergency in Central Mindanao

1 Health facilities are able to provide essential health services according to their level of care
- % of health facilities with available essential medicines and medical supplies
- % of health facilities reporting any instance of drug stock-outs of 5 sentinel drugs
- Number of OPD consultations per site/evacuation center
- Number of health human resources provided to referral hospitals
- Number of health facilities or health sites provided with support for their essential water and sanitation requirements
- Written document on referral network developed disseminated to mobile clinic staff, barangay health centers, NGOs and hospital network
- Number of referrals (emergency and non-emergency) made by mobile clinics and barangay health centers to referral hospitals
- % of referrals made to hospitals which led to timely and proper management of referred cases at same hospital
- 3 Early detection and response to potential disease outbreaks
## ANNEX VI. SELECTED PROJECTS

Projects were randomly selected for analysis. Please see the methodology section for a description of the random selection process and rating process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Documents available</th>
<th>Gender Marker</th>
<th>Reasons for score</th>
<th>Vulnerability Marker</th>
<th>Reasons for score</th>
<th>Cross-cutting marker</th>
<th>Reasons for score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PH: 06-FAO-331-RR. FAO: Agriculture - $100,000</td>
<td>Rapid damage and needs assessment; - - Provision of necessary inputs; - - Coordination and reporting.</td>
<td>Project proposal (no date, 1 page)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no mention of gender at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>the document mentions targeting the most vulnerables but there is no mention of how vulnerability is assessed and this does not specify children, IDPs, elders or disabled approach.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>there is mention of partnership with the ministry of agriculture but of no other cross-cutting issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH: 09-IOM-019-RR. IOM: Multi-sector - $991,743</td>
<td>• Immediate provision of emergency basic utensils through the distribution of up to 15,000 NFI packages. - - • Immediate provision of temporary shelter support towards the improvement of living conditions, through the distribution of up to 9,000 emergency shelter kits. - - • Contributed to the achievement of minimum WASH standards in emergency situations through the construction of up to 56 latrines and 37 bathing cubicles, the installation of 19 water point systems, the distribution of 7,500 hygiene kits, and convening of hygiene/sanitation/health-promotion capacity building activities in four (4) affected provinces. - -</td>
<td>Application template HC RC (2 oct 2009), original proposal (17 July), revised proposals (23, 27 and 30 July)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>project targets families and women will be recruited along with men for work in the project</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>the project targets only IDPs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Project is done with Department of Social welfare and Development. Community are expected to be recruited to work on the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH: 06-IOM-333-RR. IOM: Shelter and non-food items - $250,000</td>
<td>Procurement of single family-type lightweight tents for 5,000 displaced households. - - Procurement of non-food items, such as water containers, mosquito nets, sleeping mats, blankets, cooking utensils and cooking stove, suited to the specifications of the above-mentioned tents for 5,000 displaced households. - - Procurement to hire 10 national UNVs who are able to support and facilitate relief activities. - - Procurement service for other UN agencies upon demand.</td>
<td>Project proposal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no mention of gender in terms of approach or outputs</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>the project targets IDPs through emergency shelters &amp; NFIs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>the project is done with DCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PH: 06-UDP-329-RR. UNDP: Multi-sector - $350,000

**Activity:** Procurement of single family-type lightweight tents for 5,000 displaced households; - Procurement of non-food items, such as water containers, mosquito nets, sleeping mats, blankets, cooking utensils and stoves; - Procurement to hire 10 national UNVs who are able to support and facilitate relief activities; - Procurement service for other UN agencies upon demand.

**Gender Marker:** 0

**Reasons for score:** No mention of gender in terms of approach or outputs

**Vulnerability Marker:** 2b

**Reasons for score:** The project targets IDPs through emergency shelters & NFIs

**Cross-cutting marker:** 1

**Reasons for score:** The project is done with DCC

---

### PH: 09-FPA-019-RR. UNFPA: Health - $173,233

**Activity:**
- Reduced maternal and neonatal mortality in the camps.
- Indicator: Decrease in maternal and neonatal deaths.
- Reduced unplanned pregnancies and unmet need.

**Gender Marker:** 2b

**Reasons for score:** The project targeted beneficiaries are women

**Vulnerability Marker:** 2b

**Reasons for score:** The project targets IDPs girls adolescent & women for maternal health

**Cross-cutting marker:** 2a

**Reasons for score:** The project targets IDPs girls adolescent & women for maternal health

**Original proposal (17 July), final proposal (23 July)**

---

### PH: 09-FPA-028-RR. UNFPA: Health - $183,847

**Activity:**
- Zero maternal and neonatal mortality in the evacuation centers.
- Indicator: No maternal and neonatal deaths.
- Restore access to family planning services.

**Gender Marker:** 2b

**Reasons for score:** The project targeted beneficiaries are women

**Vulnerability Marker:** 2b

**Reasons for score:** The project targets IDPs girls adolescent & women for maternal health

**Cross-cutting marker:** 2a

**Reasons for score:** The project has a HIV AIDS component, and capacity building of local health workers

**Original proposal (2 Oct), final proposal (2 Oct)**

---

### PH: 09-CEF-035-C-RR. UNICEF: Protection/Human Rights/Rule of Law - $313,424

**Activity:** Community-based child protection committees are organized and functional in 60 evacuation centers/IDP camps.

**Gender Marker:** 2a

**Reasons for score:** The project plans to target equally boys and girls

**Vulnerability Marker:** 2b

**Reasons for score:** The project targets 48,000 displaced children

**Cross-cutting marker:** 2a

**Reasons for score:** The project is implemented in partnership with national and local government, community-based child protection committees and target conflict affected areas.

**Original proposal (17 July), final proposal (23 July)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Documents available</th>
<th>Gender Marker</th>
<th>Reasons for score</th>
<th>Vulnerability Marker</th>
<th>Reasons for score</th>
<th>Cross-cutting marker</th>
<th>Reasons for score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PH: 08-CEF-072-A-RR. UNICEF: Protection/Human Rights/Rule of Law - $212,768</td>
<td>• Evacuation centers in at least 3 provinces (Maguindanao, ShariffKabungsusuan, North Cotabato) are monitored for separated children. - • 10,000 displaced families are in a safe place and have access to basic services. - • 6,000 displaced girls and boys are participating in group activities and structured play. - • 6,000 displaced girls and boys have resumed their schooling or are attending non-formal, informal or other alternative education or life-skills training. -</td>
<td>Original proposal (5 Sept), final proposal (12 Sept), HC RC application September 2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>there is a disaggregatio n of data according to gender</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>the project concerns support to IDPs families and focuses on girls and boys</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>the project has a protection component as it takes place in conflict affected areas and will be implemented with national and local government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH: 08-CEF-072-B-RR. UNICEF: Water and sanitation - $330,630</td>
<td>• Children, women and their families in evacuation centers have access to safe drinking water and sanitation facilities (safe means of excreta disposal) - • Reduced risk of prevalence of water and excreta related diseases - • Gaps on WASH needs addressed</td>
<td>Original proposal (5 Sept), final proposal (12 Sept), HC RC application September 2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>there is a disaggregatio n of data according to gender</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>the project concerns support to IDPs families and focuses on girls and boys</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>the project has a protection component as it takes place in conflict affected areas and will be implemented with national and local government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH: 06-CEF-332-RR. UNICEF: Shelter and non-food items - $350,000</td>
<td>Distribution of life-saving and critical relief supplies such as blankets, sleeping mats, mosquito nets and plastic sheeting; Prevention of family separation and if necessary identification and support of unaccompanied and separated children, including family tracing mechanisms.</td>
<td>Proposal (1 page)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no mention of gender approach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>there is mention of an approach to avoid children to be separated from their parents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no mention nor linkages with cross-cutting issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH: 09-WFP-062-RR. WFP: Coordination and Support Services - Telecom and Data - $228,000</td>
<td>• Uninterrupted supply of life-saving relief items to the most affected population in the Philippines. - • Emergency relief items requested by the government timely purchased and airlifted. - • Minimum required logistics coordination and information related tools, services and set up available to the humanitarian community. - • Logistics information shared for identification and response to gaps and bottlenecks. - • Logistics Cluster dedicated website to share related information to cover the operation with bulletins, snapshots, meeting minutes, maps and SOPs. - • Availability of inter-agency telecommunications infrastructure and services. - • Cost-effective IT MOSS compliant communication</td>
<td>Original and final proposal (2 oct)</td>
<td>Cs</td>
<td>Common service. Marker scoring not appropriate.</td>
<td>Cs</td>
<td>Common service. Marker scoring not appropriate.</td>
<td>Cs</td>
<td>Common service. Marker scoring not appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Documents available</td>
<td>Gender Marker</td>
<td>Reasons for score</td>
<td>Vulnerability Marker</td>
<td>Reasons for score</td>
<td>Cross-cutting marker</td>
<td>Reasons for score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH: 09-WFP-063-RR. WFP:</td>
<td>Original and final proposal (2 oct)</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Common service. Marker scoring not appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Common service. Marker scoring not appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination and Support</td>
<td>??? to be updated when project is approved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services - UNHAS - $500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH: 08-WFP-097-RR. WFP:</td>
<td>Original proposal (5 sept.) and final proposal (15 sept.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>there is no mention of gender nor indirect reference to it</td>
<td>2b the project targets IDPs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food - $619,448</td>
<td>Urgent minimum food requirements of 139,920 people are met for one month.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH: 08-WHO-060-RR. WHO:</td>
<td>Original proposal (5 sept.) and final proposal (15 sept.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>there is no mention of gender nor indirect reference to it</td>
<td>2a the project targets IDPs and conflict affected people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health - $359,104</td>
<td>Essential health services are made available to 38,000 families living in the evacuation centres and in the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH: 06-WHO-326-RR. WHO:</td>
<td>• Outbreaks of waterborne diseases are prevented and controlled.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health - $357,500</td>
<td>• Further morbidity and mortality are prevented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH: 10-FAO-014-UFE. FAO:</td>
<td>Provision of WHO New Emergency Health Kits and other medical supplies/equipment to supplement essential medicines and health supplies from the Dept. of Health; Ensuring temporary health facilities are provided; including emergency repair of facilities and ensuring services are delivered to the affected communities; Ensuring adequate number of health providers for public health and medical services; Conducting health cluster activities which included field operational activities and information management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture - $210,536</td>
<td>Some 43,500 rural IDPs (7,250 households) improve their food security, nutritional status and income generation by the end of the 2010 wet cropping season, i.e. 750 male corn and rice farmers (cultivating 375 hectares of services in place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Documents available</td>
<td>Gender Marker</td>
<td>Reasons for score</td>
<td>Vulnerability Marker</td>
<td>Reasons for score</td>
<td>Cross-cutting marker</td>
<td>Reasons for score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH: 10-IOM-009-UFE. IOM: Camp Management - $373,568</td>
<td>• Strategy for sustainable return developed and implemented in IDP sites - • • • Referral mechanisms clearly established and socialized in IDP sites, relocation sites and return communities - • • 400 NFI return kits distributed to vulnerable populations leaving IDP sites or IDP families remaining in identified evacuation centres and relocation sites - • • Communication boards established in IDP sites, relocation sites and return communities - • • Camp management structures clearly established in IDP sites - • • Immediate small scale repair of basic facilities in communities of high return - • • Regular gap analysis and protection reports produced and disseminated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>there is no mention of gender apart that figures as beneficiaries</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>the project specifically targets IDPs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>the project is done in partnership with national and local authorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH: 10-FPA-013-UFE. UNFPA: Multi-sector - $147,462</td>
<td>By the end of 2010: - • Reduced maternal and neonatal mortality - • Indicator: Decrease in maternal and neonatal deaths by 10% - • • • Unwanted pregnancies and unplanned families prevented - • Indicator: A 20% increase in new acceptors and continuing users of family planning (FP) - • • Early marriage discouraged and teenage pregnancies prevented - • Indicator: Decrease in the number of original and final proposal, as well as HC RC consolidated request</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>the project targets pregnant, delivering, and post-partum IDP women and adolescent girls</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>the project specifically targets IDPs</td>
<td>2a</td>
<td>the project is done in partnership with national and local authorities and aims to reduce STI/HIV/AIDS transmission as well as to Establishment of community-based mechanisms to prevent and address SGBV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Documents available</td>
<td>Gender Marker</td>
<td>Reasons for score</td>
<td>Vulnerability Marker</td>
<td>Reasons for score</td>
<td>Cross-cutting marker</td>
<td>Reasons for score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH: 10-HCR-016-UFE. UNHCR: Protection/Human Rights/Rule of Law - $101,082</td>
<td>early marriages by 10% - Reduced STI/HIV/AIDS transmission - Indicator: A 20% decrease in the number of syphilis cases among pregnant women - GBV prevented or addressed - Indicators: Number of clusters integrating gender and GBV considerations</td>
<td>original and final proposal, as well as HC RC consolidated request</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>there is no mention of gender apart a general figure as beneficiaries</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>the project targets IDPs and conflict affected people and data on beneficiaries specify children</td>
<td>2a</td>
<td>The project will be done in partnership with DWSD as well as local government units and has a capacity building component enhance skills of staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH: 10-CEF-017-UFE UNICEF: Multi-sector - $788,871</td>
<td>WASH - Major and minor repairs and improvement of existing water and sanitation facilities especially those in highly critical evacuation centres and relocation sites; - Installation of additional shallow-well water pumps across the 15 target sites (generally 3 units/site); - Installation of deep-well water pumps in some 5 house-based settings where installation of shallow-well pumps are virtually impossible because of geographic characteristics; - Construction of additional communal latrines across the 15 target sites (generally 5 units/site, each unit with two bowls); - Provision of maintenance tools for WASH facilities to camp managers and IDP leaders; - Facilitation of advanced public health training for community health volunteers, including barangay health workers,</td>
<td>original and final proposal, as well as HC RC consolidated request</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>there is no mention of gender apart a general figure as beneficiaries</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>the project targets IDPs and conflict affected people and data on beneficiaries specify children</td>
<td>2a</td>
<td>government is receiving a funding from the project and project is implemented in coordination with local authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Documents available</td>
<td>Gender Marker</td>
<td>Reasons for score</td>
<td>Vulnerability Marker</td>
<td>Reasons for score</td>
<td>Cross-cutting marker</td>
<td>Reasons for score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH: 10-WFP-022-LIFE</td>
<td>Recruited and initially trained in the previous two responses to support the conduct of more health and hygiene promotion campaigns at the community level;</td>
<td>original and final proposal, as well as HC RC consolidated request</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2b</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Improved food consumption over assistance period for targeted emergency-affected households; Reduced or stabilized acute malnutrition in children under 5 in targeted, emergency-affected populations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH: 10-WHO-017-LIFE</td>
<td>1. Health facilities are able to provide essential health services according to their level of care - % of health facilities with available essential medicines and medical supplies - % of health facilities reporting any instance of drug stock-outs of 5 sentinel drugs - Number of OPD consultations per site/evacuation center - Number of health human resources provided to referral hospital/s - Number of health facilities or health sites provided with support for their essential water and sanitation requirements - - - - 2. Functioning referral network - Written document on referral network developed disseminated to mobile clinic staff, barangay health centers, NGOs and hospital network - Number of referrals (emergency and non-emergency) made by mobile clinics and barangay health centers to referral hospitals - % of referrals made to hospitals which led to timely and proper management of referred cases at same hospital - - - - 3. Early detection and response to potential disease outbreaks</td>
<td>original and final proposal, as well as HC RC consolidated request</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2b</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP: Food - $713,032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO: Health - $288,552</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WFP: $713,032

- Improved food consumption over assistance period for targeted emergency-affected households; Reduced or stabilized acute malnutrition in children under 5 in targeted, emergency-affected populations

WHO: Health - $288,552

1. Health facilities are able to provide essential health services according to their level of care - % of health facilities with available essential medicines and medical supplies - % of health facilities reporting any instance of drug stock-outs of 5 sentinel drugs - Number of OPD consultations per site/evacuation center - Number of health human resources provided to referral hospital/s - Number of health facilities or health sites provided with support for their essential water and sanitation requirements - - - - 2. Functioning referral network - Written document on referral network developed disseminated to mobile clinic staff, barangay health centers, NGOs and hospital network - Number of referrals (emergency and non-emergency) made by mobile clinics and barangay health centers to referral hospitals - % of referrals made to hospitals which led to timely and proper management of referred cases at same hospital - - - - 3. Early detection and response to potential disease outbreaks

WFP - 022-LIFE

- WFP

- WHO - 017-LIFE

- WHO

- PH - 10-WHO-017-LIFE

- PH - 10-WFP-022-LIFE

- PH

- WFP

- WHO

- PH - 10-WHO-017-LIFE

- PH - 10-WFP-022-LIFE

- PH

- WFP

- WHO

- PH - 10-WHO-017-LIFE

- PH - 10-WFP-022-LIFE
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Good Humanitarian Donorship. (2003). *Principles and Good Practice of Humanitarian Donorship*. Stockholm: Germany, Australia, Belgium, Canada, the European Commission, Denmark, the United States, Finland, France, Ireland, Japan, Luxembourg, Norway, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Sweden and Switzerland. Last viewed on 14 May 2009. URL: http://www.reliefweb.int/ghd/a%20Principles%20EN-GHD19.10.04%20RED.doc

Notes: This one page document presents the 23 principles and good practice of humanitarian donorship. This is sometimes referred to as the Good Humanitarian Donorship Initiative (GHDI). The GHD principles were endorsed in Stockholm, 17 June 2003 by seventeen major donors: Germany, Australia, Belgium, Canada, the European Commission, Denmark, the United States, Finland, France, Ireland, Japan, Luxembourg, Norway, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Sweden and Switzerland. The principles contain a useful definition of Humanitarian Action in Principle 1: The objectives of humanitarian action are to save lives, alleviate suffering and maintain human dignity during and in the aftermath of man-made crises and natural disasters, as well as to prevent and strengthen preparedness for the occurrence of such situations. The principles include three principles defining humanitarian action, seven general principles, four funding principles, six principles on promoting standards, and three principles on learning and accountability.


Notes: Data on natural disasters in the Philippines for the last 30 years. This data on natural disasters is drawn from EM-DAT, the OFDA/CRED International Disaster Database, at the Catholic University of Louvain. The data on the provention website is drawn from data version v11.08. More up to date data is available on the EM-DAT website, but it is not presented as well as on the Provention website.