GAZA STRIP

Humanitarian Programme Cycle 2015
FSS Strategic Response Plan

Overall FSS Funds Appeal for Gaza and West Bank

Project Type Funding



Regional Funding



1.6 M Beneficaries
$ 324,430,436
50 Projects
26 Partners

Project type

- LR - Land Rehabilitation
- RR - Road Rehabilitation
- GH - Greenhouse Reconstruction
- W - Water Measures
- OA - Other Agricultural Support
- LF - Livestock and Fisheries
- C - Cash for Work
- FA - Food Assistance

USD project budget per capita

- 60 and below
- 61 - 120
- 121 - 180
- 181 - 240



NORTH GAZA
Population est.: 349.000
Food insecure: 70%
No. of projects: 19
Budget est.: USD 49,0 Mio

GAZA
Population est.: 607.000
Food insecure: 68%
No. of projects: 19
Budget est.: USD 47,7 Mio

DEIR AL BALAH
Population est.: 256.000
Food insecure: 73%
No. of projects: 32
Budget est.: USD 50,3 Mio

KHAN YUNIS
Population est.: 331.000
Food insecure: 72%
No. of projects: 27
Budget est.: USD 52,9 Mio

RAFAH
Population est.: 218.000
Food insecure: 76%
No. of projects: 22
Budget est.: USD 48,6 Mio



NORTH GAZA

Org → / ↓ Type	ACT/ DCA	FAO	HelpAge Inter	IDCO	IRW	Oxfam GB	Oxfam Italia	RWDS	SC	UAWC	UNRWA	WFP
LR		✓		✓			✓		✓			
RR												
GH		✓					✓		✓			
W		✓					✓		✓			
OA	✓	✓		✓			✓	✓	✓	✓		
LF		✓					✓	✓	✓	✓		
C	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	
FA	✓		✓								✓	✓

GAZA

Org → / ↓ Type	ACT/ DCA	FAO	GVC	HelpAge Inter	IRW	Oxfam GB	Oxfam Italia	PU	RWDS	SC	UAWC	UNRWA	WFP
LR		✓					✓	✓		✓			
RR													
GH		✓					✓			✓			
W		✓	✓				✓	✓		✓			
OA	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
LF		✓					✓		✓	✓	✓		
C	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	
FA	✓			✓								✓	✓

RAFAH

Org → / ↓ Type	ACF	ACT/ DCA	ACTED	ASDPD	CARE Inter	FAO	HelpAge Inter	IRW	PU	RWDS	SC	UAWC	UNRWA	We Effect	WFP
LR	✓				✓	✓			✓		✓			✓	
RR			✓												
GH	✓				✓	✓					✓			✓	
W			✓			✓			✓		✓				
OA	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓			✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	
LF					✓	✓				✓	✓	✓		✓	
C	✓	✓				✓		✓	✓		✓		✓		
FA							✓						✓		✓

DEIR AL BALAH

Org → / ↓ Type	ACF	ACT/ DCA	ASDPD	CARE Inter	FAO	GVC	HelpAge Inter	IRW	Oxfam Italia	PFA	PU	RWDS	SC	UAWC	UNRWA	We Effect	WFP
LR				✓	✓				✓	✓	✓		✓			✓	
RR																	
GH			✓	✓	✓				✓				✓			✓	
W					✓	✓			✓		✓		✓				
OA		✓	✓		✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	
LF				✓	✓				✓			✓	✓	✓		✓	
C	✓	✓	✓		✓			✓	✓		✓		✓		✓		
FA							✓								✓		✓

KHAN YUNIS

Org → / ↓ Type	ACF	ACPP	ACT/ DCA	ACTED	Activist	Al Nakheel	ASDPD	CARE Inter	FAO	HelpAge Inter	IRW	Oxfam Italia	PFA	PU	RWDS	SC	UAWC	UNRWA	WFP
LR		✓				✓		✓	✓			✓	✓	✓		✓			
RR				✓	✓														
GH						✓		✓	✓			✓				✓			
W				✓		✓			✓			✓		✓		✓			
OA		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
LF								✓	✓			✓			✓	✓	✓		
C	✓		✓						✓		✓	✓			✓	✓		✓	
FA			✓							✓								✓	✓

Date Created:
3 February 2015

Contact:
marco.ferloni@foodsecuritycluster.net
hosne.barakat@foodsecuritycluster.net
anas.mussalam@foodsecuritycluster.net

benjamin.korff@wfp.org

Website:
foodsecuritycluster.net

Data Sources:
Food Security Sector (FSS), Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics (PCBS)

The boundaries and names and the designations used on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the United Nations.

FOOD SECURITY SECTOR
Strengthening Humanitarian Response

How to use this: The matrix is meant as tool to improve coordination between actors working in food security. Each table represents one governorate. For every governorate it is shown what organisation (columns) is active in which working field/project type (rows). Thus each organisation can quickly look up which other organisations are active in the same field in the same governorate. The map gives and overview for the whole region. Colored shading represents the proposed total budget of projects per capita in each governorate. The bar diagram shows the number of projects in the governorate for each working field/project type.

Additional Explanations:
- Food insecurity figures are taken from the 2013 socio economic food security survey (SEFsec) carried out by PCBS in coordination with the FSS, and in particular FAO, UNRWA and WFP. For the case of Gaza, in line with FSS agreement, Food Insecurity and Vulnerability to Food Insecurity figures have been combined to display overall Food Insecurity.
- Tick marks in the matrix can represent more than one project implement by the respective organization in the working field and governorate.
- As many project budgets are planned over several governorates and there are no exact figures for governorate level, budget flow can only be regarded as a rough estimation. Actual budget allocation per governorate might differ significantly from the figures shown here.
- Number of projects are double-counted between governorates and each project can have several project types. Thus numbers do not add up.
- Population estimates from PCBS are for the year of 2014.