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

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

1. This country report examines the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF)’s contribution in response to the crisis in El Salvador following Tropical Storm Ida in 2008. It is one of 16 case studies conducted to inform the 5-year Evaluation of the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF). Mandated by the UN General Assembly, the 5-year Evaluation of the CERF is managed by OCHA’s evaluation section (ESG), and conducted by Channel Research.

The CERF

2. The Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) is a US$ 500 million fund established to support rapid response and address critical humanitarian needs in underfunded emergencies. The CERF is managed by the UN’s Under Secretary General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC), and supported by a secretariat and by other branches of the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA).

Methodology

Document review

3. The team reviewed all 10 proposals for funding submitted to the CERF from El Salvador. The team also analysed data from the CERF Secretariat, the CERF Website, and the UN’s Financial Tracking Service (FTS) to establish the pattern for CERF use and examine differences between CERF allocations for El Salvador and the other 78 CERF recipients\(^1\). All the documents used are outlined in the bibliography in Annex 7.

4. The team examined applications for funding (see Annex V)) submitted to the CERF Secretariat by the country, and the extent to which the proposals paid attention to gender, vulnerability, and cross cutting issues, using the gender and vulnerability markers\(^2\).

Interviews

5. Interviews were conducted by teleconference with senior management staff in El Salvador, staff in OCHA Regional Office and Panama, and staff in the CERF Secretariat.

---

\(^1\) Please note that the team defined the year of the grant based on the disbursement date rather than the approval date (which the CERF secretariat uses as reference). This was done to facilitate comparison with other funding.

\(^2\) The gender markers were piloted in 2010 and were not launched officially until 2011 after the CERF evaluation period was concluded. Even though the CERF application template was only revised in 2010 in order to obtain this type of information, the evaluation team has used the markers as a framework for analytical purpose. The vulnerability marker was designed by Channel for this evaluation.
**Constraints**

6. The evaluation team had a limited amount of documentation to draw from for this case study. This was largely due to the fact that only one CERF allocation is covered by this particular country report.

**Analysis**

7. The analysis for this study employed the CERF’s Performance and Accountability Framework (PAF), which defines a set of indicators at each level according to a logic model approach as a means of clarifying accountability and performance expectations around a core set of agree CERF outputs, outcomes and impacts.³

**Reporting**

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

**Key definitions**

9. The case study is concerned with assessing the following⁴:

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

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

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

---

³ OCHA, Performance and Accountability Framework for the Central Emergency Response Fund (OCHA, August 2010)

⁴ These criteria are defined by Beck, T. (2006); Evaluating humanitarian action using the OECD/DAC criteria for humanitarian agencies: An ALNAP guide for humanitarian agencies. (Overseas Development Institute: London, March 2006)
Overview

10. The report is structured as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Humanitarian context

11. El Salvador is prone to both earthquakes and hurricanes. The country’s history includes numerous catastrophes, such as the Great Hurricane of 1780 that killed 22,000 in Central America, and the earthquakes in 1854 and 1917 that devastated El Salvador and destroyed most of the capital city. More recently, an earthquake in October 1986 killed 1,400 people and seriously damaged the nation’s infrastructure. In 1998, Hurricane Mitch killed 10,000 in the region, although El Salvador suffered less than Honduras and Nicaragua. Major earthquakes in January and February of 2001 took another 1,000 lives and left thousands more homeless and jobless. El Salvador’s largest volcano, Santa Ana (also known as Ilimatepec) erupted in October 2005, killing two people and permanently displacing 5,000. Meanwhile, also in October 2005, Hurricane Stan caused flooding which caused 67 deaths and temporarily displaced more than 50,000 people. Damages from the storm were estimated at US$ 355.6 million, and crop losses were estimated to have caused food insecurity for approximately 160,000 people.

Tropical Storm Ida

12. In November 2008, rains from Tropical Storm Ida caused flooding and mudslides that killed at least 199 people and left extensive property damage in the departments of Cuscatlan, La Paz, San Vicente, and San Salvador. At this time, El Salvador made its first request to the CERF; however, it could not be met due to lack of CERF funds at the central level.

13. In November 2009, El Salvador again suffered severe flooding and landslides, caused by the combined effects of Hurricane Ida and unprecedented heavy rainfall (355mm in a few hours, compared to 400mm in 4 days during Hurricane Mitch). An estimated 20,000 homes were damaged or destroyed completely and more than 250 persons were killed. In total more than 120,000 people were affected and around 15,000 people fled to emergency shelters during the first weeks. This included approximately 25,000 children and around 20,000 women of reproductive age.

14. Access to the affected areas was severely hampered as the country sustained heavy infrastructure damage and many roads were blocked because of the landslides.

---

5 The Office of Electronic Information, Bureau of Public Affairs, US State Department, http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/2033.htm
6 Ibid.
7 Report of the Secretary-General on CERF, August 2010.
The provision of basic services to affected communities was disrupted because of damage to the electricity, water and sanitation infrastructure.\textsuperscript{11}

15. On 8 November 2009, the President declared a national state of emergency. On 10 November, the Permanent Mission of El Salvador to the UN Office in Geneva officially requested international assistance through the CERF.\textsuperscript{12}

\textit{Request to CERF}

16. El Salvador received CERF funding in 2009 for US$ 2,485,827 under the Rapid Response (RR) window. The full UN Flash Appeal for El Salvador was for some US$ 12.9 million. While the original application for CERF was for some US$ 3.5 million, OCHA explained that CERF generally supports some 10 per cent of Flash Appeals and requested a revision of the application to some US$ 2.5 million. Eventually, the UN Flash Appeal in El Salvador was able to raise a total of US$ 6.7 million, and the CERF contribution proved substantial for El Salvador, representing some 37 per cent of the total funds raised but the United Nations for this emergency.\textsuperscript{13,14}

17. In addition to funding for the UN appeal and the CERF funding, El Salvador received bilateral and donor direct funding (implemented by NGOs) worth US$ 15.9 million for the crisis. Thus, CERF funding represented 16 per cent of all funding received for the crisis.\textsuperscript{15}

18. Of the total CERF funding received, US$ 1,896,248 was used directly by UN agencies/IOM and US$ 589,579 was forwarded to NGOs for implementation.\textsuperscript{16}

19. The Figure below shows the distribution of CERF by agency.

\textsuperscript{11} A post-disaster needs assessment, \textit{CERF El Salvador, Annual Report of the Resident/Humanitarian Coordinator, 2009}, suggested that total damages and losses amounted to around US$240 million, representing 1.1\% of GNP

\textsuperscript{12} El Salvador Flash Appeal, 2009.

\textsuperscript{13} Financial Tracking System (FTS) of OCHA, www.reliefweb.net.

\textsuperscript{14} In 2008 approximately US$ 12 million was requested under the RR window to deal with a food crisis cause by poor harvests in 2007 and the global food price crisis at the time. The request was unsuccessful as El Salvador was not among the priority countries identified by a consultation process held with UN Agencies and OCHA for the allocation of CERF funds related to the global food crisis.

\textsuperscript{15} CERF Annual Report, 2009.

\textsuperscript{16} CERF El Salvador, \textit{Annual Report of the Resident/Humanitarian Coordinator, 2009}. 
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20. WHO was the single largest recipient, receiving US$ 593,725 out of US$ 895,483 requested. UNDP received the second largest contribution for one project; US$ 530,000 of US$ 599,913 requested). UNDP eventually withdrew a separate project in response to OCHA’s comments that it was development- or early recovery-oriented, and its activities not sufficiently compatible with the CERF’s life-saving criteria.

21. UNICEF received US$ 426,647 of US$ 495,206 requested; here again, one project was withdrawn after comments from OCHA about its budget composition.

22. In 2009, WFP received US$ 423,720 of US$ 590,000 requested: FAO received US$ 291,860 of US$ 401,070 requested; UNFPA received US$ 119,867 of US$ 149,867 requested; and IOM received US$ 100,000 of US$ 120,000 requested.\(^{17}\) The table below provides an overview of the CERF requests and the amounts approved by agency. A list of details of all the projects funded is included in the annex.

\(^{17}\) Note that WFP and FAO requested unsuccessfully US$ 7.5 million and US$ 4.8 million respectively in 2008 in order to deal with the food crisis in the country. (Source: original project submission documents)
Table 1. CERF by Agency, Amount Requested and Approved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$895,483</td>
<td>$593,725</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$759,878</td>
<td>$530,000</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$608,198</td>
<td>$426,647</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>$7,578,450</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$590,000</td>
<td>$423,720</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>$4,429,526</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$401,070</td>
<td>$291,860</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$149,867</td>
<td>$119,867</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$100,008</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$12,007,976</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,524,496</td>
<td>$2,485,827</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. PROCESSES

2.1 Appropriateness/Relevance

23. In response to the crisis in November 2009, the UN activated the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) which included IOM and IFRC and NGOs. A United Nations Development Assistance and Coordination team (UNDAC) was deployed immediately to support Disaster and Needs Assessment actions, and the Cluster System was activated in the country for the first time. Ten clusters were activated in total and the Shelter and Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) clusters were identified as critical priorities that would require global support.\(^{18}\)

24. The HCT, in coordination with the Government, launched a Flash Appeal and applied for CERF funding on the basis of initial field visits and available Damage and Needs Assessments from national authorities.\(^{19}\) Agriculture, Food Assistance, Health, WASH, Shelter, Protection and Camp Management were deemed priorities. A special committee was formed by the HCT to prioritise CERF projects in accordance with the life-saving criteria. This was seen to facilitate close cooperation among the different agencies in launching the various interventions.\(^{20}\)

25. The original request for US$ 3,524,496 in CERF funding under the Rapid Response window was submitted on 16 November 2009, and comprised 12 projects. The CERF Secretariat reviewed the proposals and responded with detailed comments on 17 November, requesting (as mentioned above) a reduction in the total funding amount to US$ 2.5 million. Other comments included requests for further information on budgetary allocations, eligibility under the life-saving criteria and cost breakdowns.

26. On 18 November, a revised proposal for the reduced amount was submitted with a reduced total and two omitted projects.\(^{21}\) All the individual projects were approved by 24 November and all disbursements were made by 17 December. It should be noted that, as spelled out in the approval letter and LoU, agencies may expend funds as soon as they have been approved (and reimburse other project funds when disbursements arrive).

2.2 Effectiveness

27. The HCT formed an inter-cluster coordination mechanism in order to manage information and coordinate the implementation of the projects. The Resident Coordinator’s report noted that the OCHA Regional and Desk Officers provided

---


\(^{19}\) El Salvador Flash Appeal, 2009.

\(^{20}\) Highlights from FAO Global Operations funded by CERF in 2009.

\(^{21}\) Projects 09-UDP-021 – ‘Empowering women and improving collective centre management’ and 09-CEF-062-B – ‘Breastfeeding, complementary and supplementary feeding for children under 5 years of age in the context of emergency’
the HCT ‘with excellent guidance on all humanitarian response related issues, especially in relation to funding’ and that ‘the support provided in orienting the HCT, Cluster Leads and the Government on the functioning of this system was indispensable’, given that this was the first time the Cluster System had been activated in El Salvador.\textsuperscript{22}

28. The process was effective insomuch as the approval was made relatively quickly and disbursement took 3 weeks in average, which allows for immediate response in a sudden onset crisis such as flooding only if agencies have the mechanism to prefinance based on the CERF application. The agencies could generally use funds against the CERF from the moment the grants were improved. In this sense, CERF became a vital means for the UN and NGOs to support rapid response to the disaster.\textsuperscript{23} The table below shows the timeframe for the process of CERF in El Salvador in 2009.

\textit{Table 2 CERF Timeline (amount of time taken from original submission to disbursements)}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OFFICIAL TO FINAL SUBMISSION (WORKING DAYS)</th>
<th>FINAL SUBMISSION TO USG APPROVAL (WORKING DAYS)</th>
<th>OFFICIAL SUBMISSION TO USG APPROVAL (WORKING DAYS)</th>
<th>USG APPROVAL TO LOU SIGNED (WORKING DAYS)</th>
<th>LOU SIGNED TO DATE DISBURSED (WORKING DAYS)</th>
<th>USG APPROVAL TO DATE DISBURSED (WORKING DAYS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (working days)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CERF Secretariat, May, 2011

2.3 Efficiency

29. The process was efficient, as can be seen in table 2 above. CERF funding was approved in a very rapid manner and allowed for very quick response to the disaster. There is the possibility that a certain amount of monitoring of CERF activities were covered under the processes and reporting mechanisms of other funding sources (agency and appeal response from donors) or even under general programme monitoring/reporting of individual UN agencies, and is thus not


\textsuperscript{23} Interview with personnel in CERF Secretariat/OCHA, May 2011.
highlighted within the CERF reporting. At the country level, it may be necessary to streamline this process to ensure that the monitoring conducted for activities located in longer term projects (and jump started by CERF funding) are included in the CERF reporting. The clusters should be able to ensure this happens.
3. OUTPUTS

3.1 Appropriateness/Relevance

30. The Annual Report of the Resident/Humanitarian Coordinator states that the knowledge that CERF funds would be available enabled organizations to divert regular agency funds to respond immediately to the emergency. The time taken between the submission of the original proposal and final approval was between 4-8 days for the 10 projects that were implemented. Funds were disbursed within 14-21 days of approval, and, as with the proposal submission process, this varied according to the agencies involved. This period would seem reasonable, considering the large numbers of projects included, and the need for funding within two weeks of the actual crisis.

31. However, it was still felt by some on the ground that the time taken to have the proposals approved and to disburse the funds was too long: a rigid application of the life-saving criteria was seen to be a contributing factor. The CERF Secretariat had indeed requested a reduction of 10% of the overall requested amount and in order to do that a more rigid interpretation of the life saving criteria would need to be applied. The method used by the UNCT was to break down costs, greater detail on budget allocations and to analyze them according to the life saving criteria. Thus the life saving criteria was applied more rigidly because it was necessary to ensure only the more vital needs projects were included. There is a link between budget detail and the life saving criteria because the more detailed the proposed expenditure, the better activities which are truly life saving can be selected. For example, when a line item that says: "staff" with no detail, it is not clear if the staff are really linked to life saving activities. But if the budget declares: "food aid handlers" or if it says "secretarial staff" it is rather different, and would help you to reject the latter.

32. The diagram hereunder shows the timeframe of the decision for grants allocations (source Financial Tracking System).
Decision Dates for grants made in response to flooding in El Salvador on 7th and 8th November 2009. Linked to Hurricane IDA. Labels show the donor, the type of recipient and the amount of the grant.

- USA-NGO: $557,758
- USA-UN: $104,500
- USA-OGO: $5,000
- Sweden-NGO: $121,926
- Switzerland-NGO: $199,800
- Private-Various: $226,547
- Private-Various: $41,365
- Korea-Bilateral: $100,000
- Various-NGO: $1,745,929
- Private-Various: $65,859
- Finland-UN: $275,094
- Finland-NGO: $71,103
- Netherlands-NGO: $47,929
- Ireland-NGO: $147,929
- Canada-UN: $51,714
- Canada-UN: $21,307
- Canada-UN: $172,065
- Canada-UN: $83,241
- Estonia-UN: $67,376
- Germany-NGO: $47,929
- Czech Republic-NGO: $176,759
- Germany-NGO: $105,666
- Germany-NGO: $133,215
- Germany-NGO: $39,667
- Germany-NGO: $112,239
- Germany-NGO: $66,023
- Germany-NGO: $177,178
- Germany-NGO: $100,008
- Germany-NGO: $300,003
- Germany-NGO: $330,907
- Germany-NGO: $289,016
- Germany-NGO: $423,720
- Luxembourg-NGO: $88,197
- Mexico-NGO: $16,743
- Sweden-UN: $544,447
- Sweden-NGO: $219,703
- Sweden-NGO: $208,006
- USA-Bilateral: $218,591
- Brazil-Bilateral: $265,001
- Argentina-Bilateral: $1,100
- Israel-Bilateral: $50,000
- Italy-Bilateral: $10,335
- Nicaragua-Bilateral: $67,863
- OAS-Bilateral: $28,000
- PACE-Various: $4,000
- Japan-Bilateral: $1,926
- Church of Sweden-NGO: $57,656
- Canada-NGO: $90,000
- Germany-Bilateral: $50,000
- Private-Various: $1,000
- France-Bilateral: $97,000
- Italy-Bilateral: $25,000
- USA-Various: $36,623
- Venezuela-Bilateral: $14,526
- IACA-Various: $25,000
- OAS-Bilateral: $15,000
- Switzerland-NGO: $20,000
- IADB-NGO: $20,000
- Peru-NGO: $347,633
- Spain-Bilateral: $18,000
- Italy-NGO: $160,000
- Chile-NGO: $75,000
- Guatemala-Bilateral: $60,858
- Floods 8th Nov: $19,000

USA-Various: $112,392
- UNDP-UN: $400,000
- Finland-UN: $76,470
- ECHO-UN: $364,506
- Spain-NGO: $619,740
- UNDP-UN: $100,000
- ECHO-NGO: $801,205
- ECHO-NGO: $221,894
- Finland-UN: $155,449
- OCHA-UN: $50,000

USA-Various: $100,000
- ECHO-NGO: $255,754
33. The actual projects were also seen as appropriate and relevant to the disaster faced by El Salvador, and would have had a major impact on preventing excessive mortality through provision of clean water, (first in bottles and then in rehabilitating and treating wells), medicines to combat the increase in life threatening conditions (mostly respiratory and diarrhoea related) of affected populations, provision of food rations, and other immediate supplies.

### 3.2 Effectiveness

34. After the experience of 2008, where requests that were not aligned with CERF criteria were rejected, requests in 2009 were better aligned toward vital sectors, complemented the work of existing agency funds and helped launch activities that contributed to the work of the individual clusters. For example, WFP used the CERF funding to ensure the continuity of its emergency food assistance programme and UNDP developed an emergency shelter design, which was later used by other organisations working in the Shelter Cluster.

35. The shelter design met SPHERE standards and was adopted by the Government and other partners in the Shelter Cluster and subsequently used to build all official emergency shelter settlements.

### 3.3 Efficiency

36. The documentation reviewed suggests that the CERF application process included a fairly detailed examination of the proposals by OCHA, taking the response time and the required financing into account. The CERF Secretariat had made detailed comments about the original proposals. This assisted in strengthening the orientation of the UN agency discussions, given that the humanitarian reform structures were just evolving in the country. The cluster work was yet untested and took some time to become more fully evolved and effective. For this reason, the efficiency of the coordination between partners was being tested within the actual CERF compilation of projects, and would not be as comprehensive as otherwise, if humanitarian reform structures had been in place for a longer time.

37. Overall, however, the CERF facilitated a more efficient response by supporting better coordination and cooperation amongst implementing agencies and partners. Examples found in the documentation include the use of CERF funding by IOM to establish a network of non-governmental partners to monitor internally displaced person sites, and the reported close coordination within the WASH cluster which was made possible by CERF funding.

38. In this way, CERF was seen as a catalyst to further UN coordination. Another example of coordination and cooperation among agencies was a UNFPA project that included reproductive health, prevention of gender-based violence, mental health and education components and was complemented with funding and technical assistance from UNAIDS.
39. In terms of agency initiatives, one can notice that IOM also supported the emergency response of its country team through the provision of an emergency humanitarian officer and an IOM mission from the region to assist and facilitate in the CERF process and carry out the humanitarian response according to CERF guidances.

40. In terms of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) to make CERF more efficient, it was reported that IOM carried out daily monitoring, and weekly meetings with staff, the civil Protection Authority, UN agencies and NGOs were used to evaluate the project process. WHO reported that the WASH Cluster carried out joint monitoring of activities. IOM mentioned the creation of a baseline database supported by the use of a monitoring form, and in its proposal, WFP stated that its field monitors and representatives from the Ministry of Health would carry out regular field visits and that anthropometric data would be used to analyse the nutritional impact of the project throughout implementation.

41. The Annual Report of the Resident/Humanitarian Coordinator included a column on the M&E activities that had been carried out on the various projects including joint monitoring of WASH for example. This is part of the report template designed by the CERF secretariat. The M&E activities of other projects comprised mainly field visits, conducted in some cases in conjunction with government departments.
4. OUTCOMES

4.1 Appropriateness/Relevance

42. The CERF-funded projects in El Salvador appeared to be both relevant and appropriate for the emergency caused by Hurricane Ida and the heavy rainfall in November 2009. However, the unofficial ceiling demanded quick adjustments, partly resulting from the lack of experience of working with CERF in the country. This was seen to artificially limit the extent to which CERF funding could fulfil the requirements identified by needs assessments, although interviews revealed that the UNCT later recognized that CERF could only be used to jump-start operations and was appropriately used in this manner. Donors seemed to understand this as well, and, although complementary funding was relatively slow to arrive, the country was able to raise a significant amount of humanitarian funding to deal with the situation.

43. As would be expected in reacting to an acute emergency, WASH and Shelter were judged as priority areas, and these were adequately addressed by the CERF-funded projects. UNDP built some of the first emergency shelter houses which met SPHERE standards, extending emergency shelter housing to a further 321 families. UNICEF and Pan American Health Organisation (PAHO)/WHO were able to deliver drinking water and water trucks to recipients in emergency centres and other affected areas. PAHO/WHO also supported the MOH in distributing medicine and medical supplies to recipients in emergency centres and in areas where Health Centers had been destroyed. WFP and FAO used CERF funds to address food insecurity by maintaining an uninterrupted distribution of food assistance and by focusing on rebuilding basic infrastructure and supporting the resumption of agricultural activities.

4.2 Effectiveness

44. The Resident Coordinator reported that CERF funding proved a crucial funding input which also won the Government’s confidence, in that they recognized a resource on which they knew they could rely immediately to help those most in need. This helped their sense of leadership in a situation of urgency.

45. The documentation reviewed also suggests that the HCT worked closely with the Government and allowed for institutional strengthening leading up to the Flash Appeal, and stronger commitments for CERF funding, especially among the projects implemented and their continued cooperation. One such example was IOM providing the Government with monitoring tools and assistance to have daily updates on the situation in the Collective Centres and to identify gaps in assistance, that were then communicated to all of the clusters.

46. An NGO, Help Age International, reported that ‘none of the projects submitted to the Flash Appeal mention older people as a vulnerable group or included activities to address their specific vulnerabilities’.
47. An analysis of the extent to which gender, vulnerability, and cross-cutting issues were addressed in the proposals of the ten implemented projects shows this to also hold true for the majority of proposals submitted to CERF for the RR. WFP was the only organization to submit a proposal containing a reference to the elderly (it was also the only project which mentioned people living with HIV-AIDS and scored high, 2a, on the vulnerability marker). Four projects scored the highest grade, 2b, on the vulnerability marker for specifically targeting groups such as vulnerable farmers, children and pregnant women, in their proposals. The implemented projects fared less well on gender and cross-cutting markers. All but two projects scored zero (the lowest grade) on gender while aside from one 2a, all projects scored 1 or 0 on this cross-cutting marker.

4.3 Efficiency

48. The support received from the OCHA Regional Office in Panama during the CERF process was described as being invaluable. The understanding of the CERF mechanism among agencies also varied; and this was seen to have contributed to delays, as some agencies submitted proposals, which were not relevant to CERF. The country team would also benefit from a clear understanding of the linkages between the Flash Appeal process and the CERF process.

49. While CERF funds enabled critical cooperation between the agencies and local NGOs, the pre-agreement phase was seen as a cause of delay. One suggestion was to have an approved list of NGOs and partners which the country offices could enter into agreements with quickly.
5. CONTRIBUTION

50. Regarding CERF’s contribution to life-saving activities it can be noted that, between 2008 and 2009, the UN agencies in El Salvador were able to collectively better distinguish projects that could be more aligned to critical life-saving activities. This is partly credited to a more active role of the regional offices in Panama and experience gained in instituting UN reform structures to better coordinate discussion on prioritization and planning.

51. CERF funding was seen to be crucial in initiating the national response and ensuring that critical activities took place in the first few weeks of the emergency. According to the UN Secretary General’s Report on CERF to the UNGA, ‘the Fund’s resources allowed agencies to provide life-saving assistance during the most critical first days of the emergency response’.24 This point is further elaborated by the Resident Coordinator’s report which states that organizations were able to ‘increase(ing) the scope of their immediate humanitarian interventions by diverting regular agency funds to cover actions during the first weeks and then used CERF funding to continue to provide sustainable life-saving humanitarian assistance during the most critical “life-saving” period (week 5 - 12) until additional resources where received in response to the Flash Appeal.25

52. The sectors and activities determined to be priorities in El Salvador all provided immediate attention to critical needs of populations facing acute disasters: namely food, water, shelter and health care, (especially reproductive health care). The longer term food security interventions were also seen as critical interventions, given the destruction of livelihoods in affected populations, existing on top of an already protracted food security problem in the country.

24 Report of the Secretary-General on CERF, August 2010.
6. CONCLUSIONS

53. The response to the emergency in 2009 was the first time the Cluster System was activated in the country, leading to close cooperation between National Sector Coordination, the ten activated clusters and NGO partners. Cooperation between the HCT and the Government throughout the process was mentioned in a number of documents, but the humanitarian reform process was late in starting. This indicates the need for El Salvador to recognize the protracted nature of disasters linked to climate change, and the importance of strengthening the Cluster System and setting up “stand-by-readiness” for rapid response, so that the CERF could be more timely and used more effectively.

54. The speed in which actions could be initiated determine, to some extent, their life saving impact in an acute emergency such as that faced by El Salvador. For this to occur, much attention is needed in creating strong humanitarian clusters that are structured and well mandated to discuss technical issues for both preparedness and response. Greater involvement, earlier on, by Regional UN offices in training and support to clusters would have been appropriate.

55. CERF helped initiate programmes in the critical areas of camp management, food assistance, health, water and sanitation, shelter, protection and agriculture. The response was timely but certain procedure-related delays did occur. A clearer understanding of the CERF process, including linkages to the Flash Appeal process, by all agencies would be one way to reduce this delay. A possibility for assisting in this process, may be country-to-country orientation, where the HCT of El Salvador, would work closely with another country, say Guatemala, which has greater experience in developing strong humanitarian reform structures. The Regional Offices of OCHA and agencies in Panama must be highly proactive in ensuring training, guidance, and setting up of humanitarian structures, especially as staff and agencies change over time.

56. The projects submitted seemed to have been vetted in detail by the various partners in a timely manner, considering the response within life-saving sectors that were consistently addressed. However, the cap on funding meant that all requirements identified in the needs assessments could not be met. In the future, it might be advised that individual UN agencies ensure their own access to emergency funds, and that this is accelerated in the event of a disaster, to complement the CERF, in order to fill gaps earlier on in the rapid response process.
ANNEX I. LINKS TO THE TERMS OF REFERENCE AND THE INCEPTION REPORT.

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

Terms of reference:

http://www.channelresearch.com/file_download/294/CERF_5YREVAL_Final_TOR_07.11.2010.pdf

http://www.channelresearch.com/file_download/294/CERF_5YREVAL_Final_TOR_Appendix_V_07.11.pdf

Inception report:

ANNEX II. CERF PROCESS DESCRIPTION

RAPID RESPONSE GRANT PROCESS

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>El Salvador</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CERF Secretariat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX V. COUNTRY PROJECT SUMMARIES

El Salvador

UNICEF - RR - Shelter and NFI - US$171,775 (09/CEF-062-A) -

2009 315 Provide immediate attention to children, adolescents and family affected by Hurricane IDA and living in collective centers

SLU-98S-NF/31006

140 collective centers have improved living conditions, including improved participation of the affected population. 3,256 families have received family support and hygiene kits (calculated to meet the immediate needs of families of 5 members) and their adequate use. 140 hygiene kits (one per collective center) have been distributed. 200 kits of education materials have been distributed for improving living conditions in collective centers. CCC compliance in collective centers, including in the issues related to health, nutrition, hygiene, water, sanitation, education and protection. Families have improved their awareness on hygiene and sanitation issues through the use of education materials (1,300 posters that promote cleaning of hands, 6,000 flies with hygiene tips).

El Salvador

UNICEF - RR - Water and sanitation - US$223,256 (09-CEF-062-C) -

2009 316 Provision of safe water and ensuring adequate hygiene and sanitation in the context of the emergency

SLU-98W/NF/31016

15,000 people in shelters have 2 days worth of drinking water. 6,200 affected families are provided with clean water in San Salvador, San Vicente, La Paz, La Libertad, Cuscatlan, Cabañas, Usulutan and San Miguel. Population in the most affected areas have a greater awareness about hygiene and the adequate handling of water.

El Salvador

UNICEF - RR - Protection Rights - US$123,715 (09-CEF-062-D) -

2009 317 Psychosocial support to children in the immediate phase of emergencies

SLU-JSR/HRR/31036

800 youth trained in the psychosocial attention methods. 600 youth and children are satisfied with an improvement in the psychological state and the method of crisis intervention. 2,170 children received psychosocial support. 6,500 children and adolescents assisted with adequate methodologies for managing crisis. 300 institutional staff trained on adequate methodologies for providing psychosocial support to children and families in the context of emergency.

El Salvador

FAO - RR - Agriculture - US$291,867 (09/FAO-037) -

2009 318 Immediate assistance to re-establish food production and the livelihoods of the vulnerable farmers affected by the Hurricane IDA in El Salvador

Benefited families have rehabilitated the production of short-cycle food crops and vegetables, improving: i) The availability of bean seed for restarting bean production; ii) The availability of protein through the production of poultry and beans; iii) The intake of micronutrients by pregnant mothers and children through vegetable production; iv) Farmers will grow 58,800 hectares of local bean variety seeds to ensure adapted seed availability (percentages of seed to be produced) to farmers in the affected food areas of El Salvador. At the end of the cycle, they will produce enough seed for 10,000 beneficiaries (direct and indirect). 2,000 families will receive 25 pounds of improved seed of bean for the next planting season. Greater resilience and reduction in vulnerability through the reduction of asset stripping and loss of productivity.

El Salvador

UNFPA - RR - Health - US$119,867 (09-UNFPA-032) -

2009 319 Restore and strengthen the capacity of the local primary health system to provide emergency reproductive health services

SLU-98HNR/31033

SRH needs identified. All pregnant women in shelters of affected areas were offered antenatal and emergency obstetric care, including safe and clean delivery. 2,170 families received psychosocial support. 6,500 children and adolescents assisted with adequate methodologies for managing crisis. 300 institutional staff trained on adequate methodologies for providing psychosocial support to children and families in the context of emergency.

El Salvador

UNICEF - RR - Shelter and NFI - US$162,638 (09-UNICEF-039) -

2009 320 Improving management of temporary Collective Centers

SLU-98S-NF/31008

140 collective shelters monitored on a daily basis. 50 families whose houses have been destroyed receive house kits to facilitate earlier departure. Families in collective shelters better attended, reducing psycho-social and health problems.

El Salvador

UNICEF - RR - Shelter and NFI - US$289,818 (09-UNICEF-040) -

2009 321 Emergency shelter

SLU-98S-NF/31018

Temporary shelter established for 356 families accomplishing minimum standards of safety. Consultant firm or specialized NGO is hired to strengthen basic shelter units in coordination with Housing Vice-Minister, with local affected communities including women and local governments. Affected population receives income through cash-for-work to invest in humanitarian needs.

El Salvador

FAO - RR - Food - US$223,715 (09-FAO-037) -

2009 322 Emergency Food Assistance for Populations Affected by Hurricane Ida

Adequate levels of nutritional intake and dietary diversity will be ensured for 5,000 food insecure families affected by the disaster. Food assisted affected families will be able to dedicate more time and alternative resources to the rebuilding of their homes and livelihoods. 2,000 children between 6 and 59 months suffering from chronic under-nutrition and whose families have been affected will have improved their nutritional intake. 3,500 pregnant women and breastfeeding mothers will have improved their nutritional intake, preventing infections under-nutrition and improving mother-child health. 500 people living with HIV/AIDS and elderly who have benefited from supplementary feeding will have improved their nutritional intake. 90% of the beneficiaries will have bought adequate provisions in health, food and nutrition.

El Salvador

WHO - RR - Health - US$289,818 (09-WHO-039) -

2009 323 El Salvador Health Response to the Emergency in El Salvador to provide emergency health services

SLU-98HNR/31023

Marked mortality in the affected population reduced. Access to health care and medications improved.

El Salvador

WHO - RR - Water and sanitation - US$305,867 (09-WHO-040) -

2009 324 The rehabilitation of the minimal conditions of water and sanitation infrastructure of water and sanitation

SLU-98W/NF/31025

Drinking water and emergency sanitary disposal facilities provided to the affected inhabitants who have no access to basic water and sanitation services after the passage of Hurricane IDA. Hygiene activities conducted in the shelters and affected communities.
## ANNEX VI. SELECTED PROJECTS

For El Salvador, all 10 projects submitted for funding to the CERF were selected for analysis. Please see the methodology section for a description of the rating process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Documents available</th>
<th>Gender Marker</th>
<th>Vulnerability Marker</th>
<th>Cross-cutting marker</th>
<th>Reasons for score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SV: 09-FAO-037-RR. FAO: Agriculture - $291,860</td>
<td>• Benefited families have rehabilitated the production of short-cycle food crops and vegetables, improving: - - o The availability of bean seed for restarting bean production; - - o The availability of proteins through the production of poultry and beans; - - o The intake of micronutrients by pregnant mothers and children through vegetable production. - - - 42 farmers will grow 58.8 hectares of local bean variety seeds to ensure adapted seed availability (quantities of seed to be produced) to farmers in the affected food areas of El Salvador. At the end of the cycle they will produce enough seed for 10,000 beneficiaries (direct and indirect); - - - • 2,000 families will receive 25 pounds of improved seed of bean for the next planting season. - - - • Greater resilience and reduction in vulnerability through the reduction of asset stripping and loss of goods.</td>
<td>RR Final Proposal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Activities: - Production (emphasizing women-headed households) of vegetables in backyard gardens at house level, which will increase micronutrient intake (distribution of vegetable seeds, fertilizers and others inputs) - Expected Outcomes: - The intake of micronutrients by pregnant mothers and children through vegetable production.</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV: 09-IOM-030-RR. IOM: Shelter and non-food items - $100,008</td>
<td>• 140 collective shelters monitored on a daily basis; - - • 50 families whose houses have been destroyed receive house kits to facilitate earlier departure - - • Families in collective shelters better attended, reducing psycho-social and health problems</td>
<td>RR Final Proposal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No specific attention to gender.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activities: - Daily monitoring visits carried out by partner NGOs and Civil Protection to all Collective centers and shared with relevant partners and service providers. - Targeted support to families whose houses have been totally destroyed or rendered uninhabitable - Expected outcomes: - Families in collective shelters better attended, reducing psycho-social
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Documents available</th>
<th>Gender Marker</th>
<th>Vulnerability Marker</th>
<th>Cross-cutting marker</th>
<th>Reasons for score</th>
<th>Reasons for score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>El Salvador</strong> SV: 09-UDP-022-RR. UNDP: Shelter and non-food items - $590,000</td>
<td>• Temporary shelter established for 356 families accomplishing minimum standards of safety. - - • Consultant firm or specialized NGO is hired to strength national team to develop site analysis in coordination with Housing Vice Minister, with local affected communities including women and local governments. - - • Affected population receive income through cash-for-work to invest in humanitarian needs</td>
<td>RR Final Proposal 0</td>
<td>No specific attention to gender.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Objective: - Immediate assistance to 356 families (specially with women head household) in 7 affected municipalities of San Salvador, by providing housing kits for temporary shelter via self construction under cash-for-work mechanism.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Proposed Activities - Purchase and distribution of housing kits (reinforced plastic, zinc, iron, nails, etc) to affected communities to rebuild own house or to establish temporary shelter, via self-construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>El Salvador</strong> SV: 09-FPA-033-RR. UNFPA: Health - $119,867</td>
<td>• SRH needs identified. - - • All pregnant women in shelters of affected areas receive adequate prenatal and emergency obstetric care, including safe and clean delivery. - - • People affected and those providing health services and managing shelters have received information and take on preventive measures in SHR and GBV. - - • GBV prevention guidelines included in the management of temporary shelters. - - • 2,880 families in affected areas receive dignity kits.</td>
<td>RR Final Proposal 1</td>
<td>Ensure that pregnant women receive adequate emergency obstetric care through timely referral to nearby hospitals or safe and adequate delivery in shelters. - Training for HC providers and shelter managers to prevent SRH &amp; respond to GBV. - Promote prevention of unwanted pregnancies, GBV, STI and HIV-Aids in temporary shelters and local health services. - Provide technical</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Documents available</td>
<td>Gender Marker</td>
<td>Reasons for score</td>
<td>Vulnerability Marker</td>
<td>Reasons for score</td>
<td>Cross-cutting marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>• 140 collective centers have improved living conditions, including improved participation of the affected population - • • 3,500 families have received family support and hygiene kits (calculated to meet the immediate needs of families of 5 members) and their adequate use. - • • 140 hygiene kits (one per collective centers) have been distributed - • • 200 kits of education materials have been distributed for improving living conditions in collective centers - • • CCC compliance in collective centers, including in the issues related to health, nutrition, hygiene, water, sanitation, education and protection. - • • Families have improved their awareness on hygiene and sanitation issues through the use of education materials (1,000 posters that promote cleaning of hands, 6,000 fliers with hygiene tips)</td>
<td>RR Final Proposal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No specific attention to gender.</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>• 15,000 people in shelters have 2 days worth of drinking water - • • 6,200 affected families are provided with clean water in San Salvador, San Vicente, La Paz, La Libertad, Cuscatlán, Cabañas, Usulután and San Miguel. - • • Population in the most affected areas have a greater awareness about hygiene and the</td>
<td>RR Final Proposal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No specific attention to gender.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### El Salvador

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Documents available</th>
<th>Gender Marker</th>
<th>Vulnerability Marker</th>
<th>Cross-cutting marker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SV: 09-CEF-062-RR, UNICEF: Protection/Human Rights/Rule of Law - $133,215</td>
<td>Adequate handling of water.</td>
<td>RR Final Proposal</td>
<td>No specific attention to gender.</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

800 youth trained in the psychosocial attention methods - 400 youth and certified in carousel methodology and the method of crisis intervention - 2,170 families received psychosocial support - 6,500 children and adolescents assisted with adequate methodologies for managing crisis - 300 institutional staff trained on adequate methodologies for providing psychosocial support to children and families in the context of emergency.

### El Salvador

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Documents available</th>
<th>Gender Marker</th>
<th>Vulnerability Marker</th>
<th>Cross-cutting marker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SV: 09-WFP-072-RR, WFP: Food - $423,720</td>
<td>Adequate levels of nutritional intake and dietary diversity will be ensured for 5,000 food insecure families affected by the disaster - Food assisted affected families will be able to dedicate more time and alternative resources to the rebuilding of their lives and livelihoods - 2,000 children between 6 and 59 months suffering from chronic under-nutrition and whose families have been affected will have improved their nutritional intake - 3,500 pregnant women and breastfeeding mothers will have improved their nutritional intake, preventing intrauterine under-nutrition and improving mother-child health - 500 people living with HIV-AIDS and elderly who have benefited from supplementary feeding will have improved their nutritional intake;</td>
<td>RR Final Proposal</td>
<td>No specific attention to gender.</td>
<td>2a</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objectives: - To prevent the deterioration of the nutrition and health status of the most vulnerable groups in 7 out of the 40 most affected municipalities of the country (6,000 people including children between 6 and 59 months, pregnant women, lactating mothers, people living with HIV-AIDS and the elderly). - Activities: - Supplementary feeding rations will be distributed for a period of 3 months to 2,000 children between 6 and 59 months, 3,500 pregnant and lactating mothers, and 500 people living with HIV- AIDS and elderly. These 30 day rations will be composed of 100 grams of fortified blended foods (FBF), 20 grams of vegetable oil and 25 grams of beans for

Other expected results: - 90% of the beneficiary women will have been taught adequate practices in health, food and nutrition.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Documents available</th>
<th>Gender Marker Reasons for score</th>
<th>Vulnerability Marker Reasons for score</th>
<th>Cross-cutting marker Reasons for score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador SV: 09-WHO-065-RR. WHO: Health - $289,818</td>
<td>• Morbi-mortality in the affected population reduced, • Access to health care and medications improved,</td>
<td>RR Final Proposal 0</td>
<td>No specific attention to gender.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador SV: 09-WHO-066-RR. WHO: Water and sanitation - $303,907</td>
<td>• Drinking water and emergency excreta disposal facilities provided to the afflicted inhabitants who have no access to basic water and sanitation services after the passage of Hurricane IDA. • Hygiene activities conducted in the shelters and affected communities</td>
<td>RR Final Proposal 0</td>
<td>No specific attention to gender.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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