

www.ifrc.org
Saving lives,
changing minds.

Emergency Plan of Action Final Report

Africa Regional Coordination: Food Crisis



Emergency Appeal	Operation n° MDR60003;
Date of Issue: 08 July 2019	Glide number:
Date of disaster: April 2017	
Operation start date: 19/04/2017	Operation end date: 22 months and end date: 19/12/2018
Host National Society	Operation budget: CHF 2,010,476
Number of people affected:	Number of people assisted: 2,020,936
Project manager: Khaled Masud Ahmed, overall responsible for planning, implementing, reporting and compliances	
Red Cross Red Crescent Movement partners currently actively involved in the operation: American Red Cross, Austrian Red Cross, Belgian Red Cross, British Red Cross, Danish Red Cross, Canadian Red Cross, Finnish Red Cross, German Red Cross, Icelandic Red Cross, Iran Red Crescent, Society, Luxemburg Red Cross, Netherlands Red Cross, Norwegian Red Cross, Swiss Red Cross, Spanish Red Cross, and ICRC.	
N° of other partner organizations involved in the operation: In many of the countries under the umbrella of the regional appeal, the IFRC has ongoing programmes with the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • World Food Program (WFP) operates in Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Puntland, and Zimbabwe in the areas of Livelihoods and Food Security and in Water, Sanitation and Hygiene. • Care International is partnering in Mozambique, Somalia (Somaliland), and Zimbabwe in the areas of Livelihoods and Food Security and in Water, Sanitation and Hygiene. • UNICEF is present in Kenya, Malawi and Somalia (Puntland) supporting Water, Sanitation and Hygiene programmes. • Other partners such as the Norwegian Refugee Council, FAO, Save the Children, Oxfam, IRC, Caritas are also partnering with National Societies in the region. 	

A. SITUATION ANALYSIS

Description of the disaster

More than anywhere in the world, the African continent is prone to the recurrence of food insecurity situations. In 2011, a severe drought across the entire East Africa region caused a massive food crisis in countries such as Somalia, Ethiopia and Kenya, threatening the livelihoods of almost 10 million people. It was the first time in a generation that the United Nations was declaring a famine in the region. Looking back at the measures then taken, it appears that humanitarian interventions arrived too late and with a lack of longer-term vision. It is to prevent a situation like the one of 2011 that the IFRC launched a regional Emergency Appeal in April 2017 to support and scale-up actions in the countries that are most affected by the recent food crisis in Sub-Saharan Africa. The regional Emergency Appeal also aimed at promoting community-driven sustainable resilience of crisis-affected people to cope with cyclical food insecurity. This final report provides a brief overview of their key achievements, successes, challenges and lessons learned over the past year.

Summary of response

The regional coordination Emergency Appeal has supported 15 emergency operations, including 10 Emergency Appeals and 5 DREFs. The latter were aiming overall at meeting the needs of approximately two million people in 14 countries, including five countries of focus: Ethiopia, Kenya, Nigeria, Somalia and South-Sudan. The map below provides a snapshot of individual operations.

Responding to food insecurity across Africa

Number of people targeted under IFRC appeals and DREFs



Regional Coordination



14 Operations Supported
to support food crisis operations
across the region



82 Delegates Deployed
to support food crisis operations
across the region



The table below summarizes the different operation launched under the regional food crisis:

Country / Operation code	Appeal (CHF)	Targeted beneficiaries	Start date	End date
Burkina-Faso (DREF) (MDRBF014)	189,679	8,452	18 Aug 17	18 Nov 17
Chad (DREF) (MDRTD015)	233,017	12,350	11 Aug 17	11 Nov 17
Ethiopia (MDRET016)	13,686,550	318,325	4 Jan 16	4 Jan 18
Kenya (MDRKE039)	25,062,572	1,033,300	23 Nov 16	28 Feb 19
Malawi (MDRMW012)	3,590,677	22,474	17 Sept 15	31 July 17
Mauritania (MDRMR009)	1,693,785	138,000	24 May 18	24 Feb 19
Mozambique (MDRMZ012)	1,702,895	21,762	22 Apr 16	31 May 17
Namibia (MDRNA009)	1,303,196	16,500	30 Sept 15	30 Sept 17
Niger (DREF) (MDRNE019)	261,041	13,130	25 Aug 17	01 Oct 17
Nigeria (MDRNG022)	10,415,433	300,000	28 Apr 17	31 Dec 18
Senegal (DREF) (MDRSN015)	207,880	9,893	11 Aug 17	11 Nov 17
Somalia (MDRSO005)	10,491,893	150,000	25 Mar 16	31 Dec 18
South Sudan (MDRSS006)	4,163,171	282,000	8 July 17	31 Dec 18
Zimbabwe (MDRZW011)	5,181,321	38,330	14 Sept 15	31 May 17
Regional Food Crisis Africa (MDR60003)	2,010,476	2,020,936	19 Apr 17	31 Dec 18

Funding partners

The Regional Appeal has been generously supported financially by the Australian Red Cross, the British Red Cross, the Danish Red Cross, the Red Cross of Monaco, the Swedish Red Cross, the Canadian Red Cross Society, the Netherlands Red Cross, the Government of Canada, the Netherlands Government and the Ramboll Group A/S.

B. Country wise and regional achievements

In Countries:

- Ethiopia: 5,000 goats distributed to 1,000 vulnerable families; 5,459 pregnant and lactating women and children under five received a six-month supply of food in two regions; 24,447 people reached through hygiene promotion and community latrines construction.
- Kenya: KRCS reached a total of 1,415,812 people representing 103% of the 1,373,294-targeted population. The increased number of people reached is mainly due to additional interventions carried out by KRCS in partnership with county governments for instance in Kitui county where KRCS partnered with the county government to drill 36 boreholes. Some 77,812 people were reached with in-kind food distribution to 342,000 people; 401,000 people supported through the livestock destocking programme; and 252,000 benefitted from emergency cash transfers.
- Nigeria: 7,065 received emergency cash; 115,337 reached through water and sanitation activities; 1,5 million people informed on life-saving techniques through a Red cross dedicated radio programme. Some 308,000 people received health messaging; 400,000 have improved access to health care through rehabilitation of facilities; 90 mothers' clubs have been formed and mothers and children have been supported with health and nutrition; 34,000 people benefited from access to clean water; 1,500 families have received seeds to improve food production and livelihood opportunities; and 17 disaster-resistant model houses have been built by trained community masons to help internally displaced people and returnees.
- Somalia: 14,787 people have access to water through aqua tabs distribution, rehabilitation of berkedes and wells. Some 525,889 people received regular medical treatment; 400 household latrines were constructed, and 1,470 households received unconditional cash.
- South Sudan: 30,000 people received emergency shelter and households' kit, 400 volunteers trained on community-based health and first aid, water and sanitation and psychosocial support, 70 staff and volunteers trained on rapid assessment through mobile phone; 138,000 people with access to safe drinking water supply through recovery approach; 5,000 households supported with essential vegetable seeds and tools; 10,000 households reached with essential non-food items (NFIs). Some 11,200 people reached with PSS and SGBV community-based intervention delivered through awareness sessions facilitated to community leaders and women groups in the target operational area.

Individual countries reports are available on ifrc.org

At regional level:

The regional food crisis coordination team established relevant coordination mechanisms by chairing weekly Joint Task Force (JTF) meetings until February 2019. These meetings were an opportunity for the IFRC operations teams at country level to share situational analysis and operational updates with the Regional office and teams in Geneva. Timely and context-specific (surge) support to country operations was also provided through the diversity of technical profiles represented within the regional coordination team that has ensured highly relevant and timely support to country operation teams, in line with their most urgent context-specific needs and gaps. Targeted capacity-building efforts involving material investments and adapted trainings was provided to build National Society capacity to respond to (recurring) food crises. A strong focus on resilience and community ownership was maintained by providing technical guidance to IFRC Country Offices, Country Cluster Support Teams and National Societies on integrating a longer-term community resilience perspective into food crisis operations.

The IFRC regional office for Africa also ensured the consolidating of reports using operational data and monitoring information.

To reinforce the overall technical expertise and capacity related to food crisis preparedness and response in the Africa region, the regional food crisis coordination team has co-organized regular cross-context learning exercises.

SUMMARY OF MAIN IFRC APPEALS¹, Response Plans and DREFs

Country	Appeal Budget (CHF)	Coverage ² (%)	Funding Gap (CHF)	Targeted beneficiaries	Implementation on funding received	Start date	End date
Ethiopia (MDRET016)	6,108,307	54%	2,786,072	250,591	70%	28 Dec 15	31 Dec 18
Kenya (MDRKE039)	29,686,126	16%	21,824,617	1,373,294	98%	23 Nov 16	28 Feb 19
Nigeria (MDRNG022)	9,870,473	74%	2,570,473	300,000	103%	28 Apr 17	1 Oct 18
Somalia (MDRSO005)	10,491,893	76%	2,488,460	352,800	55%	25 Mar 16	30 Jun 18
South Sudan (MDRSS006)	4,700,037	75%	1,169,235	251,910	38%	8 July 17	31 Dec 18
Mauritania (MDRMR009)	1,693,785	50%	847,892	17,400	99%	24 May 18	24 Feb 19
Regional Food Crisis Africa³ (MDR6003)	2,010,476	67%	662,738	2,020,936	98%	19 Apr 17	19 Dec 18

¹ [Appeal funding figures, updated to publication, do not capture bilateral contributions supporting implementation of the plans – available details in this regard are provided in the country-by-country section.](#)

² The response plans for Nigeria and South Sudan are rolled out in two phases, the first one until end of December 2017 and the second one from 2018 on. Nigeria's IFRC response plan for 2017 is funded under the One International Appeal launched by the ICRC, For South Sudan, the 2017 response plan is covered through the ICRC 2017 South Sudan Appeal. The Funding for the IFRC operations in 2017 is channelled through the ICRC. Both countries are therefore 100 percent secured for 2017.

For more detail on funding see [Donor's Response](#).

C. DETAILED ACHIEVEMENTS

Individual countries reports are available on ifrc.org.

Some of the final reports (Nigeria, Ethiopia and Mauritania) are still under review and shall be posted once approved.

For Mauritania, operation has ended, and final report being prepared. Last operations update could be found [here](#)

The operations in West Africa and Sahel were all completed in the first year of the food crisis intervention.

West Africa/SAHEL (Burkina Faso, Niger, Chad, Senegal - DREFs)
Start Date: August 2017
End date: November 2017
Cumulative Targeted beneficiaries: 53,575 people
Cumulative Total amount: CHF 1,095,684

Narrative description of achievements
Operations' Highlights: The DREF's operations for Senegal (MDRSN015), Chad (MDRTD015) and Mauritania (MDRMR008), Burkina Faso (MDRBF014) and Niger (MDRNE019) are now completed. As a reminder, the five DREFs had been launched for a cumulative amount of CHF 1,097,684 and approximately 53,575 people. The responses comprised the following components: Cash Transfer Programming, Health, Water, sanitation and Hygiene promotion as well as Capacity-building of the National Societies and communities. Before closing activities, all countries conducted, in coordination, a Food security's multisectoral in-depth assessment to instruct a joint regional longer-term programming being developed within a resilience perspective to address the recurrent food security issues in a longer-term manner. A Sahel Food Security DREF Review, commissioned by the Geneva DREF team and the Africa Region Office, was conducted in Sahel from 16 February to 8 March 2018. The review mission ran from 16 to 24 February in Senegal, 25 February to 3 March in Chad and 4 to 8 March in Nairobi. The report was submitted on 22 March. The DREF review team was mandated to evaluate mainly two of the five DREF operations carried out following the following objectives: Assess the effectiveness, impact and achievements of operations in Senegal and Chad, in relation to the objectives and results set by the action plan; Determine the main challenges and successes in launching and implementing DREF operations, including operational and support aspects (finance, HR, logistics; Establish lessons learned based on the challenges and successes of the operations, in order to formulate recommendations for future DREF operations, Emergency Appeals (EA) or other relevant programmes of African National Societies in general, and those of the National Societies concerned in particular; Evaluate the relevance of the "DREF" tool for prolonged crises and propose improvements and adjustments to this tool. The analysis and recommendations of the report submitted took into account the findings of the lessons' learned workshop that was held in Dakar last December.
Challenges
None reported
Lessons Learned
None reported

Regional Coordination Food Crisis Appeal Support

Regional coordination Food Crisis in Africa (MDR6003)
Start Date: 19 April 2017
End date: 31 December 2018
Total amount: CHF 2,010,476



Regional Coordination:

A total of 03 amendment were done to accommodate changes in the field activities and adaptation with needs. An external lesson learned review was conducted early November 2018 to help capture the main lessons learned from the IFRC response to the food crisis in Africa in 2017/2018, with key stakeholders involved in NSs and within the IFRC, including at the country, cluster, regional and HQ levels. The overall purpose of this review was to analyze how IFRC could improve its interventions and regional coordination

to respond more effectively to food crises in Africa in the future. The review focused on both (1) the accomplishments, challenges and lessons learned of IFRC's food crisis operations at country level, and (2) the value added of regional coordination and how it could be improved if used again in 2019 and beyond or what alternative tools or mechanisms could be more appropriate. Ultimately, the results from this review, which builds on findings from previous lessons learned reviews for specific food crisis operations, will inform a revised IFRC Africa strategy for responding to food insecurity in Africa. The regional food crisis coordination appeal ended late 2018, and it was therefore important to identify how the Africa regional office can ensure efficient strategic oversight, coordination and technical support to ongoing or forthcoming food crisis operations in Africa in 2019 and beyond, while effectively mainstreaming a resilience approach.

Emergency Appeal Operations Update Regional Coordination: Food Crisis

Narrative description of achievements

Main Highlights:

- The regional appeal aims at ensuring that the response to the food crises in Africa is effectively managed and coordinated beyond the country level, focusing on five key objectives:
 - Provide strategic oversight, enhanced leadership at the regional level and ensure support to operations
 - Promote approaches which increase households and community resilience and build sustainable solutions to food insecurity.
 - Facilitate and encourage regional learning and peer-to-peer support.
 - Support the collection, consolidation and effective use of monitoring and data and information.
 - Strengthen and scale up community engagement and accountability approaches and activities.

Among Supporting activities:

- ❖ Secondary data analysis products were developed for [South Sudan](#) and [Somalia](#)
- ❖ An Information Management mission to Nigeria was conducted in February 2018 in order to support IFRC and the Nigerian Red Cross Society (NRCS) to integrate Information Management in the Nigeria Complex Crisis in the North-East operation 2018. The mission focused on delivering an information management workshop for staff, taking participants through the basics of information management, its process, and role and responsibilities. The workshop also helped in identifying key elements of an information management strategy for the operation. In addition, a filing system was set up for the operation to strengthen information sharing and collaboration.
- ❖ An Information Management mission to Hargeisa, Somaliland was conducted in March 2018 to support mapping of Movement partner activities, and to strengthen dashboard and data analysis approaches.
- ❖ Together with IM colleagues from Geneva, various Information Management capacity building activities were organized in the IFRC Regional Office, including data literacy and data visualization trainings. A two-day data skills workshop was organized on 7-8 March with colleagues from OCHA's Humanitarian Data Exchange (HDX) platform in Nairobi. The workshop is aimed at data leads and champions from humanitarian organizations working on humanitarian action in East and Southern Africa and had as main objective to strengthen knowledge on data and sharing. Participants from 20 (international) organizations participated, including IFRC colleagues from the Regional Office and Burundi Red Cross. More information can be found on [Twitter](#) as well as this blog post "[Know your data, be a champion](#)".
- A Sahel Food Security DREF Review, commissioned by the Geneva DREF team and the Africa Region Office, was conducted in Sahel from 16 February to 8 March, 2018. The review mission ran from 16 to 24 February in Senegal, 25 February to 3 March in Chad and 4 to 8 March in Nairobi. The report was submitted on 22 March. The DREF review team was mandated to evaluate mainly two of the five DREF operations carried out following the following objectives: Assess the effectiveness, impact and achievements of operations in Senegal and Chad, in relation to the objectives and results set by the action plan; Determine the main challenges and successes in launching and implementing DREF operations, including operational and support aspects (finance, HR, logistics; Establish lessons learned based on the challenges and successes of the operations, in order to formulate recommendations for future DREF operations, Emergency Appeals (EA) or other relevant programmes of African National Societies in general, and those of the National Societies concerned in particular; Evaluate the relevance of the "DREF" tool for prolonged crises and propose improvements and adjustments to this tool. The analysis and recommendations of the report submitted took into account the findings of the lessons' learned workshop that was held in Dakar last December.

- ❖ A guidance note with practical tips on Post-Distribution Monitoring (PDM) was developed for African National Societies that are interested in designing and implementing PDMs with a strong focus on Community Engagement and Accountability (CEA). It is based on the lessons learned from the PDM that took place in Aweil East, South Sudan, in February 2018 where a PDM process was undertaken. In Aweil East, 21 branch volunteers in Aweil were first trained on communication skills and on mobile data collection (Kobo Toolbox). These volunteers then conducted surveys with 334 households to assess the communities' satisfaction, for example with the selection process and the quality of the items. The results from this PDM will be used to adjust and improve the South Sudan emergency operation in 2018. A guidance note, including the complete PDM questionnaire was produced.
- ❖ Together with the Kenya Red Cross (KRCS), an IFRC delegation visited KRCS projects in Kilifi county and Tana River county to create a video about the impact of mainstreaming CEA on Kenyan communities and on KRCS field staff/volunteers. The IFRC team interviewed drought-affected communities who have participated in KRCS' interventions, for example the cash transfer program and the livestock destocking activities. The video will support the launch of the new research report on Accountability to Communities by CDA Collaborative Learning Projects, which can be found [here](#).
- ❖ Following a three-day CEA training in Burao, Somaliland, in January 2018, a systematic checklist with minimum CEA actions was developed with the Somali Red Crescent Society (SRCS) You can find the [checklist](#) in annex. Although it was developed as guidance for the SRCS branches in Somaliland, it could be useful for other National Societies to adapt this checklist to their specific context and to use it to strengthen CEA.
- ❖ In close cooperation with the Canadian Red Cross, the Ethiopian Red Cross (ERCS) was supported with their efforts to strengthen CEA in their drought operations. A two-day CEA workshop with ERCS and CRC was organized in March 2018 to design and prepare their after-Action Review in Wolayta. A similar two-day workshop is planned for April 2018 to discuss the results from this review and to develop a joint action plan with ERCS, IFRC and CRC on how to scale up CEA activities and approaches within ERCS' emergency operations.
- ❖ A Brown Bag session on Common Mistakes in CEA was held in the Nairobi Regional office on the 19 March. Around 35 people attended the session to discuss five key CEA mistakes many humanitarian organizations make, informed by community consultations in countries such as Somalia and South Sudan.
- ❖ The IFRC Africa CEA team is co-organizing an inter-agency Communication and Community Engagement conference with UN OCHA and UNICEF. The event will take place in Nairobi, Kenya, from May 29th to May 31st, 2018. The conference will focus on key learning in relation to mainstreaming CEA and examples of where agencies have worked successfully together. IFRC will be supporting National Societies to attend the conference.
- ❖ Between 26 January and 24 February, a mission was conducted in Nigeria to review the Cash Transfer Programme implemented in Adamawa and Yobe to improve effectiveness of future CTP activities.
- ❖ Several videos, photos and stories covering the South Sudan activities of the Government of Japan project and the health programme with Canadian Red Cross were developed. These were capitalized on internationally recognized days such as World Water Day, World Women's Day and World Health Day. During the mission in South Sudan, the SSRC communications unit was supported in enhancing their skills in photography and videography in the field.
- ❖ An Instagram takeover with the Kenya Red Cross through the IFRC's global account, showcasing the drought response was coordinated. Several stories were since drafted that are being used on the global IFRC website, social channels and reporting.
- ❖ ICRC and the Nigerian Red Cross were coordinated to **develop a ["one Red Cross" response animation](#)**. It is hoped that similar animations can be used for country operations and the regional food crisis appeal.
- ❖ A regional content plan and infrastructure was set up to improve coordination and strategic digital communication with National Societies and across the Red Cross movement. This is updated weekly and shared across Africa Red Cross networks.
- ❖ More than 83 tools have been developed for the food crisis since September 2017
- ❖ 41,000 mentions linked to Red Cross and Food Crisis from January 2017 to December 2018. 1.6 million people reached through social media platforms on food crisis related content from September 2017 to March 2018.

Challenges

- ❖ There was delay in the start of the operations hence it led to hurried implementation and failure of the Federation to undertake National Society Development (in the implementation period August – December 2017)
- ❖ With the donor (ICRC) restriction in geographical coverage and response options, communities accused the National Society of bias as well as offering them non-priority assistance
- ❖ Low capacity of the National Societies to access hard-to reach areas led to reduction in geographical coverage and number of people reached by the interventions. Such can be perceived as bias and is damaging the National Society credibility as responder of first choice in disaster
- ❖ The long targeting tools prolonged periods of beneficiary selection
- ❖ Serious security problems at the border between Oromia and Somali regions of Babile woreda jeopardize the operation for 2 months
- ❖ Frequent turnover of government higher officials, especially of conflict induced areas of Somali & Oromia region created a communication gap
- ❖ Revision of the operational plan of conducting water tracking created dissatisfaction among the community (e.g. Afar, Kuri district)
- ❖ Delay in budget transfer and budget settlement from the concerned bodies affected the performance of the implementation
- ❖ The changeover in Government administration in Somaliland has impacted on the speed at which SRCS is able to obtain customs clearance and tax exemption for cargo clearing and transport of relief items into Puntland. As noted previously, the change-over in administration means the SRCS must develop new relationships with the incoming Government. IFRC Hargeisa is currently in negotiation with WFP regarding the re-shipment of cargo in Berbera to Bosasso in Puntland
- ❖ A key development in January was the military confrontation between Somaliland and Puntland in the disputed territories in Sool and Sanaag which both Governments claim. This confrontation was prompted by the stated intention of the President of FRG in Mogadishu to visit territory in Sool accompanied by representatives of the Puntland administration. Military forces of Somaliland attacked and took control of territory previously controlled by Puntland. The Somaliland administration immediately began to reinforce its control of the area and at other points along the line of control (Sool and Sanaag) On the 13th of January the Government of Puntland declared war on Somaliland. In response the Government of Somaliland stated that it has no intention of attacking Puntland but will defend its territory which it defines as up the point of the colonially established border. The initial military operation has caused displacement of civilians within Sool. To date there have been ongoing low-level exchanges of artillery and gun fire between the opposing armies. As a result of this, the planned distribution of WASH/NFIs has been put on hold pending an assessment of the situation.
- ❖ Logistics – rain from July to November made overland transportation routes impossible to bypass. Flying supplies to hard-to-reach areas was the only possibility.
- ❖ For the second year in a row in 2017, South Sudan was ranked as the most dangerous context for humanitarian workers in the world, having reported the highest frequency of attacks on aid staffers. The operations had to be adaptable to the changing security environment in the areas of implementation. This posed challenges to planning.
- ❖ The SSRC is a young national society that is still working on enhancing its capacity, systems and infrastructure.

Lessons Learned

- ❖ Development of more detailed needs assessment shall enable IFRC and the National Societies respond to differential needs of males, females and persons with disabilities in disaster. ICRC should learn to listen and take advice/feedback from National Society (SSRC) which is evidence based like the needs assessment which highlighted what beneficiary required in South Sudan. While beneficiaries' priority need was food, the Federation and National Society provided them with NFI. Other reason which contributed to the aforementioned situation was ICRC driven- the SSRC implemented ICRC chosen response options.
- ❖ To respond to food crisis promptly, the process of approval of Emergency Appeals should be fast-tracked by seeking and obtaining feedback on the Appeal documents from Cluster office, Regional office and Geneva simultaneously. The approval process of the Appeals took on average two

months in all the countries under review. This resulted in delays in remitting funds to start the implementation process in all the five countries under review.

- ❖ To comprehensively address the needs of community in food crisis, all the essential components of emergency interventions (WASH, Food security and livelihood, Health and Nutrition) should be implemented in all areas targeted. Assumption of complementarity of service may turn back as failure by National Societies to provide integrated response that addresses food security needs of communities in Emergency comprehensively.
- ❖ Capacity Strengthening of RDRTs and volunteers equip them with skills that would enable them to function effectively to assist in a disaster situation and understand the issues and challenges faced by the population affected during such times.
- ❖ In circumstance where inputs are unavailable to the National Societies, it is good practice to coordinate with other humanitarian agencies working in the same area of operations to obtain inputs to realize desired outcome. For example, Mauritania Red Crescent screened children for malnutrition and those who were diagnosed with SAM/MAM got referred for care at a facility resourced by WFP and Oxfam in Brakna. In Niger, the Society collaborated with UNICEF and WFP which provided nutritional food to Loga health facility to care for the children diagnosed with SAM/MAM.
- ❖ IFRC should strengthen coordination with ICRC in high risk places/ Complex Emergencies to be able to deliver lifesaving Emergency relief items or services to most vulnerable households in such (hard-to reach and insecure) places.
- ❖ Engaging the community in operations be it in beneficiary selection, monitoring and evaluation is essential to increase by-in/ownership of the operation.
- ❖ Beneficiary committees are very important for community engagement and in obtaining feedback from beneficiaries
- ❖ Humanitarian cluster coordination meetings are important in avoiding duplication (3Ws table) and planning response with the hope of obtaining complementarity of service from actions of other humanitarian actors in the target areas
- ❖ The Harmonized Framework (Cadre Harmonize) provides information which can be used as a basis or evidence for need for intervention. But NS still needs to undertake needs analysis to inform response options and estimate the number affected in target areas in terms of gender and marginalization
- ❖ In cases where IFRC is not able to meet the priority needs, for instance due to financial constraints, donor (ICRC) conditionality, the National Society needs to explain to communities why Federation is not able to deliver certain services and identify other solutions together.
- ❖ Media, particularly radio reaches masses and is important means of reaching communities which are constantly on the move/migratory.
- ❖ Secondary data, at times is unreliable particularly in areas where there are competing interests among development agencies. The National Society had difficulty in obtaining statistics on the number of persons affected by food crisis in the target areas, and the relevant authorities were hesitant to release the figures to the National Society.
- ❖ In view of the short duration of DREFs, more focus should be on the key sectors and which NS already has competencies/ human resource capacity. The multi-sectoral approach would be feasible only when conditions permit;
- ❖ Identify the best targeting option (household or individual approach) for Cash initiatives depending on the local context;
- ❖ Provide in food security DREF operations, more initiatives focused on strengthening and protecting the livelihoods of food insecure households (IGAs, small ruminants, mothers' club approach, etc.).
- ❖ Improved planning, taking into account the types of activities and requesting necessary timeframe extensions in a timely manner to enable smooth implementation.
- ❖ A comprehensive contingency plan is key to facilitating an effective emergency response;
- ❖ Consensus-based, accurate and timely Early Warning assessments (IPC) which are communicated are crucial in order to achieve an effective and coordinated response
- ❖ A sense of job security to staff can ensure staff retention which will enable more learning particularly of staff from young and lean National Societies as well as those weak in thematic areas of food crisis response.
- ❖ Logistics is an integral part of Emergency response which the Federation should offer more support in, particularly for young and lean National Societies and those which are working in

communities in hard-to reach and insecure areas. The support should envisage market intelligence, fleet, procurement and warehouse management.

- ❖ Prepositioning enables National Societies to be responders of first choice in emergencies. It also increases visibility of both IFRC and National Society.
- ❖ Capacity building of the National Society staff in thematic areas of response improves the level of efficiency and implementation rate of emergency response options. This was clear from all the National Societies which received support from Regional food crisis team.
- ❖ Resource mobilization for slow onset or protracted crisis requires significant investment in communication and Partnership and Resource Development. This is particularly so when recurrent food crisis has not caused deaths to bring the disaster to world or donor attention. In any future response, having a large communication s department as well as Partnership and Resource Development capacity for food crisis situation and good communication tools would be helpful.
- ❖ To increase impact and sustainability of the Regional Coordination Appeal, it is important to recruit staff with long-term contracts both at regional and country levels. This will ensure that staff can provide meaningful and complete contributions for the Federation's interventions to remain high quality throughout the entire operations.
- ❖ Contingency planning and flexible timelines would help to operate effectively in complex emergencies (South Sudan, Nigeria, and Somalia). Detailed Risk assessments and contingency plans are crucial in such situations to prepare the operations team for varied scenarios.
- ❖ IFRC staffing is still donor driven. The food crisis coordination team suffered from short-term contracts and constant pressure to mobilize additional resources to extend contracts of important team members. There is a need for a better HR strategy, with long-term contracts for key staff positions in the regional DCPRR team (e.g. Food security and Livelihoods, CTP, PMER and IM). It is through Regional Coordination Appeal that the PMER unit at the Federation Office was launched which has been useful in the development of operations updates and reports.
- ❖ Even though traditional donors of the RC/RC movement are comfortable with funding Appeals which directly benefits communities affected by food crisis, the fact that the Regional Coordination Appeal still attracted funding showed that the PNS believed in the potential of the mechanism in complementing and supporting country food crisis operations.
- ❖ Given the scope of the Food Crisis Team, the delegates did not to spend ample time with the country offices, cluster and National Societies to strengthen the capacity of operations personnel through learning-by doing. The delegates were few compared to the scope and therefore they could not adequately support and complement Emergency Appeals. Another challenge faced by the Food Crisis Team was inadequate support from IFRC support services department to Food Crisis delegates (i.e. recruitment support was lacking, DSA took 3 months to be provided to delegates in NBO).
- ❖ Food security and livelihoods expertise should be mandatory in the Food Crisis Team if IFRC wants to position itself as a credible emergency response and resilience building coordination partner within the movement and with external partners. Food security should be embedded as a permanent position in the regular structure of the Federation at the Regional Office.
- ❖ In cases the Federation needs to mobilize financial resources more than the amount it can raise from its own internal Mechanisms (DREF) to respond promptly to emergency/ disaster, One International Appeal mechanism would suffice/ serve the purpose, particularly in Complex Emergencies such as South Sudan, Somalia and Nigeria. The Federation required slightly over 4Million Swiss Francs which was way over and above the limit (1 million CHF) of it's in own facility (DREF) it utilizes to enable National Societies respond to emergencies promptly.
- ❖ The Federation's rush to implement emergency response activities within ICRC's Fiscal/financial year is against its aspirations of National Society Development. The back and forth between the Federation and ICRC over the money reimbursed / returned to ICRC causes delay in implementation and damages the credibility of the Federation as emergency response coordination partners within the movement.
- ❖ National Societies and the Federation are able to indirectly address food security needs of displaced community through provision of non-food items. The NFI support enabled displaced

population to save personal income which they would have otherwise used to purchase the NFIs, for food.

- ❖ To enter into similar arrangement/mechanism in future, the Federation needs to be strong both financially and programmatically/ IFRC cannot afford to be subservient to ICRC, both financially and programmatically in future joint response.

Coordination and working with partners

RCRC Movement

One of the key trends driving the humanitarian sector is the high expectations for improved coordination among partners. To facilitate this, it is vital for the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement to ensure excellent internal coordination as well. As an inherent role of the IFRC Regional Office, it is dedicated in facilitating the coordination of actions for all RCRC partners. It remains one of the core reasons for launching the Africa Food Crisis Coordination Appeal.

Under this appeal, efforts have been exerted to ensure adequate coordination at field, regional and headquarter levels, as well as between them, both from a strategic and operational perspective. Innovative approaches are being used within this current overall food crisis response, such as in the case of the operations in Nigeria and South Sudan, where the One International Appeal modality is in effect, where ICRC and IFRC joined efforts in a deliberate way and are working together in promoting a One Movement approach to the crisis.

In South Sudan

The Response Plan (RP) is the product of continued Strengthening Movement Coordination and Cooperation (SMCC) initiatives and is representative of the new cooperative operating model of the Movement. Partners from across the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement have been integral to the design of this Response Plan since its inception and, as such, are jointly committed to ensuring its success. The IFRC Africa Regional Office has been instrumental in leading this venture early in the response and is now continuing to support the process. At country level, the IFRC has taken the role to facilitate and enhance coordination among Movement partners (SSRC, ICRC, IFRC and PNS). This is being coordinated through the mechanisms of the Movement Platform and other coordination meetings, to discuss and take decision on the response strategy and approaches, security and access, and communications.

²⁰ IFRC in Africa: Road Map 2017 – 2020. Guiding principle 5: “A commitment to measurable results. The IFRC in Africa will hold itself accountable to demonstrate a change in capacity within at least 35 National Societies by 2020.”

For the case of Nigeria

The improved coordination between the Nigeria Red Cross Society, ICRC, Partner National Societies and IFRC can be illustrated by many examples. As such, specific geographical areas of implementation have been designated early in the initial phase of the response, where IFRC and ICRC operate, to promote a complementarity approach. During this period, IFRC supported the coordination of surge deployment to scale-up the response and facilitated the deployment of a multitude of staff and delegates, including some of its Global Tools (FACT, RDRT, ERU, HEOps). Regarding security management, ICRC is responsible to maintain a security umbrella for all Red Cross Red Crescent teams operating in the north east of the country, where the context is highly volatile. To sustain a good level of coordination, regular coordination meetings between ICRC and IFRC are being held to ensure strategies remain aligned and knowledge and resources are being utilized efficiently.

As the coordination team focusing on the food crisis constitute an integral part of the **IFRC Africa Regional Office**, the individual members report to their own departments. They act more like focal points, or technical representative, rather than constitute an actual unit detached from the structure. This facilitate the integration of the work of the team and ensures sustainability within the regional office. One of the roles of the team is supporting and enhancing coordination and partnership between the different stakeholders from the Movement.

Regional situational reports and communications material have been developed to showcase situation evolvment's analysis, progress in operations, best practices, successes, challenges and lessons learned across operations in the region, in close collaboration with PMER at country and regional level. Focusing on priority countries (Kenya, Ethiopia, Nigeria, South Sudan and Somalia), several tools have been packaged and shared with partners, current and prospective donors, national societies, media and other external audiences, including factsheets, key messages, one-page operation updates, among others. Communications tools links in [annex 2](#).

Global and regional IFRC social media and the IFRC's [audio-visual resources database](#) (AV) platform have been crucial to sharing and disseminating information with the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement on the food crisis appeals taking place across the region. This includes several PNSs using and repacking content from communications missions (Canadian, Swedish and Australian). Communications has also helped develop resource mobilization tools that have been shared at the Africa donor advisory group (A-DAG) and other partnership meetings. This has helped garner more funding where resource gaps exist.

The mechanism utilized to fund operation in Somalia, Nigeria and South Sudan did not take the conventional arrangement in One International Appeal. The Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement Partners utilized this mechanism to mobilize resources to respond to food crisis in Complex Emergencies in Africa. In this mechanism coordination was such that:

- ❖ Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement Partners operated under one Movement Response Plan
- ❖ The Federation and National Societies in Complex Emergencies operated in more secure environment, ICRC responded to vulnerable households in highly insecure areas of the countries affected by food crisis
- ❖ ICRC launches and raises the profile of the Appeal.

To Strengthen Movement Coordination and Cooperation, **the South Sudan RC (SSRC)** role in Complex Emergencies was operations while the Federation's role was coordination. Coordination in One International Appeal mechanism is facilitated by the Steering Committee. The committee is composed of two members from the National Society, ICRC and IFRC. The committee ensures key programmatic issues are in place for effective implementation of the Movement Plan. The programmatic issues which the committee put in place include: Adequate volunteer base for smooth implementation of key components of operations and community engagement; availability of adequate technical capacity for the operations as needed; Negotiations of flexibility on utilization of funds from ICRC by Federation and National Society (SSRC) to expand their geographical coverage in case of other disasters in Complex Emergency.

One International Appeal mechanism had areas of success including: Readily available funds to finance the Emergency operations given the strong financial background of ICRC; the Federation and South Sudan Red Cross demonstrated capacity and ability to spend the funds transferred in time and with 100% rate of implementation; the mechanism improved credibility of the Federation to both the National Society and ICRC;.

National Society of South Sudan was able to indirectly address food needs of the communities targeted. The NFI support enabled displaced population to save personal income which they would have otherwise used to purchase NFIs, for food.

Unfortunately, the Federation had to return some of the money donated to support the food crisis operation in South Sudan and Nigeria. The reason for the aforementioned situation was because the Federation's Fiscal/Financial year and that of ICRC are not compatible. While ICRC fiscal year begins in January and end in December of the same year, that of the Federation extends to March of the subsequent year. This then meant that any money the Federation had not spent of the total amount received from ICRC in the financial period was to be returned to ICRC. In addition, the Transfer of subsequent tranches was tied to proof of expenditure of **cash in advance** and capacity of the National Society to spend.

The Movement Response Plan was emergency centered yet the National Society was responding to protracted crisis. There was no feedback mechanism particularly on issues which were addressed by the technical committee (composed of technical committees of Health, WASH and Disaster Management of SSRC) of the coordination. Lastly, no feedback was solicited or taken from the National Society by the implementing partners (ICRC) on the response options and coverage.

Recommendations

- ❖ The human resources in Regional Coordination Appeal can indeed improve efficacy in emergency operations. It is therefore important the Food Crisis team specialists (e.g. FSL, CTP, PMER and IM) be integrated into the regular structure of the Federation at Regional level while at country level, the Federation can deploy generalist(delegates with knowledge and competencies in all thematic areas) to technical support and complement National Society in future food crisis response.
- ❖ The Federation should consider more support to National Societies in the Sahel to strengthen their capacity to respond adequately and promptly to future food crisis in the regions. This can be done by placing technical delegates in thematic areas of response in at cluster, country offices to provide leadership and management of response.
- ❖ The Federation should ensure integration of long-term community resilience perspective to reduce effects of recurrent food crisis in Africa. The Federation should continue promoting the utilization of Global framework for community Resilience and encourage replication of Southern Africa Resilience plan by Sahel National Societies and Movement Partners. The approaches will strengthen community capacity to prepare for, respond to and recover from environmental, social and economic disasters and shocks.
- ❖ New tools such as DOP/OP needs to be vetted and when found appropriate should be adopted for longer term programing. Emergency Appeals needs to be adopted to accommodate longer-term resilience Actions which would foster governance at community level, risk assessment, risk management through building community assets, improving knowledge and education of the communities against risks
- ❖ Cash in advance system: The cash in advance system ensures proper accountability of the amount of money requested from IFRC by National Societies. IFRC should consider increasing the advance to cover a minimum period of three months for EA operations, to reduce the burden of documentation on the part of the National Societies during accountability. Suspending further cash advances as cases of misappropriation are investigated, delays the implementation of the Emergency Appeal actions. Other ways of dealing with such cases include asking the National Societies to use their reserves which would be reimbursed less the amount the investigation shall reveal was misappropriated can be employed.
- ❖ Food Security and Resilience delegate to assist IFRC country offices, cluster support team and National Societies to develop strategies and funding proposals for longer term holistic interventions such as potential resilience program for Lake Chad Basin. In addition, Operations Coordinator dedicated to the food crisis in Africa must continue organizing regular joint and bilateral meetings with field operations; country clusters regional and global stakeholders to ensure adequate coordination between the fields, regional and headquarters level. These meetings should be focused on strategic aspects such as effective resource mobilization for recurring disasters related to food insecurity, as well as operational aspects such as mitigating security risks to the Movement teams.

- ❖ The Federation should utilize the results from scenario-based planning which mapped-out food security, health and global trends in East, West Africa and Sahel Clusters. For each country which was affected by food crisis, there are recommended short-terms (1-3months) and medium term (3-6months) response priorities as well as documented Organizational needs of the National Societies for prompt action by the Federation.
- ❖ The Federation should continue to make use of the existing skills within African National Societies in supporting their colleagues in the future food crisis or disasters. More RDRTs should be trained for quick deployments to food crisis operations in the future. Such RDRTs have the potentials to provide leadership and management in operations just like the six RDRTs who were trained and immediately deployed to support five DREF Food Security operations in Sahel.

D. THE BUDGET

The final financial report is annexed to this report

Contact information

Reference documents



Click here for:

- Previous Appeals and updates
- Emergency Plan of Action (EPoA)

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

In the IFRC

- **IFRC Regional Office:** Adesh Tripathee, Head of DCPRR Unit; phone: +254 202 835 000; email: adesh.tripathee@ifrc.org
- **IFRC Regional Office** Khaled Masud Ahmed, Regional Operations Coordinator khaled.masud@ifrc.org; phone; Mob +254 (0) 731 067 286, email:

In IFRC Geneva

- **IFRC Geneva:** Ruben Romero, Acting Lead Response & Recovery, DCPRR; phone: +41 79 703 8807; email: ruben.romero@ifrc.org

For IFRC Resource Mobilization and Pledges support:

- **IFRC Regional Office Francisah Cherotich Kilel**, Partnerships and Resource Development Coordinator, Nairobi; phone: +254 714 026 299; email: kentaro.nagazumi@ifrc.org

For In-Kind donations and Mobilization table support:

- **IFRC Regional Office:** Rishi Ramrakha, **Logistics Coordinator**; phone: +254 733 888 022; fax: +254 20 271 2777; email: rishi.ramrakha@ifrc.org,

For Performance and Accountability support (planning, monitoring, evaluation and reporting enquiries)

- **IFRC Africa Region:** Francis Salako, PMER Delegate Food Crisis; phone: +254 780 771 136; email: francis.salako@ifrc.org
- **Fiona Gatere:** PMER coordinator PMER Coordinator; email: fiona.gatere@ifrc.org; phone: +254 780 771 139

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 (NGO's) 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.

www.ifrc.org

Saving lives, changing minds.



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

Emergency Appeal

FINAL FINANCIAL REPORT

Selected Parameters			
Reporting Timeframe	2017/04-2019/05	Operation	MDR60003
Budget Timeframe	2017/04-2018/12	Budget	APPROVED

Prepared on 24 Jun 2019

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

MDR60003 - Regional Coordination Food Crisis in Africa

Operating Timeframe: 19 Apr 2017 to 31 Dec 2018; appeal launch date: 19 Apr 2017

I. Emergency Appeal Funding Requirements

Thematic Area Code	Requirements CHF
AOF1 - Disaster risk reduction	0
AOF2 - Shelter	0
AOF3 - Livelihoods and basic needs	0
AOF4 - Health	0
AOF5 - Water, sanitation and hygiene	0
AOF6 - Protection, Gender & Inclusion	0
AOF7 - Migration	0
SF11 - Strengthen National Societies	0
SF12 - Effective international disaster management	1,948,706
SF13 - Influence others as leading strategic partners	53,250
SF14 - Ensure a strong IFRC	8,520
Total Funding Requirements	2,010,476
Donor Response* as per 24 Jun 2019	1,436,332
Appeal Coverage	71.44%

II. IFRC Operating Budget Implementation

Thematic Area Code	Budget	Expenditure	Variance
AOF1 - Disaster risk reduction	0	0	0
AOF2 - Shelter	585	585	0
AOF3 - Livelihoods and basic needs	0	10,174	-10,174
AOF4 - Health	16	16	0
AOF5 - Water, sanitation and hygiene	0	332	-332
AOF6 - Protection, Gender & Inclusion	0	0	0
AOF7 - Migration	0	0	0
SF11 - Strengthen National Societies	2,485	5,462	-2,977
SF12 - Effective international disaster management	1,402,766	1,404,264	-1,498
SF13 - Influence others as leading strategic partners	0	0	0
SF14 - Ensure a strong IFRC	0	61	-61
Grand Total	1,405,852	1,420,895	-15,043

III. Operating Movement & Closing Balance per 2019/05

Opening Balance	0
Income (includes outstanding DREF Loan per IV.)	1,434,938
Expenditure	-1,420,895
Closing Balance	14,043
Deferred Income	0
Funds Available	14,043

IV. DREF Loan

* not included in Donor Response	Loan :	Reimbursed :	Outstanding :
----------------------------------	--------	--------------	----------------------

Emergency Appeal

FINAL FINANCIAL REPORT

Selected Parameters			
Reporting Timeframe	2017/04-2019/05	Operation	MDR60003
Budget Timeframe	2017/04-2018/12	Budget	APPROVED

Prepared on 24 Jun 2019

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

MDR60003 - Regional Coordination Food Crisis in Africa

Operating Timeframe: 19 Apr 2017 to 31 Dec 2018; appeal launch date: 19 Apr 2017

V. Contributions by Donor and Other Income

Opening Balance							0
Income Type	Cash	InKind Goods	InKind Personnel	Other Income	TOTAL	Deferred Income	
Australian Red Cross	26,873		26,265		53,138		
British Red Cross	98,386				98,386		
Danish Red Cross			67,256		67,256		
Ramboll Group A/S	61,823				61,823		
Red Cross of Monaco	23,324				23,324		
Swedish Red Cross	293,754				293,754		
The Canadian Red Cross Society			206,973		206,973		
The Canadian Red Cross Society (from Canadian Gov	163,801				163,801		
The Netherlands Red Cross	50,331		17,161		67,492		
The Netherlands Red Cross (from Netherlands Govern	398,992				398,992		
Total Contributions and Other Income	1,117,283	0	317,655	0	1,434,938	0	
Total Income and Deferred Income					1,434,938	0	