

www.ifrc.org
Saving lives,
changing minds.

Emergency Plan of Action Final Report

Lesotho: Food Insecurity MDRLS004

 International Federation
of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

Emergency Appeal: MDRLS004	Glide No: OT-2016-000005-LSO
Date of Issue: 31 March 2017	Timeframe: 22 January - 31 December 2016 (12 months)
Appeal Budget: CHF 735, 736	Appeal Coverage: CHF 602,971 (82% coverage)
DREF Grant: CHF 84,369	No. of People Assisted: 9,000 (1,800HH)
Host National Society: The Lesotho Red Cross Society (LRCS) allocated nine (9) staff members and 30 volunteers to the implementation of this emergency response in three districts—Qacha's Nek, Thaba Tseka, and Mafeteng	
Red Cross Red Crescent Movement partners actively involved in the operation: Monaco Red Cross, the Netherlands Red Cross, Norwegian Red Cross, Swedish Red Cross, Japanese Red Cross and British Red Cross	
Other partner organizations actively involved in the operation: The Government of Lesotho (GoL), through the Disaster Management Authority, coordinated the emergency response at country level. WFP, FAO, and other UN and humanitarian partners were also active in the implementation of the response.	

Appeal history

- This Emergency Appeal was launched on 22 January 2016 to enable the IFRC to support the Lesotho Red Cross Society (LRCS) to respond to the food security needs of 4,500 drought affected beneficiaries for six months. The strategy entailed the immediate provision of food assistance (carried out through cash transfer programming) and strengthening community livelihoods in three districts of Mafeteng, Thaba Tseka and Qacha's Nek to allow vulnerable households to meet their basic food needs.
- Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF): CHF 84,369 was initially allocated from the Federation's DREF to support the National Society to start up the operations by meeting immediate needs of affected people.
- [Operations Update 1](#) was issued on 8 February 2016
- [Operations Update 2](#) was issued on 26 February 2016
- [Operations Update 3](#) was issued on 06 April 2016
- [Operations Update 4](#) was issued on 20 July 2016



Beneficiary training and registration on the Vodacom mobile network.

This is the final report of the Emergency Appeal operation that was launched by Lesotho Red Cross Society in response to the impacts of the El Niño induced drought.

IFRC, on behalf of Lesotho Red Cross, expresses its sincere gratitude to the British Red Cross, Monaco Red Cross, the Netherlands Red Cross, Norwegian Red Cross, Japanese Red Cross and Swedish Red Cross for their support to this Emergency Appeal. Appreciation is also extended to the volunteers of the LRCS for their commitment towards the implementation of this response.

A. Situation analysis

Description of the disaster

At the launch of the Emergency Appeal (EA), Lesotho was in the midst of a food insecurity crisis that had impacted an estimated 534,502 individuals across the country. At the peak of the lean season, food insecurity in rural areas reached around 48 per cent of the population, i.e. 679,437 people (RIASCO, 2016). Lesotho last had normal rainfall between April and May 2015. This made it difficult for the country to be engaged in winter ploughing due to scarce moisture. The first rains were expected between August, and November, but it is reported that vegetation conditions experienced in November 2015 were at their lowest in 15 years. According to the December 2015 FEWSNET report the strong El Niño event enhanced probabilities of below-normal rainfall and continued dry conditions in Southern Africa. Lesotho's onset of rains was delayed by 30-40 days affecting land preparation and other agricultural activities. The prolonged dry spells also affected the few planted crops in the country. The drought condition also negatively affected livestock conditions because of poor pastures and limited availability of water for consumption by the livestock. Other crops such as sorghum, beans, peas and wheat were also affected by the dry spells, and this affected the annual harvests. The drought situation resulted in a 51 percent cereal deficit of the required 247,000 metric tonnes annually. Out of 10 districts the five hard to reach districts in Lesotho were the most affected including Qacha's Nek, Mokhotlong, Thaba Tseka, Quthing and Mafeteng.

Contributing to the food insecurity situation were the high prices of staple foods in many areas of the country, exceeding the five-year average which reduced the purchasing power of households, relative to their food requirements and access to markets. By the time the emergency Appeal was launched, food prices had increased, with maize meal up from LSL 3.00 to LSL 6.90 per kg and these prices were expected to continue increasing mainly due to the increasing demand, high import prices from South Africa as well as the inflationary effect of increases in fuel prices. The UNOCHA Southern Africa Humanitarian Outlook of November 2015 attributed the increase in food prices to the dependency of Lesotho on South Africa's production (70 percent of cereal consumed in Lesotho). Compounding the situation was the fact that the increase in prices was not complimented by an improvement in incomes of the populace. Thus, this affected the purchasing power of the affected households. According to the Lesotho vulnerability and capacity assessment (LVCA), in 2015 the purchasing powers of the incomes were expected to decline by 80-120 percent using the price of maize meal.

Based on the prevailing situation in the country, in December 2015 the Lesotho Prime Minister declared a state emergency and requested development partners to intervene and support the government efforts in dealing with the impacts of the drought. In response to the declaration, LRCS with the support of the IFRC launched an Emergency Appeal for 664,073 Swiss francs to support 900 households (4,500 beneficiaries) affected by the drought.

Summary of response

IFRC launched an Emergency Appeal in January 2016, on behalf of the LRCS, which sought to meet the immediate needs of a total population of 900 households (4,500 beneficiaries) in three of the drought affected districts Mafeteng, Thaba Tseka, and Qacha's Nek. The support rendered was through a cash-based intervention of CHF 68 per household as well as subsidized agricultural inputs support. The LRCS received, a total amount of **CHF 84,639** that was allocated from the IFRC's Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF) for assessments and to provide the initial support to the affected communities.

As the drought emergency progressed and the number of affected individuals increased, LRCS conducted a market assessment in March 2016 to assess the operation's response approach and efficiency of its chosen cash transfer programming (CTP) modality. The market assessment concluded that the cash transfer value per household could be reduced from CHF 68 to CHF 35, which would allow LRCS to target 1,800 HH (9,000 beneficiaries) rather than the original 4,500 beneficiaries. As such, LRCS issued an operations update in April 2016 to increase the targeted beneficiaries and revise the EPoA budget. The Operations Update issued in April 2016, sought to increase the Appeal budget to a total amount of **CHF 735,736** and targeting 1,800 HH (9,000 beneficiaries) in three of the most affected districts for food insecurity across the country.

The choice of conducting a cash-based intervention was based on the results of the Lesotho Vulnerability Assessment Committee report (LVAC) which recommended the use of cash transfers to support affected households in addressing their immediate food requirements and avoiding the adoption of negative coping mechanisms. To complement this initiative and build household resilience, LRCS supported the implementation of medium-term livelihoods support through the provision of seeds and climate smart agricultural training.

Overview of Red Cross Red Crescent Movement in country

LRCS receives technical support from in-country Partner National Societies (PNS) which include Norwegian, British and Japanese Red Cross. The geographic proximity of the IFRC's Country Cluster Support Team (CCST) office in Pretoria has allowed frequent communication and consultation with the LRCS. The LRCS received constant technical support from the IFRC Operations Manager for the duration of the operation.

Overview of non-RCRC actors in country

The LRCS also coordinated with the government and its departments at National and District level in the implementation of the operation. The Government of Lesotho leads the overall coordination of disaster response through national coordination meetings hosted by the Disaster Management Authority (DMA) under the Office of the Prime Minister and LRCS also participates in these meetings. The District Disaster Management Team (DDMT) is the coordination platform for partner institutions (UN agencies, WFP, INGO's, NGOs) along with the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security. It was established for humanitarian response strategic planning (with WFP as leading agency) and policy set-ups in funding and food distribution. During the implementation of the operation, LRCS got support from different ministries like, Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security, Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation, Ministry of Health, Department of Rural Water Supply and Ministry of Education for the various trainings that were conducted.

Proposed strategy

The operation sought to assist the affected communities through the following interventions:

Immediate intervention: Support to 9000 food insecure beneficiaries (1,800 households) in Mafeteng, Thaba Tseka and Qacha's Nek Districts through:

- Distribution of food baskets worth CHF 35 per household for two months in February and March.
- A monthly mobile cash transfer of CHF 35 per household per month over four months. The transfer was designed to meet the immediate food needs for 5 members in a household. The cash transfer value was calculated based on the existing prices of a standard food basket (50kg bag of maize, 7,5kg beans, 4.5 litres cooking oil). This was done working in partnership with the Vodacom Lesotho.
- Health and hygiene activities which were focusing on promotion of the use of safe and clean water by the communities to reduce the incidences of diarrheal diseases. The health intervention also included the case to case referral system of malnourished beneficiaries to health centers for therapeutic feeding.

Medium-term intervention: Livelihood support to 9000 beneficiaries (1800 HH) through:

- Support for increased agricultural production through the provision of agricultural inputs which included hybrid maize and bean seeds, provision of chemical fertilizers and tools for winter cropping.
- Provision of climate smart agricultural training to 30 lead farmers with each lead farmer being responsible for cascading the newly acquired knowledge and skills to 10 farmers. The training covered the following farming techniques which were aimed at building the communities resilience to the impacts of drought, seed selection, inter cropping, intensifying mulching, rotational cropping, soil and moisture conserving practices like keyhole and trench gardening.
- Provision of Climate change and adaptation trainings on establishing and promoting the share of community indigenous knowledge, practices and looking at the fuelling factors for the climate change, related possible response mechanisms, mapping their resource, capacities and hazardous issues leading to climate change.
- Developmental Initiatives in which beneficiaries were engaged to participate in small development activities within their community. Each registered household would volunteer one member to take part in the activities a set period of about 20 days. The activities included construction of community dams, gully reclamation, silt trap

construction, tree planting, reseeding of rangelands and soil and water conservation activities. These activities are also aimed to enhancing resilience capacity within communities

Beneficiary selection

A community-based selection approach was applied to the beneficiary selection process, which gave the communities the autonomy to select the most vulnerable within their context. It also allowed them to select people based on their own definition of vulnerability. The selection criteria applied within the communities was consistent with the IFRC and LRCS’ commitment to strive for diversity, gender equality, and to ensure non-discrimination in the provision of services to the most vulnerable. The intervention primarily targeted the chronically ill, those with disabilities, the elderly, households with malnourished children <5, pregnant and lactating mothers, female- and child-headed households, orphans or vulnerable children (OVCs), labour constrained households, and the very poor income quartiles.

The EA reached out to a total number of 1,800 household which were equally distributed amongst the three districts each one having 600 households in total. Of the registered households, 791 were male headed households and 1009 were female headed households. The table below indicates the selected beneficiaries according to selection criteria:

Categories of vulnerable HH	No. HH
Child-, elderly-, and women-headed HH	83
HH with members who are chronically ill (people living with HIV and those on ART and TB treatment)	58
Vulnerable households (do not own or have access such as livestock and agricultural implements)	1,659
TOTAL HH	1,800

Financial Summary

The Lesotho Red Cross Society had initially proposed to meet the needs of the affected communities through a proposed budget and Appeal of **CHF 735,736**, however the appeal was only funded to a total of **CHF 602,971** from six donors. As such variances can be noted on the budget due to the limited funding and the negative variances are explained under the budget section.

Of the received funds, the LRCS could only use a total amount of **CHF 598,291** which is equivalent to a **99 percent** implementation rate. With the remaining balance of funds, IFRC will implement activities planned in the Cluster’s Operational Plan of 2018 under the “Disaster Crisis Prevention, Response & Recovery” (DCPRR) unit. The funds will focus on Disaster Risk Reduction to improve on the National Society’s preparedness and response capacities to disasters. The support will focus on strengthening the National Society systems through implementation of activities that relate to climate smart agriculture and building community resilience towards droughts.

The IFRC therefore seeks approval from its donors to reallocate this balance of **CHF 4,680** to the Lesotho Red Cross Society annual operational plan to support the National Society preparedness activities especially with the view that the country is affected annually by recurrent food insecurity. The National Society requires support for training of the affected communities on better farming methods, the adoption of drought tolerant crops and household water harvesting. Partners/donors who have any questions regarding this balance are kindly requested to contact IFRC within 30 days of publication of this report. Beyond this date the reallocation will be processed as indicated.

C. DETAILED OPERATIONAL PLAN

LRCS responded to the immediate needs of 1,800 HH (9,000 beneficiaries) in the three rural districts of Mafeteng, Thaba Tseka, and Qacha's Nek. Especially relevant for LRCS was the fact that it was able to meet the food requirements of the affected communities during the peak hunger period in the country. The Appeal was funded up to 82 percent of the projected budget and this allowed the LRCS to implement most of its activities on time.

Food security, Nutrition, and Livelihoods			
Outcome 1: Immediate food needs of 9,000 beneficiaries (1,800 households) are met over a period of six months	Outputs		% of achievement
	Output 1.1 1,800 households (9,000 beneficiaries) receive food and cash to purchase food		100%
Activities	Is implementation on time?		% progress (estimate)
	Yes (x)	No (x)	
Information for local authorities' awareness session	X		%
Beneficiary, targeting identification and registration.	X		100%
Food procurement (maize, bean, sorghum, cooking oil)	X		100%
Food distribution for 1,800 households	X		100%
Establishment of CTP and payment mechanisms processes	X		100%
Validation of beneficiary list and establishment of an accountability mechanism (beneficiary communication, feedback systems, etc.)	X		100%
Training and Capacity Building in Transfer Cash Programming among the staff and volunteers	X		100%
Training on beneficiary identification, registration, rapid assessment and field data collection and analysis	X		100%
Selection and signing contract with Service Providers	X		100%
Cash distribution for four months April, May, June and July 2016	X		75%
Procurement of mobile hand sets		X	0%
Mobile providers input into training of volunteers in mobile phone registration, provision of free Sim cards	X		100%
Monitoring and evaluation of the activity	X		100%
Outcome 2: Livelihoods of 1,800 households are reinforced to build community resilience in targeted regions	Outputs		% of achievement
	Output 1.1 Appropriate agricultural inputs (seeds, fertilizers and production tools) are distributed to 1,800 farmers (9,000 people) in rural areas		100%
Activities	Is implementation on time?		% progress (estimate)
	Yes (x)	No (x)	
Assessment to identify most vulnerable households that have capacity to work and have available land for planting	X		100%

Conduct specific needs assessment via Ministry of Agriculture to identify most appropriate items to be distributed depending on the market availability and period	X		100%
Assessment to establish capacity of local traders to provide proposed seeds and fertilizers	X		100%
Organize procurement of seeds, fertilizers and production tools for 1,800 farmers	X		100%
Training of lead farmers in agricultural production (farming techniques, water harvesting techniques like dam maintenance, catchment design and maintenance, water hygiene)	X		100%
Conduct distribution of seeds, fertilizer and production tools	X		100%
Monitoring and evaluation of the activity	X		100%

Achievements

Targeting and beneficiary selection: LRCS managed to engage local stakeholders in an authentic dialogue and this helped in identifying vulnerable beneficiaries in the selected areas. 600 households from each District were selected to make a total number of 1,800 household. The selection process that was adopted was a community participatory one in which communities were given the selection criteria and then entrusted with the role of selecting the suitable beneficiaries. The selection process was also done with support from local stakeholders and other Community based Organizations.

Mobile cash transfer: LRCS managed to conduct three against a plan of four mobile cash transfers. Each household received a total amount of CHF 35 to meet the needs for about five members of the household. Prior to the cash transfers, CTP training was conducted for the NS staff and volunteers from three districts. Vodacom Lesotho, the mobile service provider for the cash transfer provided the training for both staff and the volunteers. This process was essential as it helped the staff to understand how the system works and to enable them to trouble shoot the challenges that were faced by the beneficiaries during the cash transfer process. A brief training for beneficiaries on how to register for and use M-Pesa upon receiving cash was also conducted by the mobile service provider.

Food Distributions: During the first two months of the operation (February and March 2016), the LRCS assisted 1,800 households with food assistance through the distribution of a food basket which consisted 50kg bag of maize, 7,5kg beans, 4.5 liters cooking oil.

Lead Farmers Livelihoods Training: A five days training was conducted in the targeted districts to equip the Lead farmers on sustainable livelihood programme which incorporated the farming techniques, WASH issues as well as topics pertaining to climate change and adaptability. The main objective of the training was to increase the Lead farmers' skills and enhance their knowledge regarding climate change impact and adaptability. From each targeted area 10 lead farmers were trained, and various stakeholders participated in the trainings to make them a success. From the trainings, referral systems were well established for beneficiaries with different specific needs.

Challenges

1. Most of the targeted villages are in rural and mountainous parts of Lesotho. These are areas characterized by poor and damaged roads, sharp topography and bad weather conditions. This therefore posed a challenge in terms of delivery of food items resulting in delays in most cases.
2. The Post distribution monitoring and complaints mechanism was insufficient for effective follow up on problems / issues with Cash.

Lessons learnt

1. The use of CTP as a modality, offers flexibility to the beneficiaries to the extent that they can address their needs it empowers communities to make choices and decisions on their own.
2. A transparent and participatory targeting and selection process is important as it allows the right beneficiaries are incorporated in the program

3. Timely deployment of surge personnel contributed to design the cash transfer program component in the operation and to build capacity of volunteers and staff.
4. The use of an external mobile phone operator proved to be efficient and it offers the opportunity to be more transparent and accountable to beneficiaries and donors.
5. Including sustainability analysis in the programme design ensures continued benefits even after running out of the programme.
6. There is a need for a better and more standardised coordination of cash transfer that appropriately addressed the needs of the beneficiaries. This can be done by taking into consideration the views of the beneficiaries when coming up with the transfer value and addressing the issue of the different household sizes.

Water, sanitation, and hygiene promotion			
Outcome 3: Immediate reduction in risk of waterborne and water related diseases in targeted districts	Outputs		% of achievement
	Output 3.1 Health and hygiene promotion activities carried out to targeted population		100%
Activities	Is implementation on time?		% progress (estimate)
	Yes (x)	No (x)	
Training of volunteers, water committees and teachers on hygiene promotion (proper hand washing, water treatment and health education)	X		100%
Training of volunteers to monitor malnutrition indicators and conduct referrals and social mobilization exercises in targeted communities	X		100%
Hazard mapping and analysis in villages and schools and identify potential water sources	X		70%
Distribution of water treatment tablets		X	0%
House to house visits for hand-washing; water treatment and health education	X		50%
Monitoring and evaluation of the activity	X		90%

Achievements

Training on WASH: The primary objective incorporating Health and Sanitation in the operation was to ensure that communities have access to safe water for human and animal consumption as well as access to good sanitation facilities and promotion of good hygiene practices. To fulfil this objective, the LRCS conducted various trainings on WASH in the targeted communities. The training covered issues around the need for good hygiene practices especially for people living with HIV/AIDS, Prevention of mother to child transmission (PMTCT). The training targeted volunteers whose main role was to cascade the training to the community members and to promote good hygiene practices through household visits.

Household visits: the volunteers who received the wash training were able to conduct household visits in the targeted communities. The household visits were mainly to encourage good hygiene practices which include hand washing, water treatment.

Challenges

1. Retaining skilled volunteers remains a major challenge and this affected especially the WASH activities which relied on the volunteers for dissemination of information to the community members.

Lessons learnt

1. Educating communities on good hygiene practices and continuous community engagement is essential especially in reducing diarrheal diseases.

2. Volunteers are key in relaying messages in the communities they live in and are useful in cascading information quickly and efficiently to community members. Hence it is essential to continuously engage them.
3. There is need to provide software training but also linking it to provision of hardware for quicker adoption of hygiene practices.

Programming/Areas common to all sectors			
Outcome 4: Continuous and detailed assessment and analysis is used to inform the design and implementation of the operation.	Outputs		% of achievement
	Output 4.1 Initial needs assessment are updated following consultation with beneficiaries		%
Activities	Is implementation on time?		% progress (estimate)
	Yes (x)	No (x)	
Inception meeting with implementation team– IFRC SACO and LRCS	X		100%
Coordination and engagement with key stakeholders (DMA, MoAFS, Community leaders, NGOs, Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, UN Agencies).	X		100%
Joint monitoring of operations by LRCS & IFRC	X		80%
Evaluation of assistance impact in supported households (related to all food security activities)	X		70%
Lessons-learned and review meeting	X		100%

Achievements

Coordination with stakeholders: As part of mobilization process prior to execution of the project, stakeholder meetings were conducted at the national, district and community levels to share activities, intervention modality, beneficiary selection criteria, modality of support (food basket, sustainable livelihood activities as well as Cash transfer programme) and organisational operation response. Another purpose of the process was to map the various stakeholders as well as what they were contributing towards drought response.



Press conference: Following the information sharing with all the stakeholders in country, the communication office laid a ground for the press conference where media houses were invited for the larger publicity of the Appeal. The press conference attracted newspapers, local and national radios as well Lesotho Television. Present at the meeting was Dr Michael Charles who was the acting Head of Zone Office, the Secretary General Prof Kitleli, Programmes Director Mrs Matsepo Moletsane and the Disaster Management Coordinator Maine Makula. The press conference was mainly to highlight the secured funding as well as the intention by the LRCS to cover the three districts Qacha's Nek, Thaba-Tseka and Mafeteng with the Emergency Appeal targeting 1800 food insecure households.

Challenges

1. Communication between Finance teams internationally and nationally was always delayed and presented challenges in the implementation of project activities.

Lessons learnt

1. During the implementation of an Emergency Appeal, National Societies should be pro-active in resource mobilisation to ensure timely and sufficient reception of funding.

Operation Relevance and appropriateness

The operation set out to address three main issues that resulted from the drought situation in Lesotho. Firstly, it sought to address the food needs of the affected communities. Food security thus is achieved when communities have adequate access always to sufficient, safe, nutritious food to maintain a healthy life. The operation sought to achieve this through various measures which included the cash transfer as well as the direct food distributions. The distribution of direct food ensured that households can have access to food at all times and the food basket met the minimum dietary requirements as according to the SPHERE standards. The cash transfer was also a relevant intervention. This was done in line with the recommendations of the LVCA which recommended cash transfers as the preferred transfer modality. The cash transfer value was also determined through a market assessment conducted by the LRCS to ensure that the transfer value was adequate to meet the household food requirements. The operation also addressed the long-term food needs of the affected communities through the livelihood component which saw communities being supported with agricultural inputs. This was a deliberate move to ensure that families can produce more and also to cushion them from the impacts of the drought. Thus, the focus was not only on the short term but also on the long term making the operation relevant and appropriate. Also, to note is the bias towards promotion of better farming methods and the promotion of climate smart agriculture. This was an essential part of the response especially in building communities' resilience to drought. Based on the activities that were implemented it can be noted that the operation was relevant as it addressed the immediate as well as the long-term needs of the affected communities.

Operation efficiency and Effectiveness

LRCS managed to reach out to the targeted households with the planned interventions to meet their immediate food needs as well as the medium-term interventions. As a result, the targeted households had improved food consumption in terms of food amounts and diversity for the duration of the operation. The adopted cash transfer system was effective in ensuring that beneficiaries were able to access their cash to purchase the food stuffs which they required, and it also gave them the ability to make choices based on their needs. Thus, it aided in ensuring that food is available at household level based on the needs. The mobile cash transfer was designed to be efficient and to minimize the amount of time spent by beneficiaries' queueing for assistance. It helped in reducing the distances that the beneficiaries had to walk and indeed it was efficient in that it significantly reduced the transaction costs through elimination of transportation costs as was the case with the direct food distributions. The project was effective in supporting the local economy as the beneficiaries were able to promote local markets by purchasing goods within their communities. The effectiveness of the project was also enhanced through the integration with relevant livelihood support such as the seed support and the training in climate smart agriculture.

Monitoring

LRCS had monitoring systems in place during the operation which included the post distribution monitoring which was done after the distributions. Volunteers were also tasked with the role of getting feedback from the communities in which they lived. LRCS together with local stakeholders conducted joint monitoring missions which were also useful in getting feedback from the community. The monitoring system of the National Society was strengthened through monitoring visits by the IFRC regional office and other operational technical staff.

Sustainability Process

To ensure the sustainability of the program, relevant stakeholders at community, district and national levels were involved right from the initial stage of operation. They were greatly involved in the planning and design of the operation i.e. community mobilisation, beneficiary selection, verification and registration and direct observation of distribution of both the cash and food items. This was essential as it fostered their ownership of the processes and as such this assures continuity of the activities after the end of the appeal.

The trainings that were conducted were also essential in ensuring project sustainability. The LRCS ensured that volunteers are trained together with the local stakeholders and at the same time they are given the role of cascading the trainings to the targeted communities. As such the community, together with the local leaders, stakeholders at district level and Red Cross volunteers will be responsible for ensuring sustainability beyond project phase out. Full

engagement of the Red Cross Volunteers (committees) proves to be a good strategy towards continuity after project life. However, there is a great need to improve on volunteer retention so that the processes continue after project life.

Cash transfers are usually an immediate intervention which at times cannot be sustainable. However, the effort to link the cash transfer with the livelihood component and some community development initiatives will go a long way in ensuring the project sustainability. The distribution of seeds was essential so that households become productive and so that they can meet their basic food needs when the project ends. The climate smart agriculture trainings are also of importance especially should the communities adopt these trainings for improved farming.

Conclusions and Recommendations

- I. Cash transfer may be the most effective modality in assisting rural communities. It would be important to solicit more resource in terms of funds to assist the same beneficiaries and more beyond May 2017. Bearing in mind the need to customize the generic IFRC cash transfer guidelines to country specificities -line Ministry to develop cash transfer guidelines- and include sustainability component (e.g. re-investing cash) in future CTP.
- II. There is need for strengthening of the beneficiary feedback mechanism (toll free numbers, suggestion box, volunteers etc.) and link M&E activities with the program implementation to ensure efficient and continuous communication with the beneficiaries (e.g. status, progress and challenges). Strengthening of the local resource mobilization strategy and ensuring timely transfer of funds for emergency operation is essential for improved response.
- III. Improvement of beneficiary registration tools is essential for capturing disaggregated data on beneficiaries (gender, age. etc.)

Operational Way Forward

In ensuring that the program goals are attained, and livelihoods improved, the LRCS will still engage cascading the climate smart agriculture training so that communities are equipped with better knowledge for improved food production. Coordination with the local stakeholders will also be maintained and LRCS will continue to share knowledge and learn from other implementing partners. At the national level the coordination meetings between LRCS and the key stakeholders like Disaster Management Authority, FAO, World Vision and World Food Programme will also be maintained.

D. Budget

Activity	Budget (CHF)	Variance (%)	Comments
Food Distribution	100,800	18	The variance was because of under budgeting for the procurement of food packs which were distributed in the initial two months of the operation. The costs exceeded those proposed in the budget but since this was a key activity the NS decided to procure the actual proposed food packs to meet the objective of the operation.
Utensils and tools	41,400	11	The national society procured farming equipment for the lead farmers, the budgeted amount was exceeded due to the increased costs incurred during local procurements
Cash Disbursement	319,590	36	Due to limited funding the NS was only able to do 3 against a proposed plan of four cash transfers hence the variance
Financial Charges	3000	35	This was as a result of losses that occur due to currency revaluations.

Contact Information

For further information specifically related to this operation please contact:

- **Lesotho Red Cross Society:** Prof. Teboho Kitleli, Secretary General; phone: +266 22 313 911; email: tkitleli@redcross.org.ls
- **IFRC Cluster Representation:** Lorraine Mangwiro, Head of Southern Africa Cluster; phone: +27113039715; email: lorraine.mangwiro@ifrc.org
- **IFRC Africa Region:** Nicolas Verdy, Operations Coordinator, DCPRR; phone: +254 780 771 161; email: nicolas.verdy@ifrc.org
- **IFRC Geneva:** Ruben Romero, Acting Lead Response & Recovery, DCPRR; phone: +41 79 703 8807; email: ruben.romero@ifrc.org
- **IFRC Regional Logistics Unit:** Rishi Ramrakha, Head of zone logistics unit; phone: +254 733 888 022/ Fax +254 20 271 2777; email: rishi.ramrakha@ifrc.org

For Resource Mobilization and Pledges:

- **IFRC Africa Region:** Kentaro Nagazumi, Partnerships and Resource Development Coordinator, Nairobi; phone: +254 714 026 299; email: kentaro.nagazumi@ifrc.org

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

- **IFRC Africa Region:** Nathalie Proulx, PMER Delegate; phone: +254 780 771 136; email: nathalie.proulx@ifrc.org

How we work

All IFRC assistance seeks to adhere to the **Code of Conduct** for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO's) in Disaster Relief and the **Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Response (Sphere)** in delivering assistance to the most vulnerable. The IFRC's vision is to inspire, **encourage, facilitate and promote at all times all forms of humanitarian activities** by National Societies, with a view to **preventing and alleviating human suffering**, and thereby contributing to the maintenance and promotion of human dignity and peace in the world.

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



Save lives,
protect livelihoods,
and strengthen recovery
from disaster and crises.



Enable **healthy**
and **safe** living.



Promote **social inclusion**
and a culture of
non-violence and **peace**.

Disaster Response Financial Report

MDRLS004 - Lesotho - Food Insecurity

Timeframe: 21 Jan 16 to 31 Dec 16

Appeal Launch Date: 22 Jan 16

Final Report

Selected Parameters

Reporting Timeframe	2016/1-2017/11	Programme	MDRLS004
Budget Timeframe	2016/1-2016/12	Budget	APPROVED
Split by funding source	Y	Project	*
Subsector:	*		

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

I. Funding

	Raise humanitarian standards	Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people	Strengthen RC/RC contribution to development	Heighten influence and support for RC/RC work	Joint working and accountability	TOTAL	Deferred Income
A. Budget		735,736				735,736	
B. Opening Balance							
Income							
Cash contributions							
<i>British Red Cross</i>		277,996				277,996	
<i>Japanese Red Cross Society</i>		21,900				21,900	
<i>Norwegian Red Cross</i>		162,942				162,942	
<i>Red Cross of Monaco</i>		10,988				10,988	
<i>Swedish Red Cross</i>		63,848				63,848	
<i>The Netherlands Red Cross (from Netherlands Government*)</i>		65,297				65,297	
C1. Cash contributions		602,971				602,971	
C. Total Income = SUM(C1..C4)		602,971				602,971	
D. Total Funding = B + C		602,971				602,971	

* Funding source data based on information provided by the donor

II. Movement of Funds

	Raise humanitarian standards	Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people	Strengthen RC/RC contribution to development	Heighten influence and support for RC/RC work	Joint working and accountability	TOTAL	Deferred Income
B. Opening Balance							
C. Income		602,971				602,971	
E. Expenditure		-598,291				-598,291	
F. Closing Balance = (B + C + E)		4,680				4,680	

Disaster Response Financial Report

MDRLS004 - Lesotho - Food Insecurity

Timeframe: 21 Jan 16 to 31 Dec 16

Appeal Launch Date: 22 Jan 16

Final Report

Selected Parameters

Reporting Timeframe	2016/1-2017/11	Programme	MDRLS004
Budget Timeframe	2016/1-2016/12	Budget	APPROVED
Split by funding source	Y	Project	*
Subsector:	*		

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

III. Expenditure

Account Groups	Budget	Expenditure					TOTAL	Variance
		Raise humanitarian standards	Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people	Strengthen RC/RC contribution to development	Heighten influence and support for RC/RC work	Joint working and accountability		
	A					B	A - B	
BUDGET (C)			735,736			735,736		
Relief items, Construction, Supplies								
Food	100,800		119,344			119,344	-18,544	
Seeds & Plants	41,400		33,352			33,352	8,048	
Utensils & Tools	41,400		46,347			46,347	-4,947	
Cash Disbursement	319,590		202,444			202,444	117,146	
Total Relief items, Construction, Sup	503,190		401,487			401,487	101,703	
Logistics, Transport & Storage								
Transport & Vehicles Costs	11,500		8,549			8,549	2,951	
Total Logistics, Transport & Storage	11,500		8,549			8,549	2,951	
Personnel								
International Staff	51,000		38,272			38,272	12,729	
National Staff	4,800						4,800	
National Society Staff	44,095		44,293			44,293	-198	
Volunteers	7,185		7,920			7,920	-735	
Total Personnel	107,080		90,484			90,484	16,596	
Workshops & Training								
Workshops & Training	29,600		19,865			19,865	9,736	
Total Workshops & Training	29,600		19,865			19,865	9,736	
General Expenditure								
Travel	10,500		9,584			9,584	916	
Information & Public Relations	3,500		2,915			2,915	585	
Office Costs	2,000		847			847	1,153	
Communications	2,000		2,424			2,424	-424	
Financial Charges	3,000		4,059			4,059	-1,059	
Other General Expenses			361			361	-361	
Shared Office and Services Costs	15,018		15,500			15,500	-482	
Total General Expenditure	36,018		35,691			35,691	327	
Indirect Costs								
Programme & Services Support Recove	44,680		36,145			36,145	8,535	
Total Indirect Costs	44,680		36,145			36,145	8,535	
Pledge Specific Costs								
Pledge Earmarking Fee			4,671			4,671	-4,671	
Pledge Reporting Fees	3,667		1,400			1,400	2,267	
Total Pledge Specific Costs	3,667		6,071			6,071	-2,404	
TOTAL EXPENDITURE (D)	735,736		598,291			598,291	137,445	
VARIANCE (C - D)			137,445			137,445		

Disaster Response Financial Report**MDRLS004 - Lesotho - Food Insecurity**

Timeframe: 21 Jan 16 to 31 Dec 16

Appeal Launch Date: 22 Jan 16

Final Report

Selected Parameters

Reporting Timeframe	2016/1-2017/11	Programme	MDRLS004
Budget Timeframe	2016/1-2016/12	Budget	APPROVED
Split by funding source	Y	Project	*
Subsector:	*		

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

IV. Breakdown by subsector

Business Line / Sub-sector	Budget	Opening Balance	Income	Funding	Expenditure	Closing Balance	Deferred Income
BL2 - Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people							
Food security	735,736		602,971	602,971	598,291	4,680	
Subtotal BL2	735,736		602,971	602,971	598,291	4,680	
GRAND TOTAL	735,736		602,971	602,971	598,291	4,680	