

www.ifrc.org
Saving lives,
changing minds.

Emergency Plan of Action Final Report

Gambia: Food Insecurity

 International Federation
of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

Emergency Appeal: MDRGM010	Glide number: OT-2015-00021-GMB
Date of Issue: 31 October 2016	Date of disaster: March 2016
Operation start date: 13 May 2015	Operation end date: 13 May 2016
Host National Society: The Gambia Red Cross Society	Operation budget: CHF 1,570,943
Number of people affected: 63,100	Number of people assisted: 49,000 beneficiaries (7,000 households) with immediate needs to 16,800 beneficiaries (2,100 households) and 2,300 pregnant and lactating women and children under two years old at risk of malnutrition in Central River (north) and North Bank (west) regions.
N° of National Societies involved in the operation: 4 (Spanish Red Cross, Canadian Red Cross, Japanese Red Cross, and Monaco Red Cross)	
N° of other partner organizations involved in the operation: National Disaster Management Agency (NDMA), Gambia Bureau of Statistics (GBOS), National Nutrition Agency (NaNA), the Ministry of health through the community health nurses), WFP, UNICEF, FAO	

A. Situation analysis

Description of the disaster

The Food Security crisis 2014-2015, was a regional crisis affecting the Sahel countries including the Gambia. In the Gambia, in November 2015, the Harmonized Framework indicated the serious food security in all the regions, but more in Central River Region (CRR) and North Bank Region (NBR) as a result of this the Gambia Red Cross identified these 2 regions for both the appeal and the ECHO project. In the Gambia 60% of the assessed population remain food insecure, of which 30 per cent are considered moderately' or 'severely' food insecure. In March 2015, 1,100,763 were identified in phase 3 crisis, required immediate food assistance. This figure was projected to increase to 178,012 people in June 2015.

However, the humanitarian actors' in-country, including FAO, WFP, ACF, and Ministry of Agriculture consider the official figures are underestimated. The alarming nutritional status of children under 5 years was due to poverty, poor infant feeding practices, disease burden related to inadequate WASH services, limited knowledge and low awareness of care givers with regards to essential nutritional and hygiene practices were drivers to the worsened condition of people in 2015, with increasing household food insecurity and depletion of livelihoods.

The Gambia Red Cross partook revised Harmonized Framework from October – November 2015, the results indicated serious food insecurity situation. The food security situation remains, as factors with drivers that were making the situation more difficult for farmers to improved food security, such drivers includes, increase in commodity prices, decrease in exchange rate, limited access to basic social services, and the near total absence of relief support to the affected population. According to the 2015 Harmonized Framework for the Gambia, the burden of Moderate Acute Malnutrition (MAM) among children under 5 years has been estimated at 56,839, while Severe Acute Malnutrition (SAM) has been at 10,217 children

between 6-59 months based on the 2013, national population census projections and SMART 2012. The prevalence of malnourished pregnant and lactating women in the reproductive age group (15-49) has been estimated at 45,944.

Malnutrition was identified as a serious issue affecting the regions. The most recent Gambia National Nutrition Surveillance report produced by NaNA in September 2014, reiterated and confirmed 3 regions (Centre River Region, Lower River Region and North Bank Region) as those with the highest prevalence of malnutrition (acute and moderate) - 2 of which North Bank and Central River Regions were targeted in this intervention. Indeed, these 2 regions registered severe acute malnutrition rates that are above the WHO 'serious' threshold at 13.1% in targeted regions.

Summary of response

Overview of Host National Society

Between May and December 2015, Gambia Red Cross Society conducted training of Cash Transfer Programming (CTP) and livelihoods volunteers, targeting and registration of beneficiaries, sensitization of regional and community authorities, sensitization of the community members on nutrition and hygiene promotion, and distribution of cash to 2,100 beneficiaries for three months: October - December 2015.

The operation targeted the most affected regions, that is Central River (North) and North Bank (West). In addition to the geographical targeting, a community-based targeting system using the Household Economic Approach (HEA) was used, classifying households based on their economic status, vulnerability to decreasing food security status based on the number of children under five, health status and age, labor or other income generation opportunities, family status, disability levels, livelihood assets, and the sustainability of their coping mechanisms.



Targeting process with communities of North Bank. GRCS/IFRC

The beneficiary selection took place using participatory methods categorizing the community into three economic groupings (*Very poor, Poor and Better off*) in close coordination between Village Development Committees (VDC), national and regional partners and the GRCS volunteers. National targeting criteria sensitization happened involving all the stakeholders and the communities to target the most vulnerable for the interventions. Beneficiary community committees were formed for transparency and accountability and supported in outlining the demography of each selected families. The beneficiary list was validated with the head of the communities and the final list was developed and shared with the beneficiary communities before the actual cash distribution.

Overview of Red Cross Red Crescent Movement in country

During the implementation of the activities, a significant technical support was provided from IFRC and Spanish Red Cross. The IFRC recruited and deployed an RDRT as well as an operations manager. The Spanish Red Cross provided personnel support during the 1st cash distribution in October 2015 and the development of tools for the implementation of activities in the field. As this crisis is regional one affecting most of the countries of the Sahel Region a regional coordination was in place with the Sahel Regional Office and the Africa Zone DMU, in terms of resource mobilization, technical support and peer to peer support for affected countries and implementation process across the region.



Cash Distribution in CRR region GRCS/IFRC

Overview of non-RCRC actors in country

During the whole process of the project implementation from the pre-targeting process of development of Household Economical Approach (HEA) tools, Training module, Criteria for beneficiary inclusion and exclusion), actual field exercise on targeting, coordination meeting and planning of field activities were all done in synergies with other actors. The beneficiary selection process selection process was done in a, multi-agency teams from the National Disaster Management Agency. The Gambia Red Cross Society (GRCS), National Nutrition Agency and WFP took part in the process of identifying beneficiaries using the adapted criteria for inclusion and exclusion.

Nutrition support activities were done in collaboration with the National Nutrition Agency, Food Technology, the Ministry of Health (MoH), and the National Disaster Management Agency. GRCS collaborated closely with the Food and Technology department and National Nutrition Agency in the training and delivery of cooking demonstrations to pregnant and lactating women and women with children under five years old. The training modules and the food recipes for the cooking demonstration were developed by the Food Technology Department of the Ministry of Agriculture, while the module on nutrition was developed by the National Nutrition Agency (NaNA).

Coordination for referring was established with community health nurses of MoH, to referral all malnutrition cases identified in the programme implementation. Regarding Cash transfer programming, GRCS worked on the Cash Transfer Programme with NDMA, NaNA, WFP and the Gambia Bureau of Statistics (GBoS). This Working Group met monthly to discuss CTP strategy, targeting, and PDM harmonization; GRCS ensured that operation was presented, discussed and coordinated in this key forum. During the project implementation period, each partner institution could head a component base on the comparative advantage and the mandate of the organization.

Needs analysis and scenario planning

The methodology adapted and used were the Harmonized Framework analysis including the data inventory and data analysis considering level of administration and reliability scores as per the harmonized framework manual (6 months for nutrition). The classification was based on the data presented and reviewed by the Technical Working Group (TWG) as well as the contributing factors that have impacted on the food security situation (current and projected). There was consensus building among the technical working group participants on the classification, phasing and estimation of population.

Data for the analysis was mobilized from different institutional sources including National Nutrition Agency (/NaNA), Gambia Bureau of Statistics (GBoS), Agricultural Planning Services Unit (PSU), WFP, Gambia Red Cross Society (GRCS), National Disaster Management Agency (NDMA) Dept. of Livestock Services (DLS), Dept. of Water Resources (DWR), Forestry Department (FOD), and Plant Protection Services (PPS). Most of the data was collected at the national level some with regional disaggregation. Participants in the analysis included representatives of Government, UN agencies and NGOs.

Risk Analysis

The 3 regions selected for the intervention are among the most affected areas in terms of food insecurity and the nutritional problems. The assessment result indicated a substantial loss of income for middle-ranking households - and in turn reduced job opportunities for the poor and very poor. - Expenditures on food sources mainly include local cereal purchases (rice, maize, and millet), oil, sugar, fish and small amounts of other foods as condiments, and these are staples food in the 2 targeted areas; they contribute to over 45% of energy needs of households from all socio-economic groups, and up to 55% for poor households - which demonstrates the very strong dependence of all households on market purchases.

The assessment identified the already precarious situation in both targeted areas, with 32% of households categorized as very poor and 47% as poor according to HEA profiles (based on 2009/2010 data). Existing negative/harmful nutrition and health practices: 72% of the population is located more than 5km away from a health centre with roads in poor condition or impassable terrain, often cut off by rising waters.

Both areas targeted receive little external assistance and faced with ongoing food insecurity villagers are tending to adopt negative or harmful coping strategies in order to meet their basic food needs - for example reduction of purchase of high-protein products such as meat and milk considered as non-essential in place of purchasing cereals, to the detriment of a balanced/appropriate quality diet. Poor and very poor households are also reducing or completely unable to engage in 'non-essential' expenditures on health and education.

B. Operational strategy and plan

This intervention was based on prevention of acute malnutrition and food insecurity through cash transfers, Middle-upper arm circumference (MUAC) screening and referrals, and community sensitization session for most vulnerable households affected by the food insecurity crisis in Gambia's Central River and North Bank Regions. Nutrition support and community sensitization were provided to 30,400 beneficiaries through house-to-house and massive nutrition and hygiene promotion sensitization sessions, cooking demonstrations and community MUAC screenings and referrals of those requiring urgent care.

The projected distribution of fortified foods (PlumpyDoz) to 2,300 pregnant, lactating women and children under-five at risk of malnutrition was cancelled to avoid duplications because the National Nutrition Agency began PlumpyDoz delivery in September. As such, this activity was delivered in form of cooking demonstrations to 3,913 pregnant and lactating mothers and women with children under 5 years.

MUAC screening reached 5,948 children under 5 years old in both districts (Sami and Upper Niumi district) from those 298 cases of malnutrition were referred. All nutrition support activities were done in collaboration with the National Nutrition Agency (NaNA), Food Technology, the Ministry of Health, and the National Disaster Management Agency.

Cash Transfer or Based Programming

Food security support was provided to targeted beneficiaries through cash transfer. The cash transfers activities occurred over a period of 3 months for 2,101 very poor and vulnerable households. The activity reached 31,760 people. Pregnant and lactating women and families with children under 5 years old were included in beneficiaries of cash distribution. Beneficiaries indicated the distribution to be timely when questioned; they also indicated spending cash on food, with remaining funds going towards school fees, debts, and medical costs.

Overall Objective

The overall objective of this intervention was to contribute to mitigating the impact of food insecurity and malnutrition, and to build the community resilience in Central River (north) and North Bank (west) Regions by supporting in the short-term 2,100 households (16,800 persons) plus 2,300 pregnant and lactating women and children under 5 old at risk of malnutrition for 3 months for emergencies, with a twin track approach of medium and long term intervention to 49,000 people.

Proposed strategy

The proposed strategy for the intervention was a multi-donor approach, that initial funding was provided from the IFRC through an Emergency Appeal with a DREF start-up loan. On September 5 2015, an MoU between IFRC and GRCS to carry-out activities was signed in which; the strategy was altered to meet both the appeal and the multi-donor funded ECHO project. For the GRCS to meet the donor's request in aligning the approach of the GRCS with WFP strategy and methodology, the planned cash amount changed from GMD 4,500/family to GMD 3,350/family with an increased targeted beneficiary to 2,100 families for the cash distribution. While the social mobilization component of the operation included the ECHO reaching 30,400. IFRC-Appeal reached 920 families of 2427 beneficiaries with 9,200 bars of soap and 1,840 bottles of detergents was distributed in both CRR and NBR and the GRCS-NaNA as per the contract between the National Nutrition Agency (NaNA) and The Gambia Red Cross Society (GRCS), Lot Quality Assurance and Sampling (LQAS) Survey was carried out in ten communities in CRR implementing the Maternal and Child Nutrition and Health. The table below explains the final result of the action mentioned above.



Beneficiary verification during cash transfer GRCS/ IFRC

Table 1: Total population of people reached during the sensitization on hygiene and nutrition promotion

REACHED POPULATION	NBR	CRR	TOTAL
MALE	3,214	6,997	10,211

FEMALE	3,492	7,881	11,373
TOTAL	14,764	15,636	30,400

Table 2: Total population of people reached during the MUAC screening and the cases referred to community health nurses.

	SAM <11	MAM (11-12,4)	MILD >12,5	GREEN	Total
AUGUST	48	126	260	4,281	4,715
SEPTEMBER	44	110	308	3,921	4,389
OCTOBER	35	98	268	3,251	3,652
NOVEMBER	26	57	232	3,153	3,468
SCREENED CHILDREN	5,948				
SAM CASES	94				
MAM CASES	204				
REFERRED CASES	298				

Immediate interventions:

- Delivery of immediate cash transfer for 2,100 families (16,800 beneficiaries) in Central River (North) and North Bank (West) Regions. Based on market analysis for the region, GMD 3,350 covers 2100kls.
- 3-months of nutritional and hygiene promotion sensitization in communities (approx. 12,750 beneficiaries)
- Community Screening sessions of under-5 years' children (through MUAC) and referral of cases of acute malnutrition were conducted in parallel to nutritional sensitization in collaboration with the Ministry of Health and NaNA.
- Delivery of distribution of enriched foods for 2,300 pregnant, lactating women and children under 5 years old. This activity was later changed to do training of women on cooking demonstration using the locally grown food items for the lactating and pregnant mothers and the children under five.

Medium-term intervention

- In the medium and long-term using the Twin Track Approach, the National Society was geared towards supporting 7,000 households (49,000 people) through:
- Agricultural production: vegetable gardens to 1,000 farmers and community gardens to 5,000 households through 100 gardening women associations with 50 members / each, with the provision of agricultural inputs (seeds, tools, fertilizers and other agriculture materials such as fences or protection materials²) for dry season crops (June – October).
- Livestock production to 1,000 herders through livestock restocking or other livestock inputs distribution (livestock feed, vaccination treatment).
- Rehabilitation of wells for cooperative gardening and trainings in best practices and management (agriculture and livestock best practices, cooperatives management, market basis, destocking basis) to create and strengthen resilience and to build capacity in targeted regions.

Operational support services

Partnership, coordination, Training and additional support services were outlined to improve GRCS personnel knowledge in livelihoods and cash interventions, as well as nutrition and overall hygiene promotion. Over the period of the operation, GRCS has addressed these operational needs to effectively and efficiently implement the operation in the following manner:

- Training of 150 volunteers in hygiene promotion, nutritional sensitization, and cash transfer programming
- Creation of safety and security guidelines for personnel during cash transfer activities
- Development of banners, posters, a Facebook page for community engagement
- Held 1 media briefing (5 sources) and hosted several individual interviews in field for print article publishing
- Conducting an appeal roll-out and planning session and mini lessons learnt sessions with partners to ensure continuous monitoring and improvements can be made to programming

- Successful set-up and targeting of 2,100 households for cash transfer delivery, screening and referred 298 cases of malnutrition to community health nurses(CHN) and 30,400 people reached for nutrition and hygiene promotion sensitization
- Setting up a complaints mechanism during distributions and actively engaging beneficiaries in on-going monitoring process following cash-distributions as well as onsite post distribution monitoring and final post distribution monitoring.

Overall from the planning to the implementation and final lesson learnt session was done in synergy with all the partners mentioned above. The IFRC has also provided technical support through engagement of one RDRT and an Operations Manager deployment. Regional support was delivered via guidance from a cash transfer specialist, a food security and livelihood specialist, a PMER specialist, a Communication specialist, a logistical and finance support.

Human resources (HR)

The GRCS recruited and hired staff and trained volunteers to support the implementation of activities in the field. This staff was consolidated by the IFRC technical support. Below are the human resources recruited to support implementation of the operation.

- Ten GRCS staff for activity support including: 1 Program Manager, 1 Cash-Transfer Specialist, 2 Branch Officers, 2 Nutritional Health Officers, 2 drivers, and 1 Logistics Support
- One hundred (100) volunteers trained in hygiene promotion, nutritional sensitization, and cash transfer programming

Logistics and supply chain

There was no major procurement during the operation, but all the procurements followed the GRCS procurement procedures and standards as well as the Gambia Public Procurement Authority regulations.

Communications

Two (2) press conferences were held. The press conference at the start of the project had 5 media houses present and resulted in 4 print articles. The press conference at the end of the project resulted in 4 newsprint articles outlining results achieved. 1 news interview was conducted in December at the third cash distribution. The article was printed in the Observer on 04 January 2016.

In absence of GRCS website, a Facebook page was created to post pictures of activities as they occurred. This was used regularly. Using pictures, the Facebook page has targeted a younger generation across the country, persons with limited literacy, or those who may not have regular access newsprint.

Ten pictures were posted on the IFRC website as a photo slideshow to demonstrate the ongoing progress and activities and 13-minute documentary was created, summarizing the targeted beneficiaries, community members, governance, pro leaders were included in the video. This video was distributed to partners, donors, and shown during the lessons learned.

Security

Largest security concern remained around personnel safety and security guidelines during cash distribution. Concern was raised with the possibility of hiring of police or military support due to Red Cross no armed mandate this was not accepted. Finally, non-armed security guards were sought for the first distribution but communities identified joint agreement on creating a security net during distribution and secure basic practices were followed (i.e. not sitting behind vehicles, waiting until called, etc.).

Persons responsible for the cash slept in heightened security facilities, ensuring a guard, a gate, and cash in locked box. During the third distribution, Safety and Security practices were formalized for personnel large double lock storage boxes were purchased for maintenance of cash packages, and number of persons counting the cash significantly reduced.

Planning, monitoring, evaluation, & reporting (PMER)

- Household economy baseline survey: An economic baseline was conducted using the household economic approach survey. Following identification of beneficiaries by the communities, these surveys were used to create a baseline and as a verification method of community identification. A total of 256 households were checked by the staff in the post distribution monitoring.

- Onsite Post-distribution monitoring surveys (PDM): Onsite PDMs surveys were conducted at the 2nd and 3rd distribution to monitor activities (cash use and nutrition and hygiene promotion sensitization sessions participation) and distribution process; during the first distribution surveys were focused mainly in distribution process and on accountability and inclusion/exclusion mechanism. Target was around the 10% of beneficiaries. A two person's team was available at the distribution sites to conduct 10-min PDM surveys on every 10th person provided aid.
- End line or final PDM: A final monitoring survey was conducted as end line survey from 18 - 21 January 2016 simultaneously in both regions CRR and NBR. This final PDM reached 256 people out of the 300 people random selected, to monitor impact of project activities (cash use, basic needs accessibility and prices, sensitization participation and application, etc.) as well as to monitor project performance and satisfaction.

Related to internal evaluation and monitoring, we highlight:

- Planning sessions: At the beginning of the implementation of activities 3 planning sessions were held with team members, authorities and partners to inform and to coordinate the project; to put in place internal mechanisms (logistics and financial); and to define/allocate responsibilities among members of the team.
- Activity debriefings and lessons learned seminars. Two debriefings were held with team members following each cash-distribution (1 and 2) to identify weakness/constraints and strengths. These internal meetings provided an opportunity to debrief, focus on improvements, and re-evaluate the methods and practices. Safety and security of personnel and data clean-up of beneficiaries were the primary themes brought forward for improvement.
- Finally, lesson learnt seminar were held in January with IFRC and GRCS members, authorities and partners.
- Supervision and post-training follow-up activities: was conducted at different levels, including monthly supervision by GRCS and IFRC managers, and quarterly supervision missions led by GRCS and IFRC management.
- Progress monitoring: Tracking forms were developed to monitor project support activities directly against implementation. These were created in for the areas of Human resources, Monitoring, and Communication. Direct activity KPIs were tracked directly using the project report.

C. DETAILED OPERATIONAL PLAN

Food Security, Nutrition and Livelihoods

Food Security and Livelihoods			
Outcome 1: 12,600 beneficiaries (1,800 households receive food assistance and basic needs during 3 months through cash transfer (direct cash or vouchers)	Outputs		% of achievement
		Output 1.1: Immediate food and basic needs of 1,800 households (12,600 beneficiaries) are met through cash/vouchers distribution (GMD 4,500 – equivalent to CHF 97) per month per household for 3 months.	
Activities	Is implementation on time?		% progress (estimate)
	Yes (x)	No (x)	
1.1.1 Information for authorities / setting up of targeting committee / awareness session in village assemblies	X		100%
1.1.2 Targeting process, and surveys verification.	X		100%
1.1.3 Establishment of CTP and payment mechanisms processes ³	X		100%

1.1.4 Validation of beneficiary list and establishment of an accountability mechanism (beneficiary communication, feedback systems, etc.)	X		100%
1.1.5 Cash (direct cash or vouchers ⁷ distributions)	X		100%
1.1.6 Shops/Financial entities conciliation and billing			100%
1.1.7 Monitoring and evaluation of the activity	X		100%

Progress towards outcomes

Under this output all the activities were implemented successfully. Details are as follows:

1.1.1 The regional and community authorities were all sensitized. The sensitization includes the regional governors, the district chiefs and the technical advisory committee, the village development committees. The topics discussed were the targeting process the inclusion and exclusion issues, the cash amount per family, the period of support and the distribution process (documentation required to be presented before one could collect the cash, the complaint committees, verification, account and internal audit).

1.1.2 The targeting process was led by the communities using the community structures (VDC, women groups and elderly) to categorize the community into 3 economic statuses (very poor, Poor and Better off) through a focus group discussion. The name of each household head is placed under 1 of the categories identified, the 50 volunteers trained and the national partners deployed for targeting and registration of beneficiaries conducted house to house verification of families identified under very poor category which was the target for support in the Sami and Upper Niimi to ascertain whether the families fulfil the criteria set for selection.

1.1.3 A robust system of payment was established during the cash payment this includes the security and safety rule developed, constituting of 16 complain mechanism at each distribution centre to address all the complaints (inclusion and exclusion errors, documentations, beneficiary coupons with identity details of each beneficiary family was distributed to each household, verification desk verifying all the beneficiaries using the master list, the beneficiary coupons when one is verified, will them move to account for payment and finally internal audit will confirmed the cash with the beneficiary for under or over payment. Complains were booked and the solution reached per complain.

1.1.4 In the 2 regions 50 volunteers were trained on CTP to support food security operation, 2,400 cash coupons were printed and distributed to the beneficiaries, these coupons were used as source of verification during the cash distribution.

1.1.5 All the list of the beneficiaries that were collected during the validation was re-presented to the community authorities for feedback and validating the final list. The validated list was used to develop the master beneficiary list for cross checking of name and identity of beneficiaries during the distribution.

1.1.6 2,100 people received GMD 3,350/family/month for 3 months, October to December; this amount was different from the initial amount of GMD 4,500 in the appeal.

1.1.7 The Secretary General conducted a monitoring visit to assess during the targeting and beneficiary registration.

Lessons learned

From the final post distribution monitoring, 98% of the total household interviewed indicated receiving the GMD 3,350 per month (only one person indicated receiving GMD 3340), and 93% at the time of the survey had already mentioned that they have already spent the money. 16 complain committees were established in each of the distribution centers. The food consumption score was not also assessed during the final post distribution monitoring and therefore not information is collected as such and there is no means of verification of this indicator.

Overall the activities' implementation enjoyed great national and regional partnership, there was synergy built around the food security operation considering the comparative advantage of each partner organization. There were joint planning and implementation of activities with these partners with each partner clear role as in the TORs.

Outcome 2: Medium / longer-term twin track approach, to build community resilience through livelihoods reinforcement to avoid future food crisis to 7,000 households (1,000 farmers + 5,000 cooperative members + 1,000 herders) in targeted regions.	Outputs		% of achievement
		<p>Output 2.1: Appropriate agricultural inputs (seeds, fertilizers and tools) are distributed to 1,000 farmers (7,000 persons) in rural areas with possibility to set up counter season crops.</p> <p>Output 2.2: 100 women cooperatives with at least 50 members/cooperative which equates to 5,000 cooperative members receive adequate agricultural inputs (seeds, fertilizers and tools) and trainings to undertake the vegetable gardening campaign (September-October)</p> <p>Output 2.3: 1,000 herders (7,000 beneficiaries) receive appropriate livestock inputs to reinforce and replace their livestock production.</p>	
Activities	Is implementation on time?		% progress (estimate)
	Yes (x)	No (x)	
2.1.1 Detailed assessment on recovery needs		X	0%
2.1.2 Identification of farmer households on needs about agriculture		X	0%
2.1.3 Distribution of agriculture inputs (of seeds, fertilizers and tools) by volunteers		X	0%
2.1.4 Post distribution monitoring and monitoring and impact analysis		X	0%
2.2.1 Detailed assessment and market analysis on recovery needs		X	0%
2.2.2 Identification of beneficiary cooperatives		X	0%
2.2.3 Agricultural inputs distribution (seeds, tools, fertilizers, and other materials – such as fences or protection materials-) for 100 women groups		X	0%
2.2.4 Support to repair or provide water infrastructure for gardening (e.g. well rehabilitation, drip irrigation system etc.)		X	0%
2.2.5 Beneficiaries training on productive best practices, management, market basis and finance		X	0%
2.2.6 Post distribution monitoring and monitoring and impact analysis		X	0%
2.3.1 Detailed assessment and market analysis on recovery needs		X	0%
2.3.2 Identification of beneficiary		X	0%
2.3.3 Livestock inputs distribution, (livestock feed, vaccination treatment, restocking, etc.), depending on the market and need assessment		X	0%
2.3.4 Beneficiaries training on productive best practices, management, market basis and destocking basis		X	0%
2.2.5 Post distribution monitoring and monitoring and impact analysis		X	0%
Challenges			
No activity implemented as a result of under-funding of the appeal.			

Health & Nutrition			
Outcome 3: To improve the nutritional status of child under 5, pregnant and lactating woman for 1,500 beneficiaries	Outputs		% of achievement
	Output 3.1: Assisting the screening and referral to existing health facilities of child under 5, lactating and pregnant woman at risk of malnutrition until end of lean period (September-October 2015)		100%
Activities	Is implementation on time?		% progress (estimate)
	Yes (x)	No (x)	
3.1.1. Information for authorities / setting up of targeting committee / awareness session in village assemblies	X		100%
3.1.2. Training on malnutrition screening by MUAC and referral and on delivery of messages on nutrition and health	X		100%
3.1.3. Screening of child and women (pregnant and lactating) at risk of malnutrition in targeted communities and referral to existing nutrition/health facilities	X		100%
3.1.4. Community-based surveillance of frequent infant and children diseases from the community to health care facilities		X	100%
Progress towards outcomes			
<p>3.1.1 All the community structures were sensitized about the malnutrition screening and hygiene promotion planned to be conducted in the communities by the 100 trained GRCS volunteers.</p> <p>3.1.2 Training completed on MUAC malnutrition screening and on delivery of messages on nutrition and health</p> <p>3.1.3 / 3.1.4 Screening activities were conducted during the ongoing nutritional and hygiene promotion sensitization. This included pregnant and lactating women and children. Those in need were referred to existing nutrition/health facilities through the National Nutritional Agency where they were provided plumpy nut when needed. Follow-up was completed upon their release.</p>			
Output 3.2: Distributing enriched food to 1,500 children under 5, lactating and pregnant women in targeted regions to prevent malnutrition at this vulnerable targets for 3 months			90%
3.2.1. Identification of populations targeted by the activity (PLW, under 5 years' children) resulting from very poor households targeted by the project		X	100%
3.2.2. Fortified food for distributions (3 distributions)		X	0 %
3.2.3. Performing social mobilization activities regarding main cause of malnutrition, best practices about nutrition and their proper use (ways of improving family diets using available resources, specific food needs for sick and other vulnerable people, optimum Breastfeeding practices)	X		100 %
3.2.4. Monitoring and evaluation of the activity		X	100%
Progress towards outcomes			

Under this component, the social mobilization of the operation reaching 30,400. The IFRC-Appeal supported 920 families of 2427 beneficiaries with 9,200 bars of soap and 1,840 bottles of detergents distributed in both CRR and NBR and the GRCS-NaNA as per the contract between the National Nutrition Agency (NaNA) and The Gambia Red Cross Society (GRCS), Lot Quality Assurance and Sampling (LQAS) Survey was carried out in ten communities in CRR implementing the Maternal and Child Nutrition and Health. A total 298 malnourished children were linked with the CHNs at various referral health facilities in the 2 regions for treatment

Lessons learned

Documentation was a challenge, under this component, different standard and forms were used in field to collect data on the sensitization, as such analysis of the result collected from the field was difficult. To harmonize these results, both the data collected was processed and punched in.

Challenges

There has not been distribution of fortified food which is a result of under-funding of the appeal.

Outcome 4: Increase the access to safer water and the promotion in good hygienic practices among 30 most vulnerable communities in the targeted regions	Outputs		% of achievement
		Output 4.1: 7,000 beneficiaries (1'000 households) reached through hygiene promotion	
Activities	Is implementation on time?		% progress (estimate)
	Yes (x)	No (x)	
3.4.1. Workshop to elaborate and adapt sensitization material			
3.4.2. Community sensitization on main hygiene practices and distribution of soap, aqua tabs and any other disinfectant materials			
3.4.3. Monitoring and evaluation of the activity			
Progress towards outcomes			
No progress has been reported.			

Disaster Preparedness and Risk Reduction			
Outcome 5: Improve NS capacity on community, branch and national level in preparation, risk reduction and response to future crisis	Outputs		% of achievement
		Output 5.1: The capacity of staff and volunteers (10 staff and 100 volunteers) are built on food & nutrition security, livelihoods and cash transfer proگرامing and on better information collection and operational efficiency in targeted regions	
Activities	Is implementation on time?		% progress (estimate)
	Yes (x)	No (x)	
5.1.1. NDRT Food Security/CTP refresher	X		100%

5.1.2. Training and Capacity Building in Livelihoods and Cash Programming among the staff and volunteers	X		100%
5.1.3. Volunteers operational training in nutrition awareness and WASH	X		100%
5.1.4. Deployment of food security RDRT, a CTP delegate and a HES delegate for training and capacity building in CTP, FS and Livelihoods	X		100%
Progress towards outcomes			
<p>5.1.1 / 5.1.2 / 5.1.3 - The IFRC, the British and the Senegalese Red Cross Societies supported in the training of 50 Red Cross volunteers, staff and partners on capacity building in livelihoods and cash programming in October 2015 in Dakar. 50 volunteers were trained on Food Security, Livelihoods and Cash programming (beneficiary identification, assessment, vouchers/cash distribution, in-kind distribution, hygiene promotion, monitoring, and deployed during targeting, beneficiary identification, registration, rapid assessment and field data collection and analysis.</p> <p>5.1.5. IFRC supported the NS in the Deployment of a Regional Disaster Response Team (RDRT) delegate to support the operation for 2 months. CTP and HES were also deployed to support during the targeting phase and available to provide technical assistance remotely.</p> <p>The Food Security, CTP and Targeting training was held from two days in NBR and two days in CRR. After the sessions participants had a clear understanding of Cash Transfer programming (modalities of cash distribution such as voucher, mobile phone cash transfer or direct cash transfer; risk and security analysis to implement a CTP; and feasibility analysis -including market analysis); Targeting and data collection (targeting modalities and process; inclusion and exclusion errors, common errors); and basics of Food Security and Livelihoods.</p>			

Areas common to all sectors			
Outcome 6: The quality of the operation is ensured and documented by participatory in-depth needs assessments and accountability measures.	Outputs		% of achievement
		Output 6.1: The management of the operation is informed by a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation system which will enhance branch capacity to report on the operations.	
Activities	Is implementation on time?		% progress (estimate)
	Yes (x)	No (x)	
6.1 Coordination and engagement with key stakeholders (NDMA, MOA, MoH, Community leaders, INGOs, Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, UN Agencies and funding agencies).	X		100%
6.2 Joint monitoring of operations by GRCS & IFRC	X		100%
6.3 Preparation of the FS & Resilience Media Campaign	X		100%
6.4 Conduct lesson learned workshop with targeted branches and HQ staff.		X	100%
6.5 Beneficiary communication for all livelihood activities			100%
6.6 Evaluation of assistance impact in supported households (related to all livelihoods activities)	X		100%
6.7 Volunteer Insurance	X		100%

6.8 Activity and Response Monitoring			100%
6.9 Coordination within the Regional Strategic Framework			100%
Progress towards outcomes			
<p>6.1 GRC held four stakeholders meeting with partners (NDMA, GBOS, NaNA, WFP): planning the training, conducting targeting and beneficiary's assessment, validation of the beneficiary list, cash distribution and monitoring. These beneficiaries are also actively engaged in the lessons learn session is planed with these partners and shall be implemented in January.</p> <p>6.2 IFRC promoted a coherent and unified response in this operation by facilitating coordination activities for the Movement – primarily with the Gambian Red Cross, in the management of bilateral and multilateral support from Partner National Societies including the British Red Cross, Japanese Red Cross and Senegalese Red Cross. The IFRC Sahel Regional Office has provided support to the Gambian Red Cross through the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) and provision of DREF funds.</p> <p>6.3 Media campaign was held at the start of the operation. Media campaign with print article and social media has continued.</p> <p>6.4 Lessons learnt sessions occur with partners once returning from the field. These ensure ongoing monitoring and improvements to activities.</p> <p>6.5/6.6. The assessment attempted to identify the livelihood activities, other sources of household income, vulnerability and coping strategy adapted in each of the households. The results revealed that farming and in particular rice and groundnut cultivation was the predominant activity in the two districts. The assessment checklist focused on the types of livelihood, household size, and length of time harvests last, average number of livestock per household, vulnerability.</p> <p>6.7 Volunteer insurance was purchased for November – December 2015 and then again for 2016. This covered 100 hygiene promotion and nutritional sensitization volunteers.</p>			

Budget

Refer to the attached budget.

Budget Variance: There is a variance in the budget because appeal related activities such as Cash disbursement and distribution and monitoring have contributed in the co-funding of ECHO project in the Gambia with a budget revised from Euros 600,000 to Euros 660,000 leading to an amount of 40,885.60 Swiss francs. Budget lines like storage and Information and public relations have been underestimated.

Contact Information

For further information, specifically related to this operation please contact:

In the Gambia Red Cross Society

- Fatou Gaye, Secretary General (a.i); phone: +220393 68 13 email: fbgaye@hotmail.com

IFRC Sahel Country cluster

- Anne Leclerc, Head of cluster Dakar; phone: +221 33 869 36 30; email: anne.leclerc@ifrc.org

IFRC Geneva

- Cristina Estrada, DCPRR unit Geneva; phone: +41 22 730 45 29; email: christine.south@ifrc.org

IFRC Africa Region

- Farid Aiywar, Head of DCPRR unit for Africa; Nairobi; phone: +254 731 067 489; email: daniel.bolanos@ifrc.org
- Farid Abdulkadir Aiywar, Head of Disaster Management Unit, Africa region; Phone: + 254 731 067 489; email: farid.aiywar@ifrc.org

For Resource Mobilization and Pledges:

- Fidelis Kangethe, Partnerships and Resource Mobilization Coordinator; Nairobi; phone: +254 731 984 117; email: fidelis.kangethe@ifrc.org

For Performance and Accountability (planning, monitoring, evaluation and reporting):

- Penny ELGHADY, Acting PMER Coordinator; phone: +254 731 067277; email: penny.elghady@ifrc.org

How we work

All IFRC assistance seeks to adhere to the Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in Disaster Relief and the Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Response (Sphere) in delivering assistance to the most vulnerable.

The IFRC's vision is to inspire, encourage, facilitate and promote at all times all forms of humanitarian activities by National Societies, with a view to preventing and alleviating human suffering, and thereby contributing to the maintenance and promotion of human dignity and peace in the world.

The IFRC's work is guided by Strategy 2020 which puts forward three strategic aims:

1. Save lives, protect livelihoods, and strengthen recovery from disaster and crises.
2. Enable healthy and safe living.
3. Promote social inclusion and a culture of non-violence and peace.

www.ifrc.org
Saving lives, changing minds.



Disaster Response Financial Report

MDRGM010 - Gambia - Food Insecurity

Timeframe: 13 May 15 to 13 May 16

Appeal Launch Date: 13 May 15

Final Report

Selected Parameters

Reporting Timeframe	2015/5-2017/12	Programme	MDRGM010
Budget Timeframe	2015/5-2016/5	Budget	APPROVED
Split by funding source	Y	Project	*
Subsector:	*		

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

I. Funding

	Raise humanitarian standards	Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people	Strengthen RC/RC contribution to development	Heighten influence and support for RC/RC work	Joint working and accountability	TOTAL	Deferred Income
A. Budget		1,570,943				1,570,943	
B. Opening Balance							
Income							
Cash contributions							
<i>Japanese Red Cross Society</i>		51,800				51,800	
<i>Red Cross of Monaco</i>		10,610				10,610	
<i>The Canadian Red Cross Society (from Canadian Government*)</i>		48,294				48,294	
C1. Cash contributions		110,703				110,703	
Other Income							
<i>DREF Allocations</i>		117,125				117,125	
C4. Other Income		117,125				117,125	
C. Total Income = SUM(C1..C4)		227,828				227,828	
D. Total Funding = B + C		227,828				227,828	

* Funding source data based on information provided by the donor

II. Movement of Funds

	Raise humanitarian standards	Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people	Strengthen RC/RC contribution to development	Heighten influence and support for RC/RC work	Joint working and accountability	TOTAL	Deferred Income
B. Opening Balance							
C. Income		227,828				227,828	
E. Expenditure		-239,973				-239,973	
F. Closing Balance = (B + C + E)		-12,145				-12,145	

Disaster Response Financial Report

MDRGM010 - Gambia - Food Insecurity

Timeframe: 13 May 15 to 13 May 16

Appeal Launch Date: 13 May 15

Final Report

Selected Parameters

Reporting Timeframe	2015/5-2017/12	Programme	MDRGM010
Budget Timeframe	2015/5-2016/5	Budget	APPROVED
Split by funding source	Y	Project	*
Subsector:	*		

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

III. Expenditure

Account Groups	Budget	Expenditure					TOTAL	Variance
		Raise humanitarian standards	Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people	Strengthen RC/RC contribution to development	Heighten influence and support for RC/RC work	Joint working and accountability		
	A					B	A - B	
BUDGET (C)			1,570,943			1,570,943		
Relief items, Construction, Supplies								
Food	27,000		12,245			12,245	14,755	
Seeds & Plants	135,000						135,000	
Water, Sanitation & Hygiene	18,887		11,694			11,694	7,193	
Teaching Materials	11,250						11,250	
Utensils & Tools	40,000						40,000	
Other Supplies & Services	132,000						132,000	
Cash Disbursement	523,800						523,800	
Total Relief items, Construction, Sup	887,937		23,938			23,938	863,999	
Logistics, Transport & Storage								
Storage	6,000		9,966			9,966	-3,966	
Distribution & Monitoring	32,500		26,507			26,507	5,993	
Transport & Vehicles Costs	53,720		20,698			20,698	33,022	
Total Logistics, Transport & Storage	92,220		57,171			57,171	35,049	
Personnel								
International Staff	168,000		10,627			10,627	157,373	
National Staff	18,800		20			20	18,780	
National Society Staff	98,236		34,034			34,034	64,202	
Volunteers	36,410		35,344			35,344	1,066	
Total Personnel	321,446		80,024			80,024	241,422	
Workshops & Training								
Workshops & Training	62,750		37,048			37,048	25,702	
Total Workshops & Training	62,750		37,048			37,048	25,702	
General Expenditure								
Travel	27,151		4,760			4,760	22,390	
Information & Public Relations	7,000		8,602			8,602	-1,602	
Office Costs	25,500		5,379			5,379	20,121	
Communications	12,000		1,691			1,691	10,309	
Financial Charges	15,000		6,453			6,453	8,547	
Other General Expenses			0			0	0	
Shared Office and Services Costs	24,060						24,060	
Total General Expenditure	110,711		26,885			26,885	83,826	
Indirect Costs								
Programme & Services Support Recove	95,879		14,629			14,629	81,250	
Total Indirect Costs	95,879		14,629			14,629	81,250	
Pledge Specific Costs								
Pledge Earmarking Fee			77			77	-77	
Pledge Reporting Fees			200			200	-200	
Total Pledge Specific Costs			277			277	-277	
TOTAL EXPENDITURE (D)	1,570,943		239,973			239,973	1,330,970	
VARIANCE (C - D)			1,330,970			1,330,970		

Disaster Response Financial Report**MDRGM010 - Gambia - Food Insecurity**

Timeframe: 13 May 15 to 13 May 16

Appeal Launch Date: 13 May 15

Final Report

Selected Parameters

Reporting Timeframe	2015/5-2017/12	Programme	MDRGM010
Budget Timeframe	2015/5-2016/5	Budget	APPROVED
Split by funding source	Y	Project	*
Subsector:	*		

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

IV. Breakdown by subsector

Business Line / Sub-sector	Budget	Opening Balance	Income	Funding	Expenditure	Closing Balance	Deferred Income
BL2 - Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people							
Food security	1,570,943		227,828	227,828	239,973	-12,145	
Subtotal BL2	1,570,943		227,828	227,828	239,973	-12,145	
GRAND TOTAL	1,570,943		227,828	227,828	239,973	-12,145	