

Zimbabwe Floods MDRZW007

DREF review



31 May – 5 June

Facilitators:

Melanie Ogle IFRC Africa zone Disaster Management Unit
Janet Porter IFRC Southern Africa Regional Office



Table of contents

Executive Summary:.....	3
Introduction:	4
Key Findings	5
Quality, relevance and accountability:	5
Effectiveness and efficiency of management:	6
Capacity of the National Society:.....	7
Summary and Recommendations:.....	8
Recommendations:	9
Annexes.....	12
Annex 1: Terms of Reference: Zimbabwe Flood Disaster MDRZW007	12
Annex 2: Persons interviewed as part of the DREF review process	16
Annex 3: Timeline of the DREF operation.....	18
Annex 4: Agenda for lessons learned workshop.....	20
Annex 5: Participants recommendations on the DREF operation	21
Annex 6: Participants in the lessons learned workshop	24
Annex 7: Lessons Learned Workshop – participant evaluation form	26



Executive Summary:

The team visited two sites, one affected by (floods, in Zaka District, [Masvingo](#) Province and hailstorms in Mberengwa District, Midland Province). The field visit gave an interesting perspective into both the “planned” flood response and “opportunistic” hailstorm response. In most of the affected provinces, ZRCS was the first responder to the disasters. Overall, beneficiaries interviewed were grateful for what they had received from ZRCS.

While the operational plan was changed to include support for the Mberengwa hailstorms, this reallocation impacted on the scope of the floods response even though contributions were made by other organisations to flood-affected communities. It could have been possible to have a separate DREF operation for the hailstorms response. It is important that changes to the operational plan or to the broader context are discussed - in lieu of a DM counterpart at the IFRC Country Office – with the Operations Coordinator, at the Southern Africa Regional Office; as per the newly agreed Standard Operating Procedures (SoPs) for Disaster Management in Africa.

The operation was largely delivered efficiently and effectively. The only outstanding activity at the end of the operation was the construction of the latrines, which were in the final stages of completion at the time of the review. There seemed to be some variance between what was planned in terms of distribution of non food items (NFIs) compared with actual, however at the time of the review ZRCS were still working on reconciling the final figures. While the operation went some way towards meeting the needs of affected communities, there were gaps that were not covered by other organisations. This reinforces the need to coordinate with other organisations and agencies on a regular basis and to revise the plan of action should the needs (or context) change.

The DREF operation and intervention in floods and hailstorms has helped to raise the profile and visibility of the National Society as the first responder in disaster response by the affected communities as well as the Government’s Civil Protection Organisation (the coordinating body for disaster response, represented at National, Provincial and District levels). In fact, in the Midlands Province, not only was the Red Cross response in line with the government’s response, it actually exceeded the government’s expectation.

Throughout the review, the issue of financial transfer and reconciliations have been cited as challenges. There have been issues with the timing and quality of returns provided from branches and within budget, which has impacted on the speed of the operation. Due to the very nature of DREF, funds should be fast tracked and not treated as normal transfers to a National Society. There should be further discussions between the National Society, the Country Office finance and Regional and Zone level finance departments to find ways of streamlining the process; if possible.

The Country Office and ZRCS logistics department seem to have worked well together. Local procurement was done through IFRC, so that payments were made directly from the IFRC and would not hold up the returns process. One of the strengths of the operation has been the speed at which ZRCS has been able to respond, and this is due in large part to prepositioned stock. However, replenishment of distributed stock has been a challenge due to a hold up of containers in Beira, Mozambique. Fortunately this stock is for replenishment and not for distribution. The Africa zone Logistics Coordinator is planning to pilot a Global Logistics Service (GLS) project in Southern Africa; which aims to improve prepositioning throughout the entire region.

Overall the operation seems to have gone well, given some of the challenges faced by ZRCS and given that the National Society has an on going Emergency Appeal for Food Insecurity. The operation shows that ZRCS are dynamic and engaged, shifting resources as needed to meet needs arising from a disaster. This review aims to capture some of the strengths and challenges of the operation, and the opportunity to enhance further responses.



Introduction:

DREF Operation Floods (MDRZW007)

Budget: CHF 266,514

Alert: Weekly operations updates – starting 19 January 2013

DREF approved: 7 February 2013

Revisions: One extension to the operational timeframe by one month to allow for completion of latrine construction and one to include the hailstorm operation

<http://www.ifrc.org/docs/Appeals/13/MDRZW007.pdf>

<http://www.ifrc.org/docs/Appeals/13/MDRZW00701.pdf>

<http://www.ifrc.org/docs/Appeals/13/MDRZW00702.pdf>

In January 2013, Zimbabwe experienced rains causing heavy flooding in six provinces in the country, namely Matabeleland South, Matabeleland North, Midlands, Masvingo, Mashonaland Central and Manicaland. The floods resulted in varying degrees of damage to livestock, shelter and even lives.

The assessment carried out by the UN and Government agencies and ZRCS estimated that over 125 people died in the storms and floods and 9,700 people were affected, with over 5,910 people requiring urgent humanitarian assistance in the form of emergency shelter and basic relief assistance.

This DREF operation aimed to reach 700 of the most vulnerable displaced households (3,500 people) in the six provinces, with shelter and basic NFIs, emergency health support, and water, sanitation and hygiene. All of these activities were supported through local and international communications in media and print.

During the review it transpired that some of the DREF resources had been diverted to assist victims of a freak hailstorm occurred on 3 April, in Mberengwa, Midlands Province. This hailstorm killed two people, injuring several hundreds and caused widespread damage to houses, crops and livelihoods. As a result of the hailstorm, resources were diverted from the floods response, as the immediate need in Mberengwa was great, the response by other actors was slow, and requests were received from the local authorities.

The purpose of the DREF review and lessons learned workshop is to:

- To examine if the DREF operation has achieved its goal, objectives and expected results.
- To assess key achievements, challenges and areas of success, as well as areas for improvement within the operation and make recommendations to replicate or improve future disaster responses.
- To identify lessons learned and good practices for sharing.
- Provide recommendations to replicate or improve future disaster responses.

The review team visited two locations: the hailstorm-affected region (Mberengwa District, Midland Province) and one area affected by floods (Zaka District, Masvingo Province). The team comprised the Africa zone disaster management delegate, the SARO operations manager, the ZRCS disaster management coordinator and the IFRC county office PMER officer. The review involved interviews with key informants and focus group discussions. The list of people interviewed during the review is annex 1 to this report. A one day lessons learned workshop brought together all of ZRCS Provinces (including the six affected Provinces and the two unaffected Provinces), including the Provincial Programme Officer (PPO) and two volunteers. ZRCS headquarters staff and IFRC county office also participated in the workshop. The workshop was participatory and required those present to analyse the strengths and challenges of the operation from different perspectives and develop their own recommendations for future operations. The full list of participants in the workshop is at annex 5 to this report.

The team would like to express their thanks to the National Society headquarters, provincial offices, branch and volunteers for facilitating the DREF review and their full and open participation in the lessons learned workshop. It was a privilege to work with the National Society and to engage in discussions and interviews with community members and local authorities.



Key Findings

Quality, relevance and accountability:

Beneficiaries and local leaders were involved in the assessment of the situation. Local Red Cross branches undertook assessments without financial support from headquarters. The local Red Cross assessment goes from the branches to the Red Cross Provincial Programme Officer via the government's District Administrator and the Provincial Administrator, who are the respective heads of the Civil Protection Committee at District and Provincial level. It seems that the assessment findings cannot be passed internally and need to go through the Civil Protection process. While this may seem bureaucratic, it does mean that the government is aware of the assessment and the planning process.

It seems that the operation went some way to provide affected communities with relevant needs. Communities were happy with what they received in terms of shelter and NFI support, however the operation seems to have overlooked certain basic needs such as food and shelter. Many communities lost their crops and food stores, and shelter provision and training was not sufficient to meet the needs of affected communities. The DREF monitoring report from Mberengwa from 20 April 2013, stated that the main needs were shelter (covered by IOM), food, WatSan (as water sources were destroyed or contaminated), psychosocial support, and replacement of documents such as educational items and identification documents that were damaged or lost. Emergency health care was also needed, with some 238 cases being identified, although Zimbabwe National Army (ZNA) provided assistance through mobile medical clinics.

Sanitation facilities were provided to some individuals and for two schools. The beneficiaries interviewed were grateful for the latrines, however there were concerns that families who did not receive a latrine were still defecating in the local stream, which is also the community's water source. This undermines the impact of providing individual families with latrines; particularly in communities where people are too poor to construct their own latrine. Community latrines could have been considered as a more inclusive option (including proper management committees to ensure maintenance and sustainability and awareness raising for proper use at the community level).

This reinforces the need for on going monitoring and a beneficiary feedback mechanism, in order to know whether the planned intervention is meeting the needs of target beneficiaries. If the intervention is not relevant, the context or needs change, then the operation can be revised in order to ensure that the needs of the beneficiaries are prioritised.

The hailstorms in Mberengwa were not initially planned under the DREF operation, as the hailstorms happened almost one month after the DREF operation was approved. The hailstorm response was undertaken using NFI and shelter items not distributed as part of the floods operation, however, none of the other needs (food, WatSan, PSS, livelihoods etc.) was included in response. ZRCS should perhaps have considered a separate DREF operation, designed to meet the needs of the affected community. The new Standard Operating Procedures (SoPs) for disaster response in Africa means that in lieu of a disaster management counterpart in the Country Office, ZRCS should work directly with the Operations Coordinator at the Southern Africa Regional Office for advice on operational issues. What is not so clear at this stage is how the SoPs for disaster response affect support services in terms of HR, finance, reporting etc. The Africa DREF officer is also here to support the Operations Coordinator and to streamline the DREF process.

ZRCS now seems to be aware that the changes to the operational plan and budget can be made through prior agreement with SARO, Africa zone and Geneva, and formalised through an operations update. Even with short DREF operations, changes can happen in the context and as the situation evolves new needs may emerge or previously planned ones may no longer be relevant.

Other agencies responding to the floods included IOM, Save the Children and the Red Cross are all involved and coordinated through the national level Civil Protection Organisation (CPO). In the hailstorm operation, stakeholders include IOM, World Vision and Christian Care, Oxfam, the Zimbabwe Defence Force and various CBOs. Coordination is done through the Civil Protection Unit, which is present and coordinates disaster response at national, provincial and district level. Each district has plans to respond to various disasters through their Emergency Manual. This covers alert, assessment and response in one document and spells out roles



and responsibilities of various stakeholders. It appears that the Emergency Manual normally caters for normal or frequent disasters. Mberengwa is typically a drought affected area and has never experienced a hailstorm – let alone one similar to the one experienced in April this year – as a result the Manual did not make provisions for this type of disaster.

Effectiveness and efficiency of management:

Pre-DREF, the National Society was able to respond to earlier hailstorms in November and December 2012 using prepositioned stock (including family tents). However the National Society didn't have money to cover transport costs of NFIs; this was provided by IOM.

The response to the April hailstorm was extremely timely. As a result of prepositioned stock, the response in Mberengwa was literally the next day. The hailstorm happened on the 3 April, assessment/registration was done on 4 April and distributions started on 5 April. This was a very impressive response.

Delays have been experienced in terms of procurement of items from Dubai. Despite the requisition being made on 24 March, the goods have still not arrived. Fortunately these goods are for replenishment and not for distribution through the operation; otherwise they would be outside the timeframe.

Timely transfer of funds seems to be an overwhelming issue. It seems that transfer of funds is contingent upon acquittal of all returns, including those for the Emergency Appeal and development programmes. It is not entirely clear what has transpired in the past and why the strict controls are warranted, as DREF funds are normally transferred (less PSSR and regional costs) at the start of the operation and reconciled at the end of the DREF process. However the Memorandum of Understanding signed between the IFRC and the National Society does include a clause that *'The IFRC, at any time, may approve disbursement of an amount less than the disbursement request if the Federation concludes that the full disbursement request is not justified'*. It seems that there are issues with the quality of the returns from the ZRCS Provincial Offices. Funds are transferred from headquarters directly to the Provinces (each has their own bank account). Training is required or at least guidelines to help improve the quality of returns. It seems that this process has started, with ZRCS finance manager and IFRC Senior finance officer having visited/trained one branch already. This process should be replicated in ZRCS's seven other branches.

Local procurement was done through IFRC so that suppliers could be paid direct and payment wouldn't delay the acquittal and therefore impact on the working advance.

There is some dispute around assessment costs incurred before the start of the DREF. While these can be included, they need to be agreed in advance, along with the operational strategy. This was not done and the costs were deemed ineligible by the DREF officer.

Overall monitoring systems and templates could be improved, leading to more systematic monitoring of outputs and outcomes. The operation should draw more on the expertise of the ZRCS PMER officer, the IFRC country and regional level PMER officers, who can provide standard templates and tailored support to the operation. Furthermore, PMER should be adequately planned and budgeted.

While the DREF bulletin sets out a clear and systematic operation targeting 700 households, it seems that targeting was actually based on needs. Despite being able to respond to the unexpected hailstorm in Mberengwa, feedback from flood-affected Zaka District was that the resources they received were not adequate to meet the needs.

ZRCS felt that the IFRC were slow in recognising the extent of the floods situation, that it wasn't until an UNOCHA report was released on the scale of the floods. However, once the DREF documentation was received at the zone office on the 2 February and feedback given to the country office on 3 February, the DREF was approved quickly. Amendments made to the documentation and further follow up by the regional office, country office and ZRCS. The DREF was submitted to Geneva on the 6 February. Amendment made to the overall budget on 7 February, to include programme officer costs for three months. The DREF was approved on the 7 February. This timeline demonstrates good cooperation and turnaround from all sides, considering the initial questions raised around the operational plan and the budget.



International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

At the time of the review, all activities had been completed apart from the latrine construction; which had been delayed because of damp soil condition. These activities were underway and on track for timely completion.

Capacity of the National Society:

It seems that this DREF operation has built capacity of various stakeholders. The operational response and the lessons learned workshop have helped to clarify the DREF guidelines and process for the ZRCS and IFRC country office. While some people interviewed recall the last DREF operations, for Cholera in 2011 and 2008, a number of staff and volunteers are since new to the DREF process.

Capacity of staff and volunteers has been built as a result of shelter training given by the Africa zone shelter coordinator. Training has been cascaded by trained volunteers to community level volunteers in shelter erection. Capacity has also been built in terms of assessment, distribution and monitoring. Other capacities include latrine construction, CBHFA and PHHE, water treatment and hygiene promotion. For two of the Provincial Programme Officers (PPOs), this DREF operation has been their first experience of managing an emergency operation. For them this has been a very valuable learning opportunity, consolidated by the DREF review and lessons learned process.

The operation has highlighted that psychosocial support (PSS) as a gap in capacity of the National Society. During the review, feedback from stakeholders at various levels (government through to grass root communities) was that communities suffered loss of lives, homes and livelihoods. In the case of the freak hailstorm in Mberengwa, the community was left traumatised. While PSS may go on in a very informal way, this is an area that ZRCS could definitely specialise in, perhaps with the assistance of the Danish Red Cross, who are leaders in the PSS. This would play to the Red Cross Red Crescent strength of having a network of volunteers in the affected communities and set ZRCS apart from the other service-delivery NGOs that responded to the floods and hailstorm.

Anecdotal evidence was given by volunteers that the disaster has helped to reactive the branch volunteers and has increased their knowledge of community mobilisation. The DREF operation has motivated community members to become Red Cross volunteers and members.

This DREF operation has highlighted some weaknesses in terms of financial procedure, particularly in terms of the quality of returns. Funds are transferred direct to Provinces which then have to provide returns for acquittal before the next transfer is made. The IFRC's Senior Finance Office and the ZRCS Finance Manager have given one training session to a Province, which seems to have been successful. Roll out for this training to all Provinces should be encouraged.

It seems that operational issues are regularly raised and discussed in fortnightly meetings between ZRCS and the Country Office. This has been a very positive outcome of the DREF operation. The minutes from these meetings should be shared with the SARO Operations Coordinator, as this helps to flag concerns and ensures that timely assistance can be provided.

This DREF operation did demonstrate ZRCS's ability to divert resources as they are required, the hailstorms providing evidence of this. This demonstrates a dynamic National Society, which is ready to take the initiative to be the first responder and as a result reinforces this reputation with the Civil Protection Organisation, the affected communities and the general public (as Red Cross action was published in the national newspapers).

Both disasters seemed to highlight that there were not adequate early warning systems in place. Disaster preparedness, early warning and contingency planning are important areas where ZRCS could play a role in supporting the Civil Protection Organisation.

During the review, it was highlighted that there has been a shift in policy towards Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR), however not much has been done by the government. ZRCS is in a good position to provide a lead in DRR to the government Civil Protection Organisation at the various levels (National, Provincial and District level) and ZRCS seems to have a close working relationship with Civil Protection Organisation (CPO) at the national level.



Summary and Recommendations:

Some of the **NFI**s distributed and replenished under this operation were not locally appropriate or relevant – such as kitchen sets and tarpaulins. Feedback from beneficiaries is that while they appreciated kitchen sets, they are not suitable to use on open fires. Also tarpaulins have limited use without the distribution of poles, and it is now illegal to indiscriminately fell trees. Tents proved to be heavy and awkward to transport (for both the National Society and beneficiaries). A further recommendation from the shelter training was that the shelter tool kit needs to be adapted to the local context, with tools preferred by local community.

The DREF operation highlights an excellent response from **volunteers and branch executive committees**, who worked without financial incentives; they represent the true spirit of volunteerism. However for further operations, volunteer motivation should be considered when preparing the operational plan and budget. This could include per diem for volunteers, or branding items such as t-shirts and caps. These items will help to motivate volunteers as well as raise the profile of the work of the Red Cross within the community. Volunteers need to be aware of the provision made under the volunteer insurance (this is standard in all DREF and Emergency Appeal operations) and how to access it should the need arise.

The **operational plan** should reflect the needs of the target communities. During field visits and discussions with beneficiaries and volunteers, it was highlighted that food supplies and crops had been destroyed however food was not included in the operation. Feedback from communities was that “while they were grateful for the kitchen sets, they didn’t have any food to cook in them”, and while they were happy with the latrines, many families did not have adequate shelter (and as they said “they could not live in their latrines”). Psychosocial Support (PSS) was missing from the DREF plan; however people were traumatised particularly by the hailstorms in Mberengwa; where hailstorms were previously unheard of.

On going coordination with other stakeholders ensures that the operation is complementary to what others are providing. We found in Mberengwa that beneficiaries had received between 5 – 7 blankets, multiple buckets and soap; however no one was providing food or PSS support. Coordination with the District Administrator and other stakeholders should be continuous. Local leaders should be consulted and involved in all aspects of the operation as they represent the community and are gatekeepers that can influence the success of an operation.

Financial arrangements for the handling of DREF operations should be reviewed and streamlined where possible. It seems that transfer of DREF funds is contingent upon returns being acquitted for all programmes (including the DREF, Emergency Appeal and on-going development programmes).

According to ZRCS finance, this is often done by Provinces on an ad hoc basis, when further funds are required. There also seems to be confusion at the Provincial level, with funds being used for different projects/operations. If possible, the DREF funds should be handled in a separate way due to the short term nature and life-saving premise that the DREF is based on.

Funds are transferred from the Country Office to the National Society as soon as the DREF is approved and which was within 24 hours after approval. The transfer depends on how much the National Society requests for the immediate activities; based on the capacity of respective Province’s needs. Further funds are transferred in upon the request of the National Society when they have retired 100% the previous working advance. The delay to disburse the next funds is subject to the National Society’s ability to report within the agreed timeframe i.e. 30 days, 40 days etc.

Staff and volunteers in the field should be aware of **the DREF operation** as they are the frontline and public face of the Red Cross and the operation. They can inform beneficiaries and local leaders of the objectives and timeline of the operation. By raising awareness about the operation, beneficiary communications could be improved, which would help to raise awareness of amongst the community about who was being prioritised,



what they will receive and when and reduce misunderstanding and complaints. When complaints arise, it is best practice to have a transparent and independent beneficiary feedback mechanism in place. Issues are not addressed fairly and consistently in good time, can lead to tensions within communities (going against the IFRC principle of 'do no harm').

Systematic data collection and monitoring should be built-in throughout the operation including at assessment, registration and distribution (using a standardised data collection tool, disaggregated by gender and diversity). On going monitoring and evaluation provides data which can be used for the preparation of updates for IFRC and donors on the operations progress. It also helps to can red flags problems, which can be addressed in real time. Sufficient planning and budget should be built into the DREF operation to ensure robust monitoring and evaluation, and should include on going post distribution/beneficiary satisfaction.

One of the recommendations coming from the National Society is to have funds available for **exit strategy** from the DREF. Often the end of the DREF signals the end of engagement in a community; however communities usually have needs that go beyond the operational timeframe. Even where it doesn't signal an end, it does call for a public meeting to redefine further engagement. While this maybe doesn't necessarily require additional funds, it does highlight that a National Society needs to give some thought to the exit strategy from a community and build this into the operational plan and communication strategy.

The exit strategy should be considered at the onset of a disaster and reviewed periodically so that exit strategy can be presented to the community at the same time as, for example, the end baseline, or final monitoring visit (in order to save on additional expenses); while ensuring that this activity is suitably covered off.

Recommendations:

IFRC

Financial processes: were often highlighted as impediment to the operation's timeliness. Consider:

- Reviewing the ways of streamlining the financial process of a DREF operation
- Improve quality of returns from the Provinces through training and/or guidance in required financial processes from the IFRC Country Office & ZRCS finance team.

Coordination: internal coordination is important to build trust, ensuring that problems are identified and viable solutions sorted – together, as a team. To this end:

- Continue regular meetings between ZRCS finance/programmes and the Country Office finance/programmes and ensure that minutes are shared with the SARO Operations Coordinator.
- IFRC should proactively follow up on operations, particularly if an update has not been received recently, developing and maintaining a relationship with the DM counterparts in the National Society.
- Clarify the roles and responsibilities of support services under the new Standard Operating Procedures for Disaster Management in Africa.

PMER: a general gap in PMER practices is becoming visible in these DREF reviews. Recommend:

- IFRC to strengthen National Societies capacity including programme managers in planning, monitoring and reporting through trainings, materials, tools and support.
- One off trainings are not necessarily successful in building capacity; training should be followed up with on going support.

NDRT training: Ensure future NDRT training includes a component on psychosocial support in emergencies.

Zimbabwe Red Cross Society

DREF Planning: Ensure proper planning and budgeting in DREF responses. For future operations:

- Consider the need and budget for psychosocial support in future DREF operations (including training for volunteers)
- Plan realistically for volunteer costs, including transport costs, per diems and branding
- Include only culturally and contextually appropriate NFIs, and do not replenish items that are not appropriate.



International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

- Ensure that the National Society is aware that they can request changes to the DREF, as long as they seek approval from IFRC and report the changes in their reporting

PMER: Capacity in the National Society seems stretched, and as a result the ZRCS PMER officer has not been very involved in the DREF operation. However, monitoring is crucial for demonstrating that the operation has met the needs of affected communities. Recommend:

- ZRCS, with the support of IFRC (Country and Regional Office) should develop effective planning, monitoring and evaluation tools in advance of the next disaster/emergency operation
- Consider more sharing of internal tools used in various programmes (i.e. the food security programme had developed monitoring tools that possibly could be adapted to the DREF response).
- ZRCS to ensure gender and diversity are planned and monitored in future responses, ensuring the operation targets the most vulnerable; beneficiary data should also be immediately entered into a database to allow for better verification, monitoring and gender/vulnerability reporting to donors.

Volunteers: Are vital to the success of the operation. Try to take their needs and views into account if possible when planning the operation, as well as throughout the operation cycle. For example:

- If possible, consult with volunteers at the branch/province to ascertain their needs/constraints and adequately budgeted volunteer costs to ensure full engagement of the volunteers (including per diem, training and travel costs).
- Provide volunteers with identification (t-shirts, caps, etc.) and, if necessary, protective gear for better Red Cross visibility and recognition in the community as well as to increase volunteer motivation.
- Provide certificate of acknowledgement to volunteers for their response.
- Volunteer feedback mechanism: provide a mechanism for volunteer to feed into the operations (volunteers are the closest and most knowledgeable to the communities and can provide valuable information to the on going operations).

Coordination: Is key to an operations relevance and effectiveness. In order to avoid duplication and gaps and to draw on the full resources of the Movement. Consider:

- Strengthening the coordination between internal finance and operations through continued finance/programme meetings and ensuring two way information flow between headquarters and the branches.
- DM team should provide regular weekly updates to ensure SARO is aware of current operations and challenges (and can provide appropriate support).
- Ensure PNSs and other stakeholders are kept aware of the DREF on going operations (including the sharing of the DREF document and updates).
- A copy of the DREF bulletin should be available for staff and volunteers, translated into local languages if possible.
- While coordination is primarily the responsibility of the local authority, ZRCS should support the CPO to fulfil their responsibility in terms of coordination and reporting on contributions made in disaster response.

Beneficiary communications: Build in a formal system for beneficiary complaints and feedback mechanisms throughout all activities in future DREF planning and monitoring, including how complaints will be followed up and addressed. Each community member should know who to go to with questions or concerns regarding the ZRCS response and be assured that concerns will be addressed in a consistent and transparent way. Consider:

- Exploring methods of communication to the communities and beneficiaries about the on going DREF activities. Allow for feedback from the community and beneficiaries; include existing groups (or committees) of stakeholders to give unified feedback/messages to the community.
- Broader messages can increase awareness of the operations, thereby reducing confusion in the community and complaints. Consider using tools such as community radio, community meetings and pamphlets.

DREF management

The review revealed a number of misinformed comments and many great questions regarding the DREF processes, including revisions to the plan of action, eligible costs particularly around assessment etc. Recommend:

- Producing suitable, field-tested training materials and guidelines on DREF (perhaps a pocket guide or a DREF one-pager).



International Federation
of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

- Clarify around when assessment costs can be included in a DREF operation.

For recommendations emerging from the lessons learned workshop (and the participants made up of staff HQ, Provinces, volunteers and IFRC Country Office), please see annex 5



Annexes

Annex 1: Terms of Reference: Zimbabwe Flood Disaster MDRZW007

Date: May 17th, 2013

Time frame of mission: May 30th to June 6th 2013

Location: Zimbabwe, Harare (& field visits)

Evaluators:

Melanie Ogle, Disaster Response Delegate, IFRC African Zone (Team Leader)

Janet Porter, Operations Manager, IFRC Southern Africa Regional Office

Country Office Participant (optional)

1. Background:

DREF Operation Floods (MDRZW007). DREF allocated: CHF 266,514.

<http://www.ifrc.org/docs/Appeals/13/MDRZW007.pdf>

In January 2013, Zimbabwe experienced rains causing heavy flooding in six provinces in the country, namely Matabeleland South, Matabeleland North, Midlands, Masvingo, Mashonaland Central and Manicaland. The floods resulted in varying degrees of damage to livestock, shelter and even lives.

The assessment carried out by ZRCS, verified in reports from OCHA and Directorate of Civil Protection (DCP) estimated that over 125 people died in the storms and floods and 9,700 people were affected, with over 5,910 people requiring urgent humanitarian assistance in the form of emergency shelter and basic relief assistance. Assessments done in March 2013 reaffirmed the existing needs which include temporary shelter as well as non-food items such as kitchen utensils and blankets. The need for sanitation facilities in some schools where the toilets collapsed was also identified.

This DREF operation was to (1) provide 700 of the most vulnerable displaced households (3,500 people) in the six provinces identified with temporary shelter and basic relief items. ZRCS was also to (2) provide emergency health support through CBHFA trainings on epidemic control & PHHE, awareness campaigns, and ITN distributions, thereby reducing health risks for affected families. Finally, (3) water, sanitation and hygiene needs were addressed through hygiene promotions, support in building latrines, distribution and education on water treatment products and provision of NFI items. All of these activities were supported through (4) local and international communications in media and print.

This operation was expected to be implemented over three months, however due to an unexpected storm which diverted human resources from the DREF operations; it was extended for one-month to complete construction of latrines. Operations are to end on 7th June 2013. A Final Report will be made available three months after the end of the operation (by 7th September, 2013).

2. Purpose and scope of the Review:

The purpose of the mission is to perform a review in order to examine if the MDRZW007 DREF operation has achieved its planned goals and outcomes, and assess outputs against the plan. Furthermore, the review intends to assess key achievements, challenges, and provide an opportunity to capture the lessons learned from the involved staff and volunteers. The review will provide recommendations for future DREF operations.

The review will be performed in following locations: Harare, Field Visit (TBD); the preference would be to a site with a large number of representative beneficiaries (i.e. Masvingo)

- Key staff and volunteers from the ZRCS will be interviewed, as well as the Country office, IFRC regional/zone office/logistic centre, and other relevant RC/RC movement partners (involved in the DREF operation or present in the area).



International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

- Beneficiaries from the target areas will be interviewed, ensuring taking into consideration gender, age and persons/groups with special needs (vulnerabilities) in beneficiary representation.
- A selection of other institutions and agencies involved in emergency response to the disaster, such as government institutions (i.e. NCPC, DCPC), UN agencies (i.e. UNOCHA, WFP), international organizations and NGOs (i.e. IOM, MSF, World Vision, CPU, Christian Care, Care) can be included in the interviews and asked to provide secondary data.

Limitations: Translators needed for local language.

3. Objectives of the review:

- To examine if the DREF operation has achieved its goal and outcomes (expected results), and to review outputs against the plan.
- To assess key achievements, areas of success and challenges, as well as areas for improvement within the operation.
- To identify lessons learned and good practices.
- Provide recommendations to replicate or improve future disasters responses.

4. Methodology:

- Desk review and review of secondary data.
- Key informant interviews (e.g. National Society (NS) National Program Coordinator, DM Managing Coordinator, Logistics Officer, WatSan Officer, Financial Unit; Country Office (CO) Programme Coordinator (if available), PMER Officer, Finance Officer, Logistics officer; IFRC country/regional finance unit, other actors/organizations etc.).
- Field visit and group interviews with the communities that received assistance through the DREF operation.
- Lesson Learnt Workshop with the NS HQ and branches involved in the response operation.
- Follow-up (to address the outputs of the review).

5. Guideline questions for interviews:

1. *Quality, relevance and accountability:*

- To what extent were the beneficiaries involved in planning, design and monitoring of the operation? How were women and vulnerable groups involved (in planning, design and monitoring)? What was the beneficiary feedback and on-going communication process?
- How effective has the operation been in identifying the most vulnerable among the affected population and in developing appropriate strategies to respond to their particular needs?
- How relevant has the operation been in terms of responding to the needs identified by the affected communities? To what extent was the most vulnerable population reached / provided with assistance relevant to their needs? How was the assistance taking into account any special needs of women, children, elderly persons, other vulnerable persons (such as persons with disabilities, HIV/AIDS affected etc.)?
- Did any other agency respond to the disaster?
- Were the operation's strategies and priorities in line with the priorities of the authorities and other key coordination bodies?
- What were some of the successes and opportunities that came out of the operation?
- What problems and constraints have been encountered during the implementation of the operation and how did the operation deal with those?

2. *Effectiveness and efficiency of management:*

- Was the operation outcomes (expected results) reached in an efficient and effective way?
- How effective were the NS/IFRC systems and processes in supporting the operation (e.g. management decision making and approval, logistics system, financial system, etc.).
- What NS/IFRC mechanisms and tools were used to promote good practice (e.g. SPHERE, Better Programme initiative, emergency assessment tools, Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment etc.)?



International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

- How effective were the operation's processes for planning, priority setting, and monitoring, reporting and quality management? What tools were used to systematically monitor the operation? (excel sheets? Logframe matrixes, tables, finance programmes etc?)
- How well was the operation planned in regards to finance? Costs and expenditures as planned and expected? Where there new or other needs that the NS would have wanted to use resources for? (even if the operation is not completely finalized, the NS might have an idea of this.)
- Was there adequate integration across the different programs? (e.g. Emergency health, relief, WATSAN, etc.)
- How well did the country (if applicable)/regional/zone/Geneva Secretariat support the operation – from preparation of DREF documentation and approval, throughout the DREF operation until the end of the operation?
- How was the volunteer managed? Where they insured? Where the volunteers provided with relevant training and equipment for their activities performed during the operation?
- Was there effective coordination with Movement partners / other actors? And how appropriate and effective were the inputs of partner organizations in the implementation of the operation?

3. *Capacity of the National Society:*

- Where there any gaps in capacity of the National Society to implement the operation that needs to be addressed? Are there any plans in the National Society to address the gaps? Have these plans been incorporated in the National Society's long term/yearly planning?
- What changes in capacity, capability, understanding and learning have occurred within the National Society as a result of the ongoing operation? Are these appropriate?
- What important lessons have been learned which can improve future disasters response? What would the National Society do differently in future DREF operations?

6. **Outputs:**

- Review/evaluation report including executive summary, key conclusions and recommendations. The draft report will be submitted 14 days after the conclusion of the review, and final report submitted no later than four weeks after the review (with seven days allowed for feedback).
- A feedback session with NS, IFRC country office (and possibly interested PNS) outlining the key preliminary findings and recommendations.

7. **Schedule:**

It is envisaged for the review to take place during (30th May and 6th June, 2013) with the following schedule (including drafting and finalization of report):

Activity Review Flood operation	Time	Date
Arrive to Harare	TBD (based on arrival times)	30 May 2013 (Thurs)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Briefing with Country Office & National Society • Individual meetings/interviews/discussions with CO & ZRCS HQ relevant staff: <i>Fin, Logs & PMER to bring documents & receipts to be reviewed</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CO Programme Coordinator (if available) or Country Office Rep - CO PMER Officer - CO Logistics Office & Financial Officer (separate meetings) (LUNCH) - ZRCS National Program Coordinator - ZRCS DM Managing Coordinator - ZRCS Logistics Officer & ZRCS Financial Unit (separate meetings) - ZRCS Watsan Officer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 08:00-09:00 - 09:00-10:00 - 10:00-11:30 - 11:30-12:30 - 13:30-14:30 - 14:30-16:00 - 16:00-17:00 - 17:00-18:00 	31 May 2013 (Fri)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travel to Field 	• 08:00-12:00	1 June 2013



(LUNCH) • Working session with District Officials • Working session with Volunteers (6 directly involved in operations) • Working session with Local Branch	• 13:30-15:00 • 15:00-16:00 • 16:00-17:00	(Sat)
• Travel to field site • Meeting with Community Leaders • Group meeting with women beneficiaries (6 women) (LUNCH) • Group meeting with men beneficiaries (6 men) • Meeting with local health officer • Visit to affected area	• 08:00-09:30 • 09:30-10:30 • 10:30-12:00 • 13:00-14:30 • 14:30-15:30 • 15:30-16:30	2 June 2013 (Sun)
• Working session with Stakeholders (IOM, MSF, World Vision, CPU, Christian Care, Care, etc) • Travel to Harare (including 5 branch members/volunteers) • Preparations for Lessons Learned Workshop	• 09:00-11:00 • 11:00-15:00	3 June 2013 (Mon)
• Lessons Learned Workshop (includes HQ staff, branch & volunteers)	• 08:00-17:00	4 June 2013 (Tues)
• Lessons Learned Workshop (LUNCH) • Branch & volunteers travel back to ? • Meeting with National Disaster Response Forums	• 08:00-12:00 • Afternoon • 14:00-17:00	5 June 2013 (Wed)
• Debrief with NS & IFRC on preliminary findings • Depart from Harare	• 09:00-11:00 • 11:00+	6 June 2013 (Thurs)
Present the draft report		20 June 2013
Comments and feedback on draft report		20-24 June 2013
Final report		25 June 2013

8. Review Team

The preferred team composition will consist of two or three persons, each with clear roles and responsibilities defined. The team members will have the following skills:

- Experience in performing reviews
- Experience and technical skills in the field of disaster management and public health in emergencies
- Strong analytical skills and ability to put together and present findings in a clear way, draw conclusions and make recommendations
- Excellent writing skills in English

9. Budget for review mission

TBD. This is to include available funds remaining for lessons learned & internal evaluation budget lines.



Annex 2: Persons interviewed as part of the DREF review process

National Society Staff		
Maxwell Phiri	Secretary General	Harare
Karikoga Kutadzaushe	Operations Manager	Harare
Eunice	Logistics Officer	Harare
William Mhlani	Assistant Logistics Officer	Harare
Pamila Torto	PMER Officer	Harare
Desmond Mudombi	DM Coordinator	Harare
Hope Munyari	Assistant DM Officer	Harare
Tapiwa Chaduka	Assistant DM Officer	Harare
Markson Naibe	Provincial Programme Officer	Midlands Province
Fungi Maregeche	Provincial Programme Officer	Masvingo Province
Jeffta Matosi	Provincial Board Member	Masvingo Province
Bota Chivamba Branch Executive Committee		
Grace Chekew	Chairwoman	Zaka, Masvingo
Raymond Mujena	Secretary	Zaka, Masvingo
Clemence Chikowo	Vice Chairperson	Zaka, Masvingo
Sheilla Musareva	Treasurer	Zaka, Masvingo
Plaxedes Mugani	Vice Secretary	Zaka, Masvingo
Interviews with Government stakeholders		
Ms. Sibusisiwe Ndlovu	Deputy Director, Civil Protection Organisation	Harare
Ms. Chitiyo	Provincial Administrator	Midlands Province
Mr. Mtetwa	District Administrator	Mberengwa District, Midlands Province
Mr T. Chivanga	District Administrator	Zaka District, Masvingo Province
Focus group discussions in Mberengwa Community (Midlands Province)		
Women Beneficiaries (8): Sicelesile Moyo Rita Khumalo Francisica Marienirrie Ezina Siziba Vignia Mabunda Eta Dewya Claudia Chiri Ena Ndaba	All women had their houses fully or partially destroyed. Many lost their household items, crops and food stores, educational material and in one case, money. Children got sick as a result of the rain. A number of agencies responded including the Army, Christian Care, World Vision, Save the Children, Oxfam and Helpline. RC distributed shelter two days after the storm. Food was a gap. The women felt that everyone who received was deserving, however others who were deserving did not receive anything. Three villages did not receive any assistance, even though severely affected.	
Volunteers (7): Frank Ndlovu (M) Mombuso Gambiza (M) Farai Moyo (M) Golden Ncube (M) Ruben Zhou (M) Farai Bwanya (M) Chance Ohewa (M)	Volunteers of affected communities – all were involved in erecting shelters for the affected communities. None received per diem for their work. All were first time volunteers for the RC. Tents were easy to erect, however most who received tarpaulins didn't know how to use them. Household size was an issue, some families are very big and in some instances it is not culturally appropriate for mixed gender to share. WatSan not addressed, people taking water from polluted streams.	
Village Head focus group (4): Village Head A. Mugumi (M) Village Head D. Tigere (M) Village Head O. Tuna (M)	Village Heads telephoned to Chief, who contacted District Administrator (DA). Worked closely with the DAs office in assessment and id destroyed houses. No EW system in place for hailstorms. Drought experienced for the past 5 years. NFIs received from RC	



Village Head E. Machona (M)	were appropriate. The concern now is food.	
Focus group discussions in Zaka Community (Masvingo Province)		
Women Beneficiaries (7): Etina Haruzivishe Ester Mulcodi Sarudzai Mbengo Muchenjeri Blantina Miriam Saul Anna Mubalco Saraphina Mbanyele	Representatives of affected community. All women had their houses partially or fully destroyed and lost household items in the floods and received from the RC various NFIs including blankets, buckets, soap, kitchen sets and cement for latrine construction. All families had vulnerable family members, which qualified them for assistance. Overall, communities were happy as they would have to carry the burden of those affected. Gaps include borehole rehabilitation, more latrines coverage, food and livelihoods and DRR/preparedness.	
Male Beneficiaries (6): Mafias Mapato Steven Sibauda Soul Toperoso Fammel Mbuaya Muchaiwa Muzivareva Francis Bwanuo	While most had their houses destroyed and lost household items, two of the men interviewed didn't lose anything in the floods. All had vulnerable family members. Men reported struggle to sustain their families and are consuming food that could be salvaged, causal labour, cattle herding, begging and relying on support from family and community members. Assistance includes NFIs including kitchen sets, blankets, buckets and cement. One person received a tent.	
Village Head (5): Chief Nyamutare (M) Village Head Clara (F) Village Head Mutaki (M) Village Head Chanya Jaston (M) Village Head Maturu Jona (M)	Mobilise the community, Village Heads collect information by phone from unreachable areas. Village Heads were involved in id families whose homes have been destroyed and prioritising the most vulnerable. Very happy with the speed of RC response. Difficulties accessing hard to reach areas, information from remote areas came late. Requested guidance on developing contingency plans, were not aware of any Govt or District Civil Protection.	
Volunteers (6): Charles Margere (M) Mapasa Jaremba (M) Lydia Chikosi (F) Olivia Ruhinga (F) Syodi Chwamba (F) Petropilla Mujena (F)	Volunteers were involved in a variety of tasks including assessment, community mobilisation, sanitation, health and hygiene promotion, brick making and construction of pit latrines. Volunteers felt that assistance was timely and appropriate, however there was not enough assistance for all those in need. Challenge in terms of long distances travelled for assessment. Latrine construction delayed due to crop cultivation being a higher priority. Volunteers had to use their own food to share with construction workers, other volunteers and elderly beneficiaries.	
IFRC country office		
Oforbuike Nwobodo	Country Representative	Harare
Julita Manyere	Senior Finance Officer	Harare
Cecil Maposa	Logistics Officer	Harare
Rumbidzai Matewe	PMER Officer	Harare



Annex 3: Timeline of the DREF operation

-Week 5 (6 – 12/12/12)	Stocks in warehouse Norcross contribution to IFRC CBHFA for volunteers (7-12-12) Manicaland Monitoring visits and community meeting Mat North 120 volunteers trained in DM and First Aid 160 participants trained in PHHE training
-Week 4 (13 -19/12/12)	Hailstorms in Mt Darwin, 56 families affected DCPU meeting Mt Darwin
-Week 3 (20 – 26/12/12)	Hailstorms in Chadereka, Mash Central – 20 households affected Assessments undertaken - Chadereka
-Week 2 (27/12 – 2/1/13)	Input to weekly update Hailstorms, Chivi District - Masvingo Prepositioning of tents - Beibridge, Mat South National Society considered DREF request
-Week 1 (3 – 9/1/13)	Flooding in Mbire National Society considered DREF request
Disaster	
Week 1 (10 – 16/1/13)	Flood assessment with the District CPO – Mbire Masacent District Hailstorms - Mash West – 8 families affected Hailstorms Hurungwe, Nyamakate – 8 families affected Report of th disaster and identification of victims Floods hit Beibridge – call for help 8 January 2013 – First reports to our province 5:05 (Manicaland, Chipinge) 15 January 2013 – Call from Deputy Director of National CPU - Maroone people; Nyanga: Meeting with PA and Provincial CPU Manicaland
Week 2 (17 – 23/1/13)	Assessment with CPU - Mat North Alarm raised for Gokwe Initial assessment First update shared with zone and OCHA Initial updates on disaster Hailstorms in Bindura Nyanga assessment Disaster coordination meeting Prepositioning in Chipange
Week 3 (24 -30/1/13)	Initial call for DREF Distribution of tents, water makers, jerry cans and request for relief items from headquarters - Mat North Budget formulated for DREF request Provincial CPO development plan meeting, Mash West Submission of returns Assessment continues, beneficiary registration and update reports - Manicaland
Week 4 (31/1 – 6/2/13)	First DREF draft received by Africa zone 2/2/13 Feedback on DREF draft from Africa zone to region 3/2/13 Submit FED budget to zone finance unit (ZFU) for validation
Week 5 (7 – 13/2/13)	Flood DREF approved 7/2/13 Response to hailstorms - Bindura Cash request from received from Geneva Distribution of NFIs, updated reports, PHHE - Manicaland
Week 6 (14 – 20/2/13)	Pitching tent assessment - Bindura/Chivero/ Garikai/ Chinaridzo – Mash Cen-



	tral Cash request made 17/02/13, transfer to National Society Funds received at ZRCS headquarters bank account on 18/2/13 District CPU meeting - Muzarabam
Week 7 (21 – 27/02/13)	Assessments undertaken in Beibridge – Mat South Assessments of the damage by the rains – Masheasi Wedza Visit affected Provinces – Beibridge, Mat South Updated reports and further assessments and monitoring visit – Mat North
Week 8 (28/02 – 6/3/13)	Monitoring visits headquarters – Beibridge, Mat South
Week 9 (7 - 13/3/13)	Second assessment Gokwe District – Midlands Distribution of tents, blankets and NFIs – Beibridge, Mat South Weekly updates on going PHHE training, support and supervisions, update reports - Manicaland
Week 10 (14 – 20/3/13)	Agreement, timeframe and guidelines of the programme shared in March 2013
	Prepositioning of first aid materials for referendum Submission of returns from all provinces Constitutional referendum NS DREF returns submitted to IFRC on 20 March 2013 PHHE, coordination meetings, media and stakeholder tour, update reports - Manicaland
Week 11 (21 – 27/3/13)	Shelter training (21 – 27 March) for ZRCS by Africa zone shelter coordinator 2 volunteers trained in shelter construction – Mash West DREF materials to the affected district – Wadza, Mash East Tents pitched and shelters constructed - Wedza, Mash East DMC and ADM monitoring visit – Midlands and Mat North Distribution of NFIs – Zaka, Masvingo Assessments, Gwanda – Mat South
Week 12 (28/3 – 3/4/13)	Distribution of NFIs (tents, blankets, kitchen sets) - Gwanda Submission of financial returns - Masvingo
Week 13 (4 – 10/4/13)	Second operational update report – Headquarters Cement delivered - Zaka, Masvingo Support visit by Headquarters and IFRC Alarm from Mberengwa – initial assessment undertaken Construction of shelter – Mberengwa Distribution of NFIs – Mberengwa Distribution of NFIs (tents, blankets, kitchen sets) - Gwanda
Week 14 (11 – 17/4/13)	Finance field support visit – Masvingo Latrine construction – Zaka, Masvingo Submission of returns Receive materials for toilet construction to affected schools
Week 15 (18 – 24/4/13)	Internal DREF review workshop Hailstorm in Mwenezi Delivery of cement – Mat North Distribution of NFIs, PHHE, update reports – Chipinge, Manicaland Received ITNs in April Distribution of soap, buckets and kitchen utensils – Mat North
Week 16 (25 – 31/4/13)	Latrine construction continues – Zaka, Masvingo
Week 17 (1 – 6/5/13)	DREF review and lessons learned workshop Operations update number 2



Annex 4: Agenda for lessons learned workshop

Purpose of the workshop:

- To examine if the DREF operation has achieved its goal, objectives and expected results.
- To assess key achievements, challenges and areas of success, as well as areas for improvement within the operation and make recommendations to replicate or improve future disasters response.
- To identify lessons learned and good practices for sharing.

Opening ceremony

Introductions

Timeline of the operation

A participative exercise, where participants contribute their input into the operation

This exercise is designed to help refresh memory of the operational timeframe, what went well and where there were delays or blockages

Tea Break

Participatory group work

On a flip chart discuss in small groups what went well, what were the challenges were and your recommendations for each topic.

After thirty minutes, you should swap groups and discuss another topic.

What recommendations and conclusions can we draw from this operation? What would you do differently? What are the lessons learned?

Findings will be discussed in plenary, and other participants will have a chance to contribute their own thoughts

Lunch

DREF guidelines

Short presentation on DREF guidelines, what is eligible and what is not eligible under DREF, when to use a DREF or an Emergency Appeal, templates and the new plan of action

Feedback from the Participatory group work

Tea Break

Participant evaluation of the workshop

Evaluations of the DREF review methodology (general discussion to improve the methodology to evaluate DREF operations) – participant feedback template

Closing ceremony



Annex 5: Participants recommendations on the DREF operation

Topic	Strengths	Challenges	Recommendations
Early Warning	Weather reports Accurate Informed in advance	No pre-warning of extent of hailstorm in Mberengwa, as it is not a traditional disaster prone area	1. District emergency manual should be updated to include hailstorms with early warning, simulation exercises etc.
Monitoring	Local authorities (CPO) monitored the situation, RC involved Provincial and HQ monitoring Volunteer based involved in monitoring Beneficiaries registers available	HQ and Provinces financial constraints to monitor major activities and all areas No standard tools for monitor and guidelines	1. Include monitoring costs in the budget 2. Need for assessment tool for selection criteria 3. Include sufficient PMER funds in the budget when planning 4. Standardise operation procedures during start up meeting: ZRCS PPOs, HQs and IFRC Country and Region office
Beneficiary feedback mechanisms	First-hand information from beneficiaries Interaction during information dissemination, question and answer sessions Good volunteer base for beneficiaries to communicate their complaints through Red Cross works well with stakeholders at all levels	Expectations are high (you give kitchen utensils and beneficiaries ask where is the food) Timeframes for assessments – initial assessments don't always capture all the needs Feedback not documented Feedback mechanism not well structured	1. Training on communication for field staff in SPHERE and principles for disaster response 2. Community involvement in the selection process 3. Encourage volunteers to strengthen capacity to effectively communicate with beneficiaries 4. Need to document feedback so as to strengthen the feedback mechanism 5. Feedback mechanism must be formalised and well structured
Logistics	Volunteer commitment Storage facilities in Midlands Province Prepositioned stock IFRC country office logistics support ZRCS first responder	Delay in receiving funds from the IFRC country office Goods ordered on time, however delays in delivery Damaged roads Inadequate storage space the national levels and provincial level NS does not have appropriate vehicles Relevance of items for the African context (pots, shelter kits) Access to regional stock in a timely manner	1. Prepositioning of stock 2. Procure locally where possible 3. Consider expanding national warehouse capacity 4. Train national society staff in warehouse management 5. Improve speedy information sharing in order to address problems/issues as they arise 6. Logistics contingency plan 7. Insure best value for money and culturally appropriate items 8. Have appropriate vehicles for size and terrain
Speed	Good volunteer base, in some areas volunteers already trained in CBHFA programme Good information sharing and coordination Good partnership with Civil Protection Organisation NS speed in response in some areas was between 4 – 8 hours	Slow feedback – response and resources Lengthy procurement processes	1. Prepositioning of resources (NFIs) at the Provincial level 2. Disaster fund at the national society level 3. Bilateral networks for disaster response 4. Cultivate networks with suppliers 5. Waivers to procurement processes for emergency response 6. Pre-disaster agreements with suppliers
NFIs	Guidelines of distributions	Inadequate resources	1. Plan for culturally appropriate items



	were followed Distributions was done based on needs	Some items not culturally appropriate (shelter tool kit and kitchen set) Timeliness of distribution of NFIs	(rather than standard IFRC items) 2. Effective use of the hierarchy of needs
Water and Sanitation	Operation in areas with CBHFA volunteers Volunteers knew the right information to disseminate to communities Community health workers have a strong role in the communities Permanent latrines constructed	No access to clean water No access to sanitation facilities at household or institutional level In some areas no information about water and sanitation	1. Water and sanitation needs should be planned from the outset of the operation 2. Training for communities on alternative methods of water treatment e.g. boiling 3. PHHE training for volunteers as part of disaster preparedness 4. Construction of more latrines and more sanitation coverage 5. Information dissemination and health clubs in communities and schools
Volunteers	Volunteers involved at all levels of the operation Good existing volunteer base in all areas Volunteers involved in Community Action Planning processes	Volunteers didn't receive any payment (this was used on shelter training) Volunteers require resources including transport, stationery, communications, visibility	1. Increase the number of volunteers mobilised and increase their skills 2. Emergency volunteer allowance 3. Volunteer costs should be budgeted in the DREF, as well as NS contingency planning 4. Improve volunteer/stakeholder relations particularly with community leaders, who assist volunteers with motivation and recognition
Coordination	Participation of all CPO members (headquarters, Provinces etc.) Regular updates Volunteers actively participated Interaction with the country office Participation in the clusters Coordination with the local leadership	Volunteers not available when needed Information sharing from grassroots to HQ Inadequate resources for coordination	1. Recruit and train more volunteers 2. Regular two-way updates from Provinces to HQ and HQ back to Provinces 3. Develop a basic template for data collection and share with other Government and non government partners 4. Continue sharing information with the clusters 5. Deliberate coordination meetings with key stakeholders 6. Include a budget line in DREF for exit meeting so that communities, local leaders and district understand what will happen moving forward after the DREF
Health	PHHE training provided ITNs distributed as part of the operation	Need further support in Health activities Delay in distribution of ITNs Not enough training for volunteers in PHHE No IEC materials available	1. Plan and budget for health needs, including trained staff/vols and IEC materials 2. Training in PHHE needs to be expanded 3. Simultaneous assessment on PSS and rapid community health
Finance	NS managed to utilise own resources for assessment and distribution of NFIs	Delay in disbursement of funds affected operational implementation Lack of understanding of budg-	1. Timely release of relief funds to support the operation 2. Meeting on finance issues should continue between IFRC, HQ and field



International Federation
of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

	Cost sharing benefit with CPO and other partners	et guidelines resulted in the rejection of acquittals Delay of returns from the field Change of needs during operation affected budget line items DREF and long term funds combined in return (challenge in accessing the next cash request)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Budget should be reviewed when necessary during the operation 4. Strengthen capacities of Provincial finance teams to understand HQ requirements 5. Strengthen HQ understanding of IFRC requirements
Communications	<p>Informed decisions Timely and appropriate intervention Community involvement Avoid duplication Information sharing with stakeholders including CPO Red Cross is well known for relief operations and a member of the CPO</p>	<p>Delay in the disbursement of resources, i.e. financial and material Limited community participation Non effective communication from the community during the assessment period Inaccessibility of the affected areas (roads etc.) Chain of communication for the affected area to the province, HQ and IFRC is too long</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Beneficiary communication should be increased to ensure communities are adequately sensitised 2. Increased visibility of the Red Cross work 3. Parties in the DREF operation should treat it as an emergency 4. Installation of VHF radios in vehicles 5. Training/ information flow on DREF operations should be stepped up
Distribution	<p>Volunteers readily available to assist in assessment, response and monitoring Distributions were transparent Beneficiary register (good record keeping) Availability of prepositioned material Needs assessment determined type/amount material Involvement of beneficiaries (not part of the problem, but part of the solution) Involvement of all stakeholders in assessment (triangulation and validation) Trained volunteers in shelter construction available Acceptability of the Red Cross improved accessibility</p>	<p>Not enough/appropriate material – Gender, health, PSS, food, thatching Delayed response due to late disbursement of funds and materials No community preparedness or contingency plans Aid is hijacked for political exploitation Coordinator of response agencies – duplication and non-standard relief packages Inadequate resources for continuous assessments (CPO and NS) Rigidity of the DREF funds Volunteers were required to work long days and suffered burnout Accessibility of some areas delayed response</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use SPHERE standards 2. Timely disbursement of funds/prepositioned stock 3. Train/support CPO on disaster response 4. Capacity building in disaster response and preparedness 5. CPO should take central role in coordination 6. DREF funding policies should be more responsive, especially within the funding period 7. Rotation of volunteers (availability of funds) 8. Capacity building for volunteers (disaster response and distribution)
Planning	<p>Skilled human resources Tents and blankets were prepositioned in provinces</p>	<p>Not all volunteers and staff are trained in disaster management Mobilisation of volunteers for disaster management Mobilisation of volunteers for disaster response Transport Expenses incurred before DREF</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More training in disaster management (including DREF processes) 2. Provision of adequate transport in order to access hard to reach areas



		approved were rejected	
--	--	------------------------	--

Annex 6: Participants in the lessons learned workshop

	Name	Title	Area/District	Role in Floods Response
1	Julita Manyere	Senior Finance Of-	Country Office,	Finance



International Federation
of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

		ficie	IFRC	
2	Tandiwe Ganyam	Finance Assistance	Country Office, IFRC	Finance
3	Rudo Tamangan	Programme and Finance Officer	Norcross – Coun- try office	Finance
4	Leken Cube	Provincial Pro- gramme Officer	Midlands Province	Internal and Exter- nal coordination of operation
5	Jephson Chikuni	Volunteer	Masvingo	Assessment, moni- toring and erecting of shelter
6	Kamutiga Clemente	Volunteer	Mash West	First Aid training and DM
7	Pamela Torto	PMER officer	HQ	Reporting
8	Amon Choba	PPO	Mash West	Coordination and Reporting
9	Pedzisai Mukora	Finance Assistant	HQ	Finance
10	Cynthia Dube	Volunteer	Mat North	Distribution of NFIs, monitoring visits
11	Aumbo Thandaban- tu	Volunteer	Mat North	Mobilise volunteers
12	Marshal Mukuvare	FS officer	HQ	Input into DREF docs
13	Josphat Muchowbe	Volunteer Instruc- tor	Mash Central	Assessment and CPO
14	Might Machekecha	Volunteer	Midlands	Tent pitching, as- sessment
15	Asvin Gorereza	Volunteer Instruc- tor	Midlands	Distribution of NFIs, erecting tents/shelter, as- sessment
16	Tapiwa Chaduka	Assistant DM of- ficer	HQ	Develop DREF docs and operation im- plementation
17	Rawgarirai Mahachi	Health and Social Services officer	HQ	Healthcare
18	P. Munjoma	Provincial Manag- er	Manicaland	Coordination, as- sessment and op- eration implemen- tation
19	J. Sheube	District Pro- gramme Coordina- tor	Chipinze	Field visits, coordi- nation of volun- teers
20	Karikoga Kutadzau- she	Operations Man- ager	HQ	Overall coordina- tion and implemen- tation of operation
21	Desmond Mudom- bi	Disaster Manage- ment Coordinator	HQ	Design and Imple- mentation of the DREF operation
22	William Mhcani	Logistics	HQ	Warehousing
23	Collins Kundishora	Programme Ac-	Mash East	Prepared returns



		countant		
24	Hope Munyari	Assistant DMO	HQ	Internal and external coordination and implementation
25	Siphiwethina Tshuwo	Provincial Manager	Matabeleland South	Relief distribution
26	Regis Moyo	District Programme Coordinator	Mat South	Assessment and distribution
27	Romeo Nzamhete	Volunteer District Projects Coordinator	Mash Central	Assessment and distribution
28	Thomas Keyers	Volunteer	Mash East	Assessment and distribution
29	Joalons Zendeza	Volunteer	Mash East	Assessment and distribution
30	Rumbidzai Matewe	Performance and Accountability	IFRC Country Office	Planning and reporting
31	Ernest Maruzo	Provincial Programmes Manager	Mash Central	Coordinating response
32	Zvandalzaitirwa Mahanga	Volunteer	Zaka, Masvingo	Community Mobilisation
33	Munyanyi Emmison	Provincial Accountant	Masvingo	Finance
34	T. Valo	PPo	Mat North	Planning, response and reporting
35	Morris Machawira	Finance Manager	HQ	Financial reporting and budgeting

Annex 7: Lessons Learned Workshop – participant evaluation form

DREF for Zimbabwe – 5 June 2013

Overall, how useful was the workshop for you? (please circle one answer)

1 – poor 2 – average 3- good - 3 4 – useful -20 5 – excellent - 8

Comments:



The programme was so good and the facilitators
This kind of workshop should be held after every end of the programme
It was very useful especially getting to understand the DREF requirement
Useful in terms of deviating of funds for activities not in initial DREF plan
Enjoyed the interaction and participatory approach. This ensures that all participants contributed.
It was an eye opener to all, making it important to understand each other's roles and responsibilities
The duration was too short
If you could continue to have such training with volunteers as well
Sharing a few practical examples of scenarios in the field could have made the workshop excellent
Pertinent information shared for planning and implementation
More time was needed to cover in depth the requirements and implementation of DREF
Good planning tool for future projects to come
Very useful in improving my understanding of DREF, its use and application
Points out issues which need to be redressed in the future
It was a rare opportunity to improve DREF management skills
Very useful in that I now know that DREF requirements and how reconciled funds from other projects affect DREF
The workshop was an eye opener – as a volunteer, I learned a lot
Educative, informative of the DREF programme. I hope that the recommendations will be considered in due course
The time frame should be extended
Highlighted major areas of concern
A bit on the rushed side. The workshop should have been more than one day long. Some participants left during sessions because they had to go back the same day
There is need of DREF management skills
I learned more about DREF
It was good
Keep it up. But more time for such a workshop
It gives us the programme overview and recommendations
It was very useful, more time is needed in such workshops

Was the workshop...(please circle one answer)

Too long Too short – 19 Enough time – 12

How do you rate the facilitators?

1 2 3 4 – 14 5 – 17

How well was the workshop prepared?

1 2 3 4 – 14 5 – 17

What was the most useful session and why?

Most useful session was DRE presentation and general discussion
Fund disbursements and channels
The open discussion involving groups – strengths, weaknesses and recommendations x 2
Very useful – what costs constitute DREF
Group work and plenary and background of DREF
Timeline



Group work, particularly the finance which focused on the disbursement of DREF funds
Information of DREF requirements
The group work led to meaningful discussions
Group discussions as we learn from other provinces
The group work as it gave an opportunity for sharing what worked and how to improve next DREF and share lessons learned
Feedback from all people involved in the project
All the sessions, the programme as well structured
DREF presentation clarified issues
The session on finance and how it affects the flow of funds from Geneva to the field
All sessions were equally important
Access and use of the DREF funds
Logistics and finance – exposes the weaknesses of all stakeholders including IFRC and NS
Group work
Discussions on topics which affect DREF funds release systems
Disaster response, flexibility of procedures and early dispatch of funds and items
Finance, delay in funds release owing to tight procedures. Useful because funding determines time-lines and quality of intervention
Group discussions because everyone is mixed (HQ, provinces, volunteers)
Finance x 3
Group discussions – we learn more from others and the facilitating team
All the sessions were very useful cause the were the daily happenings within the provinces

How was the food?

1 2 – 1 3 – 6 4 – 9 5 – 9

How could we improve the next DREF lessons learned workshop?

Evaluation
Should be longer e.g. 3 days
Allow enough time to enable all groups to discuss and reach a common understanding
More time for workshop
Give opportunity for presentations from those involved in the operation, instead of just answering questions
Include a practical session on preparing a DREF update and bulletin
Provision of stationery
More time should be created for such a workshop
If it could be done in three days
It would be better if the workshop was held when the report from the field was ready. This will help sharing of expenses
All was well but we may need to agree in areas with gaps and have one message to put forward
Implement the recommendations particularly on systems review to make DREF more responsive and relevant to national society needs
Have workshops in between implementation to share before the project ends
More time required
Provision of the programme on time ensures adequate information is also brought from provinces
It would make more sense to have every player involved from the word go
More time, use of images from the DREF operation on flash back
The workshop should be conducted in the area where the evaluation are being done or where the activities were conducted



Clear guidelines on application and use of DREF funds and how to overcome fund release bottle-necks

Try to have more time

Involvement of the field staff necessary

Allocate 2 days to deliberate on various factors that affected implementation

Increase time and provide possible solutions

Needs more time allocation and keep up involvement of the provinces and volunteers

Timeframe should be improved by setting programme in time so as to improve our skills

Give us more days

Enough time for discussions

Enough time, flexible venue

Proving better venue for everyone to be at even a day before the day of the workshop

Timeframe