

www.ifrc.org
Saving lives,
changing minds.

Emergency Plan of Action Final Report

Malawi: Food Insecurity

 International Federation
of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

Emergency Appeal – Final Report	Operation n° MDRMW012
Date of Issue: October 2017	Glide number: DR-2015-000136-MWI
Operation start date: 17 September 2015	Operation end date: 30 June 2017
Host National Society: Malawi Red Cross	Operation budget: CHF 3,590,677
Number of people affected: 3 million	Number of people assisted: 22,474 individuals (4,268 households)
National Society involved in the operation: Malawi Red Cross Society: 20 Staff and 250 volunteers actively engaged on Emergency response in five districts of Balaka, Chikwawa, Nsanje, Phalombe and Salima	
Other partner organizations involved: The Department of Disaster Management Affairs (DODMA) coordinates the disaster response activities at country level, WFP, Goal Malawi, Oxfam, Christian Aid, Irish Aid, Save the Children, World Vision, Norwegian Church Aid, COOPI, UNICEF INGO Consortium are all active in Malawi	

A. SITUATION ANALYSIS

Description of the disaster

Malawi, as was the case with many countries in the Southern Africa Region, experienced weather-related hazards because of the effects of the El Niño. These weather-related hazards included late on-set of rains, erratic rainfall, prolonged dry spells in most parts of the Central and Southern Regions and floods in Northern Region that affected parts of Karonga and Mzimba districts. As a result, Malawi's crop production in the 2015/16 farming season dropped significantly. The districts in the Southern region of Malawi were the worst affected, followed by those of the Central region and Northern region. Despite relatively good production in the Northern region, heavy rains towards the end of the rainy season caused flooding and destroyed crops.

The Second Round Agriculture Production Estimate Survey released in April 2016 by the Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Water Development (MoAWAD) highlighted that maize production during the 2015/16 agricultural season had dropped by 12.4 percent. The Survey estimated maize production at 2,431,313MT compared to 2,776,277MT during the 2014/15 production season. The national maize requirement was estimated at 3.2 million MT translating to a maize deficit of about 768,687 MT. The survey also revealed that besides a drop in maize production, other food crops, apart from sweet potatoes and Cassava, registered decreases compared to the previous agriculture season as follows: rice decreased by 21.6 percent, cassava by 0.1 percent, wheat by 31.1 percent, while sorghum and millet dropped by 27.1 percent and 40.9 percent, respectively. A total number of 6.5 million people were estimated to be food insecure due to the drought. On 12 April 2016, the President of Malawi declared a state of national disaster as a result of prolonged dry spells during 2015/2016 season

To respond to the call for support by the State President, the Malawi Red Cross Society (MRCS) made an Appeal for support to IFRC and in country Partner National Societies to support affected households. The overall strategy of the Appeal was to improve food security of the affected households; to mitigate the consequences of the food shortages and increase resilience in five districts of Balaka, Chikwawa, Nsanje, Phalombe and Salima. The operation sought to meet the immediate food needs through a cash transfer intervention whilst the medium-term needs would be met through the provision of agricultural inputs to encourage increased production.

Summary of response

Overview of Host National Society

Malawi Red Cross Society (MRCS) is one of the leading humanitarian organizations in the country with a network of volunteers across the country. The core mandate of the MRCS is to play an auxiliary role to the government through the provision of relief services during disasters. Malawi Red Cross Society has 32 divisions (branches) and a network of more than 30,000 members. It is present in all the 28 districts in Malawi. A democratically elected committee manages each division. At national level, the Secretary General heads Malawi Red Cross Society and reports to the national executive committee (governing board) that in turn is answerable to the council. The council comprises representatives from all the 28 districts across the country. Malawi Red Cross Society has previous experience in implementing disaster and relief programs throughout the country with support from various donor partners and Partner National Societies.

The National society has been active in responding to disasters in the country through IFRC support. Already in 2012, the National Society was implementing a Food Insecurity Emergency Appeal to support 9000 individuals with direct food and seed support. The National society has also gained experience in implementing cash transfers and in 2009 the National Society responded to the earthquake in Karonga with shelter construction support using CTP, funded by the Department for International Development (DFID) through the IFRC. In early 2015, MRCS launched an IFRC Emergency Appeal in response to extensive flooding and implemented activities in four districts, and operated in one other district through Danish Red Cross bi-lateral support.

In response to the growing food insecurity in the country the National Society launched this Emergency Appeal initially in September 2015 to support 10,000 individuals (2,000 households-HH). The total budget of the Appeal was CHF 749,268 over a period of six months. The National Society received a DREF support of CHF 74,900 to kick start immediate activities. However, after the declaration of the state of emergency by the President of Malawi in April 2016, the NS revised their Appeal upwards to target 25 000 individuals (5000 households) and the budget increased to CHF 3,590,677. The intervention focused on providing cash-based interventions to meet immediate food needs of the affected communities, agricultural inputs subsidization and training of lead farmers to strengthen livelihoods.

Overview of the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement (RCRC) in country

The Danish Red Cross (DRC), Finish Red Cross (FRC), and Icelandic Red Cross (IRC) are working in a consortium supporting a Community Resilience Project (CRP) being implemented in three Districts of Mwanza, Chikwawa and Mangochi. The four-year project which started in March 2016 has three components: Disaster Risk Reduction, WASH and Health. Additionally, the Danish Red Cross supports two Humanitarian Diplomacy initiatives in Malawi: one focusing on the prevention of early and forced marriages; the other concerned with climate change and the [National Adaptation Plan](#) (NAP) process. The Belgian Red Cross (BRC) currently cooperates with MRCS on First Aid, WASH, and Orphans and Vulnerable Children(OVC) programs. The project is implemented in Kasungu while First Aid is implemented at National level. The Finnish Red Cross (FRC) supports MRCS in capacity building components of Organizational Development (OD) program. The Netherlands Red Cross (NLRC) supports MRCS in implementing a Water Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) program. Apart from this program, NLRC has been overseeing the European Union funded WASH program implementation in Karonga and Mzuzu. The NLRC jointly with MRCS is also implementing an 18-month ECHO funded project in four districts: Phalombe, Thyolo, Chikwawa and Nsanje. The focus of the project is on community preparedness and Early Warning Systems. The Swiss Red Cross is involved in improving health status by enhancing health literacy within the communities and MRCS staff and volunteers; reducing vulnerability and strengthening community resilience as well as in improving the quality and quantity of safe blood transfusion services in Salima and Mzimba Districts.

Overview of non-RCRC actors in country

In Malawi the government leads the overall coordination of disaster response through its Department of Disaster Management Affairs (DoDMA) under the Ministry of Local Government. The Malawi Red Cross Society takes part in the coordination meetings held at DoDMA as part of monitoring and sharing information at national level. The Humanitarian Country Team is the coordination platform for partner institutions (UN agencies, WFP, INGO's, NGOs); its mandate is to build common strategies related to humanitarian response and policy issues. WFP plays a major role in the formulation of any response planning, and the funding of food distribution. This forum is well established and is chaired by UNDP.

Several humanitarian organizations including WFP and other INGO consortium consisting of several NGOs like WVI, Concern Universal, Emmanuel International, ACF, SCF and COOP responded to the food insecurity situation in Malawi through cash transfer intervention. Goal Malawi and CARE implemented food assistance operations in Nsanje district. Goal was mainly focusing on Cash Transfers, whilst CARE was involved in direct food distribution. In Phalombe district, Adventist Relief Services (ADRA) was also implementing food assistance activities using direct food distributions. In Chikwawa World Vision was using direct food distribution while Goal Malawi was using cash transfer. MRCS

coordinated with these agencies in the selection and registration of beneficiaries to avoid overlapping using the open-air selection criteria. When the National Society was involved in cash transfer programming (CTP) in Chikwawa, Nsanje and Phalombe, meetings and discussions were held with the Agricultural Development Marketing and Research Cooperation (ADMARC) the agency mandated by government to source and distribute cereal and pulses in the country. The visits to the ADMARC depots showed that the agency had capacity to meet increased cereal and pulses demand which also helped control the risk of inflation. MRCS also participated in the INGO coordination meetings as well as the CTP coordination meetings hosted by WFP in collaboration with the Government through the Department of Disaster Management Affairs (DoDMA).

Needs analysis and scenario planning

The Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Development, through the Malawi Vulnerability Assessment Committee (MVAC), carried out an annual food security assessment exercise during May 2016. The exercise was aimed at assessing the food security situation in the country, and determining the number of people who are likely to be food insecure during the 2016/17 consumption period. The results of the assessment revealed that a minimum of 6.5 million people, or 39 percent of the country's projected population of 16.8 million, will not be able to meet their annual food requirements during the 2016/17 consumption period. To ensure that the affected people would survive up to the next harvest period without disrupting their socio-economic livelihoods, the total humanitarian food assistance that was required was estimated at the equivalent of 493,000 metric tons of maize, with an estimated cash value of MK148 billion.

Hence there was an urgent need to meet the food needs of the affected communities. The MRCS focused on the provision on the immediate food needs through a community-based cash transfer program as an immediate response to the needs on the ground. MRCS initially planned to use a mobile phone operator for the disbursement of cash but due to unreliable network it opted for cash-in-envelope and use of financial Service provider to support the communities. The support also focused on ensuring improved production for the affected communities and the medium-term support to agricultural production through the provision of agricultural inputs (hybrid seeds of maize, groundnuts and beans and top and base fertilizers for crop season (March 2016) distributed in October/November 2015. Focus was also on provision of agricultural training of lead farmers with each lead farmer being responsible for cascading knowledge and skills to ten farmers, as well as dissemination of nutrition education in agricultural training

Food insecurity has been noted to affect communities' social well-being, especially resulting in increase of gender-based violence. Physical abuse is also likely to increase especially when men fail to provide for their families. The socially prescribed roles and ownership of assets is also likely to increase the challenges that women face as they do not have access to means of production and depend more on men for their food security needs. The operation thus prioritized the empowerment of vulnerable groups to ensure that MRCS observes the 'Do No Harm' principle. The operation took into consideration mainstreaming gender and prioritizing the needs of women and children and this was done specifically through the selection of beneficiaries and recipients of trainings

Beneficiary selection was made through a community participatory approach in which the MRCS worked closely with community leaders to select the beneficiaries following the set selection criteria. The registration exercise took two approaches the first one used community meetings per Village Head to do the registration and verification in an open air with the participation of all village members. The second approach was through engagement and recommendations from the ministry of health staff who mainly helped with the registration and verification of pregnant and lactating mothers. Considering the government strategy as well as selection criteria/process from interagency committee of humanitarian actors, the MRCS mainly supported the chronically ill, persons living with disabilities, child headed households, female headed households, and pregnant or lactating woman.

Risk Analysis

The much-anticipated risk to the operation was the misdirection of the funds received by the households to purchase alcohol, as was highlighted in various surveys. To mitigate, the MRCS made efforts to ensure that women were the recipients and that education was provided to the communities during the pre-distribution address. Security was also a foreseen risk as the National Society was conducting cash transfers using the envelope system. The cash in envelope system was adopted due to poor network challenges in the areas of operation which were not conducive for a mobile cash transfer as planned. The National Society made use of the cash in transit service for security of the funds and ensured that distributions were done during the day when it is safer.

B. OPERATIONAL STRATEGY

The Overall Objective of the Emergency Appeal focused on **improving food security in the households, mitigate the consequences of the food shortages and increase resilience in five districts** of Balaka, Chikwawa, Nsanje, Phalombe and Salima

Proposed strategy

Through the Emergency Appeal, the MRCS focused on supporting a total number of 5000 households (25000 people) to meet their immediate food needs through a cash transfer programme. A medium-term intervention was also adopted focusing on the provision of seeds and fertilizer for 1,000 households who had the capacity to produce in the 2017/2018 farming season. The Appeal did not receive the anticipated support as the National Society only got support amounting to **CHF 936,777 which is about 26 percent of the proposed budget**. As such the MRCS had to focus **mainly on the cash transfer support for 4268 households** (2,000 households with funding from the Netherlands Red Cross and 2,268 households with funding from IFRC) in Traditional Authority Ndakwera. Due to limited funding the livelihoods support component could not meet the targeted number and was reduced from 1000 individuals to 100 individuals. The operation sought to fulfil the overall objective through the following initiatives and activities:

- 1. Food support through cash transfer distributions:** This was the main activity of the project and it targeted 4268 households in Traditional Authority Ndakwera. To effectively deliver the project, three centers were identified as Cash Distribution sites. MRCS initially planned to use a mobile phone operator for the disbursement of cash but due to unreliable network it opted for Cash in envelopes and use of a financial Service provider. For the initial first four months MRCS got support from the Netherlands Red Cross through the crisis modifier to conduct the cash transfers and as of December 2016, the IFRC support also came in to facilitate the cash transfers. A total number of twelve cash transfer activities were done.
- 2. Livelihoods protection and reinforcement through seed and fertilizer distribution, and agricultural training for lead farmers.:** The project also supported 100 small scale irrigation farmers with the aim of making their households food secure. These farmers were from two irrigation schemes with 50 farmers from each scheme. The farmers were supported with maize seed, vegetable seeds, fertilizer, and fuel for motorized irrigation as well as technical support from Ministry of Agriculture.

C. DETAILED OPERATIONAL PLAN

 <p>Livelihoods and basic needs People reached: Male: 2,219 Female: 2,049</p>		
Indicators:	Target	Actual
Appropriate agricultural inputs (seeds and fertilizers) are distributed and training provided to 1,000 households (5,000 persons) in rural areas	1,000	100
Narrative description of achievements		
A total number of 100 small-scale irrigation farmers were supported with the aim of making their households food secure. These farmers were from two irrigation schemes with 50 farmers from each scheme. The farmers were supported with maize seeds, vegetable seeds, fertilizer, and fuel for motorized irrigation as well as technical support from the Ministry of Agriculture.		
Challenges		
Due to limited funding of the Emergency Appeal, the National Society was not able to reach the targeted number of beneficiaries under this component of the operation. This affected the overall performance of the operation as well as the planned efforts of the National Society to increase food production in the affected communities. This activity had been planned with the desire to ensure that communities are supported with seeds which they might not have been able to purchase due to the impact of the drought on their incomes. Training of farmers had also been designed to ensure that families would be equipped with the knowledge of climate smart agriculture. However, due to limited funding, priority was given to the cash transfers.		

Lessons Learned

MRCS has learnt on the importance of the involvement of different key stakeholders in planning and implementation of emergency appeals as it strengthened information sharing and helps ironing out of any misconceptions surrounding such operations. Collaborations with governments departments also ensures sustainability of project activities especially useful was the involvement of extension workers in the training of community members of better farming methods.



Livelihoods and basic needs

People reached:

Male: 2,219

Female: 2,049

Indicators:	Target	Actual
5,000 households (25,000 beneficiaries) received cash distribution to purchase food (CHF 40 per month per household)	5000	4,268
Initial needs assessment is updated following consultation with beneficiaries and stakeholders	6	6

Narrative description of achievements

Orientation of staff and volunteers in Cash Transfers Programming (CTP)

Cash Transfer Programming is a new concept in MRCS and in Malawi as a country in general. This implies that not many people are conversant with the approaches used in CTP. MRCS is one of the pioneers of cash transfer in the country and has a pool of experts. Staff hired, and volunteers recruited to support this project were taken through the concept of CTP. The orientation also included members from the government line department. A total of 12 volunteers (eight males, four females) were oriented in Chikwawa as well as two government staff (One police VSU and one District council) Other than orienting the members about the CTP, the participants were also taken through the overview of the Food Crisis Project for them to better understand its design and implementation modality. This was an important activity as it provided the participants with knowledge and skills in CTP as well as an in-depth understanding of the project

Sensitization of stakeholders and community members.

The District Executive Committee (DEC) is a technical forum at district level whose membership is composed of all heads of government institutions and heads of non-state actors. One meeting was conducted with the committee and by the end of the meeting, the project was approved. The DEC further requested MRCS to make sure that cash is transferred timely to avoid exposing beneficiaries to more vulnerabilities or indulging themselves in negative coping strategies. The committee also emphasized the need for MRCS to involve government officers and have good collaboration with other stakeholders who are implementing similar interventions during the implementation period. A total of 51 (40 male, 11 female) members participated in the meeting.

Cash transfers

The National Society could conduct a total number of seven cash transfer activities during the operation. The table below indicates the cash transfer activities conducted, and the amounts received by each beneficiary in the local currency.

Month	Beneficiaries supported	Amount (MK) ¹	Donor
September, 2016	2268	21,000.00	NLRC
October, 2016	2268	17,750.00	NLRC
November, 2016	2268	18,400.00 ordinary beneficiaries 21,400.00 Pregnant & lactating mothers	NLRC
December, 2016	2268	18,400.00 ordinary beneficiaries 21,400.00 Pregnant & lactating mothers	NLRC/ IFRC

¹ 1 CHF = 743 Kwacha Malawien approximately, 22/10/17

January, 2017	2268	20,000.00 ordinary beneficiaries 26,000.00 Pregnant & lactating mothers	IFRC
February, 2017	2268	20,000.00 ordinary beneficiaries 26,000.00 Pregnant & lactating mothers	IFRC
June, 2017	2268	12,000.00 for everyone	IFRC

Monthly post distribution monitoring

Monitoring was done two ways with onsite monitoring done during the cash distribution days and the door to door monitoring which was conducted by the volunteers. During the onsite monitoring the most important and notable areas that were looked at included the use of identification materials for each beneficiary, consideration of older persons and people with disability and other health complications to be supported first. The time while beneficiaries were standing in line, was used to monitor how they would use the cash, the counting and verification of cash to be given to beneficiaries. Post monitoring was mainly conducted by volunteers through house-to-house visits. The aim of this monitoring was basically to check on how the beneficiaries had been using the cash received. More emphasis was given to households with lactating mothers and pregnant women.

Complaints Mechanism

Bearing in mind that Violence during cash transfers may erupt either amongst the beneficiaries, beneficiaries with their relations or with community structures supporting the transfers, the project supported the formation, orientation and conduct of monthly meeting of complaint handling committees. Each Cash Distribution Centre had one complaint handling committee. During the implementation of the operation, this committee handled different complaints such as delayed time of cash distribution. Beneficiaries also complained that cash distributions in some cases ended relatively late, with security issue related to cash transport. In some cases, some beneficiaries also complained that MRCS did not fulfil some of the promises it had made at the start of the project and in some isolated cases beneficiaries also complained about local leaders snatching cash Vouchers. This was a good initiative as it helped to hold MRCS, local leaders and the beneficiaries themselves accountable for their actions. At least eight cases were reported where the local leaders imposed registration of wrong beneficiaries. These were children of the local leaders and their relatives who did not deserve support. Two cases of local leaders snatching ration cards from the rightful holders were also reported one at Satodwa and another one at Mandrade. Having this committee in place thus helped in solving these cases and ensured that programming was done taking into consideration the needs of the beneficiaries.

Monthly Market assessments

To establish the value of the food basket, the project was monitoring the market prices of all the commodities in the food basket. The process involved a team of MRCS staff and district stakeholders (four members) moving in all the reliable and nearby markets available in the impact areas. Once all costs have been gathered an average price or cost for the items was calculated to establish the market value which was subsequently used to decide the amount of money to be given to the beneficiaries. This was a very good approach in deciding the cash value as in some cases the prices of commodities kept on rising due to the decreasing availability of food items as the lean period was becoming to its peak.

Challenges

The operation was affected by the late cash distributions due to the turnaround time on reporting on the funds received from IFRC and the time of receiving another working advance. This affected the reputation of the National Society in the communities as it was always delaying in assisting the affected families. Also, due to network challenges the National Society ended up changing its preferred modality of using mobile phones to resort to cash in envelopes. Since the project did not receive enough resources, priority of the available funds was given to cash distributions making it difficult for monitoring activities to have a feel of how the activity is helping the community which led to some malpractices being discovered some months into the distributions.

Lessons Learned

MRCS has learnt that the use of cash in envelopes is one of the best options in the delivery of cash transfers. This was evidenced by having all beneficiaries receiving their cash in each distribution as opposed to some areas where mobile phones were used as some beneficiaries were left without receiving cash due to varying reasons related to the used of mobile phones.

MRCS has also learnt that for the cash distribution process to be faster there is a need to pack all the cash in envelopes before distribution and not at the cash distribution point as it does not only help the process to go fast but also allows the beneficiaries to receive the money with dignity, without waiting for a longer period.

MRCS has also learnt that the use of Financial Service Providers is a good practice as it helps to transfer the risk to the other party hence allowing the project staff to concentrate on other project operational arrangements.

MRCS has also learnt that post distribution monitoring using household visits is an important tool as it helps the project team to understand the challenges that the communities might be facing and obtaining successes on how the project has helped the beneficiaries.

MRCS has also learnt that pre-cash distribution meetings of staff, Volunteers and stakeholders before Cash distribution day is important as they help the team to share roles and responsibilities, review the previous distribution and make recommendations on how to handle the impending cash distribution.

MRCS has also learnt that it is not good to start any disaster response initiatives before all the required resources have been mobilized

MRCS has also learnt that there is need to have IFRC funding cycle properly shared as it helps the National Society to understand the periods that it can receive funding. This is often not shared leaving the National Society unclear on issues which result in delayed cash transfers.

D. THE BUDGET

Explanation of variances:

The total budget of the Appeal was **CHF 3,590,677** however the National society received **CHF 926,648** and used **CHF 873,155** which is **94 percent** of the received amount. As such, a total of **CHF 53,493** will be returned to the DREF. The following variances were encountered during the implementation of the DREF operations.

1. There was a variance for **CHF 337** which was caused by labour for rehabilitation of water reservoir and pumps for irrigation which were budgeted for.
2. Under logistics services there was a variance **CHF 2,500** due to mobile cash transfer services which the NS paid which was not budgeted. This was done for security of the cash to beneficiaries.
3. The over spending of **CHF 19,570** was as the result of consultation fees paid to food security consultancy and videography consultancy in Malawi.
4. The professional fees were not budgeted, however the NS found it necessary to engage security during distributions and also for translation of survey tools and this resulted in variance of **CHF 260**.
5. The variance of **CHF 51,205** for financial charges was mainly due to currency revaluations.
6. There was a variance of **CHF 14,968** for refreshment during registration of beneficiaries and cash distributions.
7. Pledge earmarking and reporting fees were not budgeted, as the results there were variances of **CHF 4,057** and **CHF 1,600** respectively.

Contact Information

For further information specifically related to this operation please contact:

Malawi Red Cross Society:

Mcbain Kanongodza, Secretary General; phone: 0999 306 960; email: mkanongodza@redcross.mw

IFRC Southern Africa Pretoria Country Cluster Support Team (CCST):

Lorraine Mangwiro, Head of Southern Africa Cluster; phone: +271 130 39715; email: lorraine.mangwiro@ifrc.org

IFRC Africa Region:

Adesh Tripathee, Head of DCPRR; phone: +254 780 771 161; email: adesh.tripathee@ifrc.org

Nicolas Verdy, Operations Coordinator, Kenya; phone: +254 780 771 161; email: nicolas.verdy@ifrc.org

Rishi Ramrakha, Head Regional Logistics; Tel: +254 733 888 022/ Fax +254 202 71 2777 email: rishi.ramrakha@ifrc.org

IFRC Geneva:

Cristina Estrada, Response and Recovery lead; phone: +41-2-2730-4260; email: cristina.estrada@ifrc.org

Alma Alsayed, Senior officer, response and recovery; phone: +41-2-2730-4566; email: alma.alsayed@ifrc.org

For Resource Mobilization and Pledges:

Kentaro Nagazumi, Head of Partnership and Resource Development, Nairobi; phone: +254 202 83 5155;

email: kentaro.nagazumi@ifrc.org

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

Fiona Gatere, PMER Coordinator; phone: +254 780 77 1139; email: fiona.gatere@ifrc.org

Nathalie Proulx, PMER Delegate; phone: +254 780 77 1136; 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.

www.ifrc.org

Saving lives, changing minds.



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

1. Save lives, protect livelihoods, and strengthen recovery from disaster and crises.
2. Enable healthy and safe living.
3. Promote social inclusion and a culture of non-violence and peace

Disaster Response Financial Report

MDRMW012 - Malawi - Food Insecurity

Timeframe: 17 Sep 15 to 31 Jul 17

Appeal Launch Date: 18 Sep 15

Final Report

Selected Parameters

Reporting Timeframe	2015/9-2018/2	Programme	MDRMW012
Budget Timeframe	2015/9-2017/07	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		3,590,677				3,590,677	
B. Opening Balance							
Income							
Cash contributions							
<i>Finnish Red Cross</i>		86,381				86,381	
<i>Japanese Red Cross Society</i>		24,700				24,700	
<i>Red Cross of Monaco</i>		5,397				5,397	
<i>Swiss Red Cross</i>		10,731				10,731	
<i>Swiss Red Cross (from Swiss Government*)</i>		346,969				346,969	
<i>The Canadian Red Cross Society (from Canadian Government*)</i>		25,750				25,750	
<i>The Netherlands Red Cross (from Netherlands Government*)</i>		426,720				426,720	
C1. Cash contributions		926,648				926,648	
C. Total Income = SUM(C1..C4)		926,648				926,648	
D. Total Funding = B + C		926,648				926,648	

* 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		926,648				926,648	
E. Expenditure		-873,155				-873,155	
F. Closing Balance = (B + C + E)		53,493				53,493	

Disaster Response Financial Report

MDRMW012 - Malawi - Food Insecurity

Timeframe: 17 Sep 15 to 31 Jul 17

Appeal Launch Date: 18 Sep 15

Final Report

Selected Parameters

Reporting Timeframe	2015/9-2018/2	Programme	MDRMW012
Budget Timeframe	2015/9-2017/07	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)			3,590,677			3,590,677		
Relief items, Construction, Supplies								
Construction Materials	0						0	
Seeds & Plants	50,000		3,747			3,747	46,253	
Water, Sanitation & Hygiene			337			337	-337	
Cash Disbursement	2,680,000		562,289			562,289	2,117,711	
Total Relief items, Construction, Sup	2,730,000		566,373			566,373	2,163,627	
Land, vehicles & equipment								
Computers & Telecom	50,000		17,410			17,410	32,590	
Total Land, vehicles & equipment	50,000		17,410			17,410	32,590	
Logistics, Transport & Storage								
Transport & Vehicles Costs	54,100		16,803			16,803	37,297	
Logistics Services	0		2,500			2,500	-2,500	
Total Logistics, Transport & Storage	54,100		19,303			19,303	34,797	
Personnel								
International Staff	119,000		51,568			51,568	67,433	
National Staff	16,500						16,500	
National Society Staff	164,650		25,298			25,298	139,352	
Volunteers	4,562		1,348			1,348	3,214	
Total Personnel	304,713		78,214			78,214	226,499	
Consultants & Professional Fees								
Consultants	10,000		29,570			29,570	-19,570	
Professional Fees			260			260	-260	
Total Consultants & Professional Fees	10,000		29,831			29,831	-19,831	
Workshops & Training								
Workshops & Training	111,000		16,942			16,942	94,058	
Total Workshops & Training	111,000		16,942			16,942	94,058	
General Expenditure								
Travel	21,000		10,633			10,633	10,367	
Information & Public Relations	5,500						5,500	
Office Costs	9,540		1,899			1,899	7,641	
Communications	8,100		2,477			2,477	5,623	
Financial Charges	5,000		56,205			56,205	-51,205	
Other General Expenses	0		14,968			14,968	-14,968	
Shared Office and Services Costs	62,575		300			300	62,275	
Total General Expenditure	111,715		86,481			86,481	25,234	
Indirect Costs								
Programme & Services Support Recover	219,149		52,946			52,946	166,203	
Total Indirect Costs	219,149		52,946			52,946	166,203	
Pledge Specific Costs								
Pledge Earmarking Fee			4,057			4,057	-4,057	
Pledge Reporting Fees	0		1,600			1,600	-1,600	
Total Pledge Specific Costs	0		5,657			5,657	-5,657	
TOTAL EXPENDITURE (D)	3,590,677		873,155			873,155	2,717,522	
VARIANCE (C - D)			2,717,522			2,717,522		

Disaster Response Financial Report**MDRMW012 - Malawi - Food Insecurity**

Timeframe: 17 Sep 15 to 31 Jul 17

Appeal Launch Date: 18 Sep 15

Final Report

Selected Parameters

Reporting Timeframe	2015/9-2018/2	Programme	MDRMW012
Budget Timeframe	2015/9-2017/07	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	3,590,677		926,648	926,648	873,155	53,493	
Subtotal BL2	3,590,677		926,648	926,648	873,155	53,493	
GRAND TOTAL	3,590,677		926,648	926,648	873,155	53,493	