

www.ifrc.org  
Saving lives,  
changing minds.

# Emergency Plan of Action Final Report

## Zambia: Population Movement

 International Federation  
of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

<b>DREF operation</b>	<b>Operation n° MDRZM010</b>
<b>Date of Issue: 08 August 2018</b>	<b>Glide number: OT-2017-000135-ZMB</b>
<b>Date of disaster: August 2017</b>	
<b>Operation start date: 26 September 2017</b>	<b>Operation end date: 26 February 2018</b>
<b>Host National Society: Zambia Red Cross Society</b>	<b>Operation budget: CHF 267,300</b>
<b>Number of people affected: 20,000</b>	<b>Number of people assisted: 7,000 People (1,400 HH) directly and 13,950 people (2,790 HH) indirectly.</b>
<b>N° of National Societies involved in the operation:</b> Zambia Red Cross Society (ZRCS) deployed 7 National HQ Staff and mobilized 120 volunteers across the operation areas, 1 Operations Manager International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent (IFRC)/Netherlands Red Cross (NLRC), 1 shelter RDRT (Regional Disaster Response Team) staff, International Committee of Red Cross (ICRC).	
<b>N° of other partner organizations involved in the operation:</b> United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), World Vision Zambia, United Nations Children Fund (UNICEF), Action Africa Help (AAH), Norwegian Church Aid (NCA), Oxfam Zambia, Plan International, United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), World Food Programme (WFP), Save the Children, Ministry of Home affairs (Office of the Commissioner for Refugees (CoR), Ministry of Health, Zambia Police, Terre Des Hommes (TDH) and Care International.	

## A. SITUATION ANALYSIS

### Description of the disaster

The situation in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) continued to deteriorate leading to a continuous streaming of refugees into Zambia. The influx continued to increase and since end of August 2017 - Zambia has been receiving new arrivals from the DRC, mainly from Pweto in Haute Katanga and Moba, in Tanganyika provinces. The main cause of Congolese refugees fleeing was conflict and violation of human rights in the DRC as Government soldiers fight militias that have sprung up in Eastern DRC. While most of the new arrivals entered through the Chiengi border area, some were also crossing into Zambia through other entry points, such as Nsumbu, Kaputa and Mpulungu as well as Kipushi and Kakoma, in North Western, Kasumbalesa and Sakania, in the Copperbelt province. Some went directly to Lusaka. Refugees from Kaputa were relocated to Kenani Transit Centre in Nchelenge district although most of the refugees in Kenani Transit Centre were those that entered Zambia through Chiengi Reception Centre.

On 26 September 2017, the IFRC launched a [DREF operation](#) for CHF 270,909 to support 1,400 households (7,000 people) through provision of immediate Shelter, Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH), and Health needs. On 27 November 2017, an [Operation update](#) was published, revising the operation budget downwards to CHF 267,300 following a reallocation of costs. In addition, following the reallocation of costs which enabled the operation to make savings, new activities were proposed, in addition to those planned in the initial EPoA.

## Number of refugees' arrivals for January and February

### NEW ARRIVALS IN 4 BORDER RECEPTION CENTRES - JANUARY and FEBRUARY 26, 2018

MONTH	CHIENGI	KAPUTA	NSUMBU	MPULUNGU	TOTAL ENTRY
<b>JANUARY</b>					
Week 1	360	17	0	8	385
Week 2	389	26	0	0	415
Week 3	375	29	1	16	421
Week 4	255	43	0	8	306
<b>Total</b>					<b>1,527</b>
<b>FEBRUARY</b>					
Week 1	174	33	6	14	227
Week 2	115	40	4	23	182
Week 3	39	15	2	2	58
Week 4	40	12	0	10	62
<b>Total</b>					<b>529</b>

Note that the refugees in Nsumbu and Mpulungu were relocated to Maheba whereas those in Chiengi and Kaputa were relocated to Kenani Reception Centre in Nchelenge.

With Kenani Transit centre having reached its maximum capacity, a new settlement area, Mantapala Settlement was opened about 140 km away from Chiengi the main border entry-point further inland. The plan of Government/UNHCR was to support the refugees with access to better livelihood options further inland in Mantapala, away from the border. Each household with an interest in Agriculture will be allocated with a piece of farm land.

With funding support from IFRC (Disaster Response Emergency Fund - DREF), ZRCS procured 840 tarpaulins which were distributed to Refugees in Kenani and Mantapala in coordination with UNHCR. The other tarpaulins (5400) were supplied with support from Netherlands Red Cross (NLRC) and 360 of these were distributed to the four (04) Border Reception Centres namely (Chiengi, Nsumbu, Kaputa, and Mpulungu) while the remaining 5040 were distributed in Mantapala. Relocation of refugees from Kenani Camp to Mantapala Refugee Settlement started in January 2018. At the time of reporting eight (8) convoys were used to relocate 2,728 refugees to Mantapala Settlement coordinated by UNHCR protection. The relocation is still ongoing today.

The statistics provided by the UNHCR and CoR, as at 28<sup>th</sup> February 2018, indicated a cumulative total of 15,156 individuals from DRC comprising 4,910 households which have been biometrically registered at Kenani Transit centre in Nchelenge since 30<sup>th</sup> August 2017. Out of the total, there were 3,128 (1,970 females and 1,158 Males) vulnerable people.

Some 1,310 people with special needs (PSNs) aged between 18-59 made up the majority and dominant category. The unaccompanied or separated children were 1,404 (689 girls and 715 boys). Children at risk were 125 (64 girls and 61 boys); Disabled people were 141 (63 females and 78 males); Older people at risk were 117 (91 females and 26 males); people with serious medical condition were 48 (27 females and 21 males); Single parents were 806 (682 females and 124 males).

#### The table shows the following

Age Group	Females	Males	Totals
0 - 4	1,614	1,439	3,053
5 -11	1,875	1,743	3,618
12-17	956	1042	1,998
18- 59	3,098	3,008	6,106
59 +	231	150	381
<b>Total</b>	<b>7,774</b>	<b>7,551</b>	<b>15,325</b>

**NB:** The data in the table includes figures after closure of DREF mobilized from Inter-Agency sources whereas the above information is as at the closure of DREF.

The major donors and partners of the Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF) include the Red Cross Societies and governments of Australia, Austria, Belgium, Britain, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Monaco, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden and the USA, as well as DG ECHO, the UK Department for International Development (DFID), AECID, the Medtronic and Zurich Foundations and other corporate and private donors. On behalf of the Zambia Red Crescent Society (ZRCS), the IFRC would like to extend its gratitude to all partners for their generous contributions.

## Summary of response

### Overview of Host National Society

On 30 August 2017, Zambia recorded an increased number of refugees that crossed the Border in Chiengi. Therefore, the National Society (NS) mobilized its staff and Branch Disaster Response Teams to respond to the disaster. Two National Disaster Response Team members (NDRT) were also mobilized to provide immediate support to the displaced asylum seekers in the Reception centres of Chiengi and Nchelenge. Further, 120 volunteers were mobilized from the four local branches; namely Chiengi and Nchelenge in the affected districts within Luapula and Kaputa, Nsumbu and Mpulungu Branches in the Northern provinces. Kenani Transit centre was quickly established by ZRCS in coordination with UNHCR and Commissioner of Refugees (CoR) where the asylum seekers who entered through Chiengi were provided with relief materials as well as shelter support. The relief materials included clothing, blankets, tarpaulins for temporary shelters and hygiene kits.

ZRCS Field staff and volunteers were in September 2017 involved in joint needs assessment missions with other partners within Kenani Transit centre to identify the needs of the affected population as well the most vulnerable beneficiaries such as the unaccompanied minors, separated children, elderly, pregnant and lactating mothers, and children with malnutrition.

The DREF operation focused on the provision of immediate shelter assistance to 210 households, provision of health care and services to the 1,400 targeted households to supplement the services the District Health Office was providing as well as the provision of WASH services in the Camp with a distribution of WASH NFIs to 480 households.

Standby First Aid support was provided to convoys during relocations from the Reception Centres of Kaputa and Chiengi to the Kenani Transits centre as well as from Kenani Transit centres to Mantapala Refugee settlement. During the operation, ZRCS supported with the management of Human Remains through process facilitation, provision of transport and coffins for burials.

### Overview of Red Cross Red Crescent Movement in Country

International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) provided technical support during planning, implementation and monitoring of the operation including guidelines on procurement, warehousing, distribution and financial procedures related to the DREF operation. IFRC deployed a shelter RDRT member to provide support in shelter activities. An Operations Manager was also deployed to the field to support the operation in the month of December of 2017 until May 2018.

ICRC provided support in the Restoration of Family Links (RFL) activities in the operation. Phone contact services were made available for the beneficiaries to contact their family members in DRC and a family reunification was scheduled for later in April 2018. This reunification was later undertaken in June 2018 by ICRC.

Netherlands Red Cross with its in-country delegation provided support in shelter, Water, Sanitation and Hygiene activities and in staffing needs in the operation.

### Overview of non-RCRC actors in country

The overall coordinator of the refugee operation was the Commissioner of Refugees under the Ministry of Home affairs for the Government of Zambia. The District Joint Operation Commission (DJOC) comprising of Zambia Police, Immigration department, Office of the President, District Commissioner facilitated the screening and admission of the asylum seekers in the country. The Ministry of Health, through the District Health Office provided health services and referral to the refugees who are unwell.

UNHCR in collaboration with CoR also provided protection and assistance to refugees. Save the Children Zambia and Plan International looked at issues of child protection and provision of child friendly centres and education. UNICEF were the overall coordinators of all WASH activities in the camp. UNFPA provided HIV awareness programme, maternity service, while WFP oversaw warehousing and provision of food rations to the refugees. Norwegian Church Aid (NCA)

was involved in provision of water and solid waste management and construction of latrines. Action Africa Help (AAH) with funding support from Oxfam constructed latrines and bathing shelters, installed hand washing buckets and distributed food and non-food items.

## Needs analysis and scenario planning

ZRCS was involved in Refugee Operations way before the disaster happened. In Mpulungu, Kaputa and Nsumbu ZRCS was involved in provision of food, shelter and WASH through UNHCR support. The transit centres (Chiengi and Kenani) were already prepared for any influx of refugees with the funding support of UNHCR. Basic services such as permanent latrines and water points were already constructed. However, the influx of refugees was beyond anticipation and plan. The mobilization of branches was already in place and volunteers were prepared to respond to new influx of refugees. The trainings that were conducted by UNHCR such as simple reception procedures were done to the volunteers in the mentioned branches.

When the DREF Operation was launched, the NS had adequate information which guided the planning process. The volunteers from the areas where the influx of refugees entered were already mobilized and were on stand-by. Again, shelters were already available. The National Society only increased the numbers to meet the demand.

The location of the Refugee Transit Centres and Kenani Camp in Luapula Province are about 1,200 km from Lusaka Head office and the distance entailed an increase in logistical expenses. The camp was also a distance from the main town and that resulted in extra need of transport of volunteers from town to the refugee camp. The Emergency Plan of Action (EPOA) was developed to cover the most urgent gaps that were identified during the needs assessment exercise.

### Risk Analysis

The road between Chiengi and Kenani Camp was not in good condition and most of the implementation time was in the rain season. Therefore, several breakdowns of vehicles transporting refugees from Chiengi Reception Centre to Kenani Camp occurred posing a risk to the refugees.

Some refugees were crossing into Zambia using unsecure banana boats through Lake Mweru which separates Zambia from DRC and that posed a danger to the lives of the refugees.

## B. OPERATIONAL STRATEGY

### Proposed strategy

Upon receiving the report of huge influx of refugees from DRC coming through Chiengi border, the NS conducted a rapid assessment on 9<sup>th</sup> September 2017 in Chiengi border which led to applying for DREF. With the support of IFRC, ZRCS applied for DREF which was approved and was to last for a period of three months (26<sup>th</sup> September to 26<sup>th</sup> December 2017). Detailed needs assessment was conducted within September 2017 and based on the findings, the operation focused on the provision of WASH, Health and Shelter support to the vulnerable refugees in Kenani Camp and Chiengi Reception centre. Chiengi Reception Centre was the border town where the influx of refugees was entering into Zambia. However, in November 2017, the operation was revised, extending it by two additional months (until 26 February 2018). This operation update also included additional activities to the operation and a downwards revision of the budget to CHF 267,300.

Further in January 2018, the NS conducted a Knowledge Attitudes and Practices (KAP) Survey in Kenani camp focusing on hygiene practices in the camp with support from NLRC. Nchelenge District where Kenani Camp is situated was prone to Cholera outbreaks which occur almost annually. Therefore, providing safe water and sanitation to the refugees in Kenani Transit Centre apart from Shelter and Health was important because of the threat of a Cholera outbreak, endemic in that area. For this reason, the NS conducted the KAP Survey in Kenani Camp to find out about the hygiene behaviour and practices in the Camp. It was important to collect updated information on hygiene behaviour and practices in the early stages of implementing of the WASH interventions, to better design the interventions strategy and provide a more adequate response but also to serve as baseline information for monitoring impact.

The KAP survey targeted a population of 3,487 households out of which 224 households were sampled and answered questionnaires. This accounted for 6.4% of target households with 53% female representation.

The survey revealed that most of interviewed households (67%) fetched water from the tap, 15% from a borehole equipped with India Mark II pump and 18% from open unprotected sources, i.e. Lake Mweru and Kenani River respectively.

Further, the burden of water collection for domestic use was done by adult females constituting 85% of the respondents. Among the water treatment modalities, the respondents use boiling (35%), filtration (23%) and sun exposure (12%) while the rest adopted other unexplained methods.

Regarding sanitation the survey shows that 93% had access to communal latrines, while 7% made use of open defecation and other means respectively.

## DETAILED OPERATIONAL PLAN

 <p><b>Shelter</b>  <b>People reached: 7,000</b>  Male: 3,430  Female: 3,570</p>		
<b>Outcome 1: Communities in disaster and crisis affected areas restore and strengthen their safety, well-being and longer-term recovery through shelter and settlement solutions.</b>		
<b>Output 1.1: Short, medium-term shelter and settlement assistance is provided to affected households (Target: 1,400 Households).</b>		
<b>Indicators:</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
Percentage of households living in shelters meeting agreed standards for emergency shelter.	100%	100%
Number of households who have received temporary/transitional shelter assistance to enable agreed standards.	210	210
Procure and transport 840 (increased from 240) shelter kits (tarpaulins, ropes, nails).	840	840
Distribute 840 (increased from 240) shelter kits into entry points.	840	840
Procure and transport 2,800 blankets.	2,800	2,800
Distribute blankets (2 per family) to 1,400 households.	1,400	1,400
Construction of 210 shelters for vulnerable population in the camp (for new arrivals)	210	100
Construction of 4 communal shelters for the reception of daily new arrivals.	4	2
Transportation of non-food items to the Transit Centres (to account for increased costs with long distance travel between Transit Centres and hire of 2 utility vehicles).	2	2
<b>Output 1.2: Technical support, guidance and awareness raising in safe shelter design and settlement planning and improved building techniques are provided to affected households (1,400 households).</b>		
<b>Indicators:</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
Train volunteers on cover shelter.	40	40
Volunteers conduct awareness campaign to raise understating of safety principles.	20	12
Develop and print IEC materials to promote safe shelter practices in both displacement sites.	210	210
Beneficiary satisfaction survey on the provided relief items (as part of survey mentioned above).	1	1
Narrative description of achievements		
<p>Some 40 volunteers were trained in basic shelter setup. The training was conducted by the shelter RDRT expert and was also extended to the refugee community representatives. The RDRT also conducted an orientation for all key stakeholders in the camp on site planning for the new settlement area. A total of 840 shelter kits were procured and delivered to the Camp. 100 Shelters were constructed for the vulnerable refugees in the camp who included the elderly and unaccompanied minors. Increased shelter for the vulnerable population was achieved. This intervention improved the shelter condition for the beneficiaries.</p> <p>The size of the tarpaulins was smaller than the standard and ZRCS needed 5 tarps to make up one household shelter. Due to budget limit, this reduced the number of shelter constructed from 210 to 100. Other shelter needs were then covered by other agencies.</p>		

Twelve (12) awareness campaigns on safety were conducted instead of 20 because of other demands that required urgent attention using the same volunteer base. Therefore, ZRCS did not have enough volunteers to implement the planned 20 campaigns.

A total of 2,800 blankets were procured delivered and distributed to 1,400 households in Kenani Transits camp (2 blankets per household).

Two (2) communal shelters were constructed at Kenani Transit Centre which were meant to temporarily hold the new arrivals from the Reception centres before they were allocated plots and building material to build their own family shelters. The plan was to build 4 communal shelters for reception however, UNHCR built two as well therefore, the need for ZRCS to build was reduced to 2.

#### Challenges

- ❖ Construction of the shelters using nails as fasteners on the tarpaulins was challenging as the nails often tore the tarpaulins due to strong wind in the camp, leading to leakages when it rained.
- ❖ Kenani camp had limited space to construct more shelter due to increase in the number of refugees that were coming into the camp. As such, only 100 out of the 210 shelters planned for vulnerable population in the camp were constructed.
- ❖ Tarpaulins bought locally were not strong enough and were tearing up easily. Indeed, due to the emergency nature of the intervention, local procurement was necessary and exposed the operation to compromised quality of the tarpaulins.

#### Lessons Learned

- ❖ Strings were better off used to fasten the tarpaulins as opposed to nails which made perforations.
- ❖ Construction of shelters in lone area and distributing them to the vulnerable beneficiaries had a negative effect as the area was labeled, "*The vulnerable corridor*".
- ❖ The shelters support activities should have targeted the whole camp instead of only care givers to avoid stigmatization.



### Health

**People reached: 7,000**

Male: 3,430

Female: 3,570

**Outcome 2: Vulnerable people's health and dignity are improved through increased access to appropriate health services.**

**Output 2.1: Communities are supported by the National Society to effectively detect and respond to infectious disease outbreaks; including distribution of mosquito nets (Target: 1,400 HHs - 200 households per Transit Centre).**

Indicators:	Target	Actual
Percentage of people in transit centre area who can access appropriate health services.	100%	100%
Procure/distribute mosquito nets to target population (Target: 1,400 households' mosquito nets / two per household).	2,800	2,800
Demonstration for the beneficiaries on how to use the mosquito nets.	1,400 HH	1,400 HH
Procure 50 First Aid kits	50	50
Number of volunteers trained in Malaria, Malnutrition detection combined with Hygiene Promotion practices.	30	30
Carry out first aid services to persons in need and referrals to identified appropriate health facilities.	Ongoing	Done (36)
Identify a possible site for isolation and treatment if an outbreak occurs.	1	1
Procure 150 gum boats and other Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) for volunteers.	150	150

**Output 2.2: Communities are supported by the National Society to effectively respond to health and psychosocial needs during an emergency (Target: 30 people).**

Indicators:	Target	Actual
Conduct two days training for 30 volunteers on psychosocial support.	30	0
Carry out psychosocial support services.	Ongoing	0
Management of human remains (cost of burial, coffins).	20	2

<p><b>Narrative description of achievements</b></p> <p>A total of 2,800 mosquito nets were procured and distributed to 1,400 households. In addition, 30 hygiene promoters were trained in Malaria prevention and disseminated information on how to prevent malaria by keeping their surroundings clean. They also conducted demonstrations on the proper use of the mosquito nets.</p> <p>Some 50 First Aid Kits were procured and distributed to the transit and reception centres for the trained First Aid (FA) volunteers to use in the Camp. FA services were offered to persons in need and referrals to health facilities were done where necessary. The support was extended to the child friendly centres where other agencies (Plan International and Save the children) were supporting minor First Aid to children injured on the playgrounds.</p> <p>Standby First Aiders supported 263 refugees' convoys (from November 2017 to February 2018) during relocations from the Reception centres of Kaputa and Chiengi to the Kenani Transit centre as well as from Kenani transit centres to Mantapala Refugee settlement.</p> <p>Other First Aid services were provided within the camps with support from other movement partners (i.e. NLRC); 30 individuals were assisted with FA and 6 others were referred to appropriate health services.</p> <p>In conjunction with UNHCR and other actors on the ground, ZRCS identified a site and erected a tent for isolation and treatment in readiness for any disease outbreak, especially WASH relate and cholera considering that Nchelenge where the transit camp was situated, is a cholera hotspot.</p> <p>150 gum boots and other Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) were procured for volunteers to ensure that everyone and every part of the camp was reached without having the volunteers being affected considering that the operations happened during the rainy season.</p> <p>Training of 30 volunteers on psychosocial support was not done as the Health and care manager, who was supposed to facilitate the training, was already involved in the cholera operations in Lusaka. Therefore, he was not available to deliver the training during the time of the operation and consequently no beneficiaries were reached with PSS. However, this was indicated by ZRCS during the multi-agencies coordination meeting and other organizations provided PSS to the refugees.</p> <p>ZRCS in collaboration with other stake holders, Ministry of Health, World Vision and MSF Spain assisted in setting up a Cholera Treatment centre at Kenani Transits centre. The NS also supported the management of human remains in the camps through process facilitation, provision of transport and coffins for use during burials. Indeed, ZRCS fully managed two (2) human remains and burials. Others were directly managed by UNHCR; however, ZRCS provided volunteers to support UNHCR in other burials that took place during the operation.</p> <p><b>Challenges</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Some refugees were using the mosquito nets as fishing nets in lake Mweru.</li> <li>❖ It was difficult to follow-up feedback from the Malaria activities and Malaria detection as the same volunteers were also conducting door to door campaigns on hygiene prevention.</li> <li>❖ Hygiene Promotion activities received more attention from volunteers than the other activities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Lessons Learned</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Data collection tools and mechanisms should comprehensively and quickly collect information on all activities in the field in order not to keep all the volunteers focusing on it in detriment of other activities implementation.</li> <li>❖ Proper engagement and awareness of refugees on the use of mosquito nets is necessary to ensure appropriate use.</li> </ul>
--



**Water, sanitation and hygiene**

**People reached: 13,950**  
 Male: 6,277  
 Female: 7,673

**Outcome 3: Vulnerable people have increased access to appropriate and sustainable water, sanitation and hygiene services.**

**Output 3.1: National Society promotes positive behavioural change in personal and community hygiene among targeted communities (480 households).**

Indicators:	Target	Actual
Number of people provided with excreta disposal facilities.	1,000	5,752
Average number of people per toilet.	23	32
Number of people reached by hygiene promotion activities.	7,000	13,950
Number of volunteers deployed to ensure that water is adequately treated.	30	30
Conduct continuous assessment of water, sanitation, and hygiene situation in case of deterioration or disease outbreak, and coordination with Local Government authorities.	Ongoing	Done
Procure and transport hygiene-related NFIs (dignity kits, toothbrush, toothpaste, sanitary pads, diapers, soap, buckets and water treatment tablets).	480	480
Distribute hygiene-related NFIs to 480 families (2 buckets per family, 1 hygiene kit/dignity kit per person).	480	480
Conduct training/demonstration at household level on how to use hygiene-related goods.	480 HH	480 HH
Develop a hygiene communication plan (based on the needs assessment, hygiene issues, target group etc.).	1	1
Number of volunteers trained on basic hygiene and sanitation practices and on how to implement hygiene promotion activities.	30	30
Develop and print appropriate IEC materials on hygiene Promotion.	1,100	5,000
Volunteers conduct awareness creation campaigns on good hygiene and sanitation practices.	7,000	13,950
<b>Output 3.2: Adequate sanitation which meets Sphere standards in terms of quantity and quality is provided (Target: 7,000 people).</b>		
Indicators:	Target	Actual
Installation of handwashing station at latrines	50	50
Construction of 100 temporary latrines.	100	100
Repair of boreholes and water taps in the camp.	18	50
Decommissioning of 350 temporary latrines (procurement of enzymes)	350	48
Installation of a solar powered light system in camp	1	0
Installation of latrines at entry point (2 in Kipushi and 2 in Kakoma communal station) with hand washing station in each Transit centre.	4	2
Installation of Waste Management Structure in both Transit centres.	2	0
<b>Narrative description of achievements</b>		
<p>Continuous assessment on water, sanitation and hygiene situation in coordination with local government authorities were conducted to keep monitoring the situation in the camps. Procurement and distribution of chlorine to 480 households was done to ensure water is clean and safe for domestic use. Liquid hand washing soap were also distributed for use at the latrines in the camps. Some 480 families were provided with hygiene/dignity kits for their personal hygiene.</p> <p>A rise in the number of excreta disposal facilities implemented from the targeted 1,000 to 5,752 was as a result of increased influx of refugees and was enabled by the extension of the DREF implementation period. The activity was also supported by other partners, i.e. UNICEF.</p> <p>The number of beneficiaries / households reached with hygiene promotion exceeded target due to the increase of influx of refugees and extension of the DREF as well. The needs were much higher than expected and ZRCS had the lead on this activity, so this priority increased the number of beneficiaries reached under this operation.</p> <p>Continuous assessment of water, sanitation, and hygiene situation was done in coordination with the district WASH committees, health authorities and under the inter-agencies coordination mechanisms. ZRCS participated in the assessment which was conducted throughout the operation.</p> <p>50 handwashing stations were installed with the latrines as planned.</p> <p>A hygiene communication plan was developed based on the needs assessment and demonstrations were conducted at household levels on how to use the hygiene related materials. 30 volunteers were trained on basic hygiene and</p>		

sanitation practices, and 5,000 IEC materials on hygiene promotion were produced while continuous implementation of hygiene promotion activities was conducted. A total of 100 temporary latrines were constructed and still in use at the end of the DREF operation.

Only other 48 of the planned 350 temporary latrines were decommissioned as during the time of the DREF operation only 48 needed to be decommissioned. Other were still operational as well.

The installation of the solar powered system did not take place because of several of technical challenges and there was no supplier able to provide technical support to ZRCS during the time of the operation.

Routine maintenance of boreholes and repair of water taps in the camps were done. More taps were repaired than initially planned since more taps were erected as the number of refugees increased.

Two (2) latrines were erected at entry points instead of 4 as others were constructed with support from the Netherlands Red Cross. A total of 5,000 IEC materials were procured instead of the planned 1,100 to meet the increased demand.

#### Challenges

- ❖ The number of latrines that were decommissioned was high due to increasing number of refugees.
- ❖ High number of collapsing temporal latrines due to unstable ground.
- ❖ The population increase was far higher than what was planned for the operation leading to inadequate latrines.
- ❖ Inadequate hand washing facilities in addition to soap displayed that were being removed by the refugees.
- ❖ Little participation of refugees in hygiene promotion activities as the refugees wanted ZRCS volunteers to be cleaning their toilets.
- ❖ Insufficient collaboration between ZRCS Hygiene Promoters and Refugee WASH committee.

#### Lessons Learned

- ❖ Adequate involvement of the refugees as hygiene promoters would enhance participation of community members in hygiene activities.
- ❖ Information sharing among partners to enhance complementarity and avoid unnecessary duplication.
- ❖ Child friendly and disability friendly latrines would cater for needs of children, disabled and the elderly to help reduce open defecation.
- ❖ Improved design of temporal latrines would reduce the risk of collapsing and prolong the life span of latrines.

## Strategies for Implementation 1 – Strengthening National Societies

**Outcome 4: National Society capacity building and organizational development objectives are facilitated to ensure that National Societies have the necessary legal, ethical and financial foundations, systems and structures, competences and capacities to plan and perform**

**Output 1.1: Initial needs assessment are updated following consultation with beneficiaries; and Emergency Plan of Action is updated and revised as necessary to reflect needs during the timeframe of the DREF.**

Indicators:	Target	Actual
% of people involved in the emergency planning process who are working for the local branch.	100	130 (120 Volunteers and 10 HQ Staff)
n° of volunteers provided with insurance	120	120
% of required volunteers and staff with adequate response tools (Internet, visibility materials, and stationary)	100%	100%

**Output 4.1: National Societies have the necessary corporate infrastructure and systems in place.**

Indicators:	Target	Actual
Provide staff and volunteers with stationary and connectivity materials (phones, SIM cards, etc.)	130 (120 volunteers and 10 HQ Staff)	130
Establish volunteer insurance for working volunteers	120	120
Procure 150 t-shirts and other visibility materials (stickers with ZRCS logo, and megaphones)	150 T-shirts + 30 megaphones + 100 stickers	120 T-shirts + 30 megaphones + 100 stickers

<b>Narrative description of achievements</b>		
<p>A total of 120 ZRCS volunteers and 10 NHQ staff were deployed to implement and support the DREF operation. Twenty additional were deployed compared to the initial plan, due to the high influx of refugees and needs that were above the estimation from initial assessment. All the 120 volunteers were provided with adequate response tools and IFRC insurance.</p> <p>For visibility and communication, a total of 150 bibs, 30 megaphones with 60 batteries, 100 ZRCS stickers, 120 T-shirts for volunteers were procured under this DREF operation. Only 120 T-shirts were procured instead of 150 as only 120 volunteers were deployed.</p>		
<b>Challenges</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ The influx of refugees was higher than expected which required a deployment of 20 extra volunteers.</li> <li>❖ Staff deployed from the NHQ to support the operation were limited and not 100% involved as they had to keep working on other programmes and NHQ priorities.</li> <li>❖ No clear Terms of References for the role of support staff to the operation.</li> <li>❖ Conflicting instructions to the project teams caused frustration and confusion.</li> </ul>		
<b>Lessons Learned</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Need of more detailed and continuous assessment with integration of forecast scenario to anticipate better a higher level of needs.</li> </ul>		

## Strategies for Implementation 2 – International Disaster Management

### Outcome 5: Effective and coordinated international disaster response is ensured

<b>Indicators:</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
N° of surge deployed to support the operation	3	3
<b>Output 5.1 Effective and respected surge capacity mechanism is maintained.</b>		
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
Deployment of Shelter RDRT	1	1
Deployment of IFRC Logistics to support local procurement alongside ZRCS	1	1
Deployment of IFRC Operations Manager from Regional Office to support operations revision, assessments and coordination alongside ZRCS	1	1
<b>Narrative description of achievements</b>		
<p>Shelter RDRT was deployed to support ZRCS volunteers' training on Shelter and supervise the implementation/monitoring of shelter activities.</p> <p>IFRC deployed a logistics officer from Zimbabwe office to support ZRCS with the local and international procurement, and other logistics challenges (transport, storage).</p> <p>From December of 2017 until May 2018 IFRC deployed an Operations Manager from Regional Office to support operations revision, assessments and coordination alongside ZRCS.</p> <p>In addition, 2 NDRT members were deployed to support the operation. 1 member was stationed in Chiengi Reception centre while the other was stationed at Kenani Transits centre. They were both involved on disaster response activities such as reception of asylum seekers, distribution of food and non-food items, construction of shelters and needs assessment. NHQ staff were also deployed to support the operation. ZRCS staff involved in the operation were from Disaster Management Department, Health and care, Communications, Accounting and Logistics.</p>		
<b>Challenges</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ No challenge to report here.</li> </ul>		
<b>Lessons Learned</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ NDRT teams were critical in the initial setting up of the camp as they provided support and trainings to the volunteers in the field.</li> <li>❖ NDRT teams helped establish coordination mechanisms and took leadership in project implementation.</li> <li>❖ Surge support were critical for technical support and assisting the global implementation of the DREF.</li> </ul>		

## Strategies for Implementation 3 – Influence others as leading strategic partners in humanitarian action and resilience

**Outcome 6: The IFRC Secretariat, together with National Societies, uses their unique position to influence decisions at local, national and international levels that affect the most vulnerable**

Indicators:	Target	Actual
n° of monitoring visits completed	4	6
n° of media communications produced	1	1
% of beneficiary satisfied with assistance through the DREF	100%	100%
<b>Output 6.1 Effective and respected surge capacity mechanism is maintained.</b>		
Indicator	Target	Actual
Conduct continuous needs and situation assessment	Continuous	Done
The emergency plan of action is updated and revised as necessary to reflect on needs	1	1
Continuous NHQ/field level monitoring and documentation of the activities planned in the DREF; and refugee influx	Continuous	Done
Preparation of reporting as required (including Operations updates)	1	1
Media documentary produced	1	1
Conduct beneficiary satisfaction survey	1	1
Establish beneficiary complaints and feedback mechanism in the areas of implementation	Ongoing	Done
Conduct final evaluation and lessons learned workshop	1	1
<b>Narrative description of achievements</b>		
<p>Monitoring and documentation of DREF activities and refugee influx were conducted throughout the operation. 4 out of 6 visits were conducted as other monitoring were conducted through the multi-agency coordination and therefore this was sufficient for the time of the operation.</p> <p>The initial EPoA was revised and updated once to request time extension and budget revision.</p> <p>1 Media documentary was produced and it captured the activities (Shelter, WASH, Health) implemented by ZRCS with the support of the DREF in the camp.</p> <p>1 Lessons learned workshop was conducted at the end of the operation, gathering the volunteers deployed, the NHQ staff, other partners and the IFRC Operations Manager.</p> <p>Beneficiary complaints and feedback mechanisms were established but no complaints were registered during the time of the operation. This was mainly due to the lack of technical skills and capacities of ZRCS in CEA activities and implementing such mechanism. In addition, the NS did not have enough capacities to continuously track the community feedback. This was reported to the inter-agencies coordination meetings and UNHCR covered this gap by implementing their own feedback mechanism.</p>		
<b>Challenges</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Lack of technical capacities from ZRCS in Community Engagement and Accountability and especially Community feedback and complaints mechanisms.</li> <li>❖ Lack of anticipation of the number of refugees' influx which was higher than expected.</li> </ul>		
<b>Lessons Learned</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Inter-agencies coordination for such operation was benefitted the whole implementation to cover the identified gaps and avoid duplications.</li> <li>❖ Need for training on CEA and complaint mechanisms. This was done as 2 ZRCS staff attended the CEA training and ToT conducted by IFRC in Pretoria from 25 to 29 of June 2018.</li> </ul>		

## D. THE BUDGET

The overall budget for this DREF operation was CHF 267,300 of which CHF 250,162 (93.73%) were spent. However, as the initial income allocation of CHF 270,909 was not adjusted to match the revised budget (done through an Ops update in November 2017) of CHF 267,300; a balance of CHF 20,747 will be returned to the DREF.

### **Explanation of variances**

- “Construction Materials” was underspent by CHF 3,142 (1%) as shelter construction were erroneously coded under “Water, sanitation & Hygiene”.
- As a direct consequence of the above coding error, “Water, Sanitation & Hygiene” was over spent by CHF 9,408 (23%) as shelter construction were erroneously coded under this line.
- No budget was allocated on the “Other supplies & services” budget line, but CHF 184 expenses booked on this line. This is because of coffins expenditure, budgeted under “Water, sanitation & Hygiene” budget line was erroneously coded under this line.
- No budget was allocated on the “Storage” budget line, but CHF 585 expenses booked on this line due to the long distance between ZRCS HQ and the targeted camp which increased the logistical costs and constraints. Storage of relief items were needed during the time of the operation but was not planned in the initial EPoA.
- No budget was allocated on the “Logistics Services” budget line, but CHF 328 expenses booked on this line to manage the tarpaulins stock movement from Dubai which was not planned in the initial EPoA.
- No budget was allocated on the “International Staff” budget line, but CHF 584 expenses booked on this line. This is because RDRT deployment was wrongly budgeted under “Travel” while it should have been budgeted under “International Staff”
- “Workshops & Training” was over spent by CHF 855 (16%) as training costs were under budgeted.
- “Travel” was over spent by CHF 5,707 (52%) due to the long distance between ZRCS HQ and the targeted camp which increased the logistical costs and constraints.
- “Information & Public Relations” were over spent by CHF 4,487 (117%) as information costs were under budgeted.
- “Office Costs” were over spent by CHF 600 (90%) as office costs were under budgeted
- No budget was allocated on the “Other General Expenses” budget line, but CHF 292 expenses booked on this line. This is because of office consumable expenditures budgeted under “Office Costs” was erroneously coded under this line.

## Contact Information

### For further information specifically related to this operation please contact:

- **Zambia Red Cross Society:** Patricia Nambuka, Deputy Secretary General, phone: +260953632864, email: [nambukapatricia@gmail.com](mailto:nambukapatricia@gmail.com)
- **IFRC Country Representative:** Alexander Mwangi; Operations Manager, Zambia Population movement, Phone +260974523150; email: [alexander.mwangi@ifrc.org](mailto:alexander.mwangi@ifrc.org)
- **IFRC Southern Africa Cluster:** Lorraine Mangwi, Head of Southern Africa Cluster; phone: +27113039715; email: [lorraine.mangwi@ifrc.org](mailto:lorraine.mangwi@ifrc.org)
- **IFRC Africa Region :** Nicole Fassina, Disaster Management Unit; Nairobi; phone: +254 731583200 ; email : [nicole.fassina@ifrc.org](mailto:nicole.fassina@ifrc.org)
- **IFRC Geneva:** Alma Alsayed, Senior Officer, Response and Recovery; phone: +41 22 730 4566; Email: [alma.alsayed@ifrc.org](mailto:alma.alsayed@ifrc.org)
- **IFRC Region Logistics Unit:** Rishi Ramrakha, Head of Africa Region Logistics Unit; phone: +254 733 888 022/ Fax +254 20 271 2777; email: [rishi.ramrakha@ifrc.org](mailto:rishi.ramrakha@ifrc.org)

### For Resource Mobilization and Pledges:

- **In IFRC Africa Zone:** Kentaro Nagazumi, Head of Partnership and Resource Development, Nairobi; phone: +254202835155; email: [kentaro.nagazumi@ifrc.org](mailto:kentaro.nagazumi@ifrc.org)

### or Performance and Accountability (planning, monitoring, evaluation and reporting):

- **IFRC Zone:** Fiona Gatere, PMER Coordinator; phone: +254780771139; email: [fiona.gatere@ifrc.org](mailto:fiona.gatere@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 always 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](http://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

## MDRZM010 - Zambia - Population Movement

Timeframe: 26 Sep 17 to 26 Feb 18

Appeal Launch Date: 26 Sep 17

Final Report

## Selected Parameters

Reporting Timeframe	2017/9-2018/6	Programme	MDRZM010
Budget Timeframe	2017/9-2018/2	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
<b>A. Budget</b>		267,300				267,300	
<b>B. Opening Balance</b>							
<b>Income</b>							
<u>Other Income</u>							
<i>DREF Allocations</i>		270,909				270,909	
<b>C4. Other Income</b>		270,909				270,909	
<b>C. Total Income = SUM(C1..C4)</b>		270,909				270,909	
<b>D. Total Funding = B +C</b>		270,909				270,909	

\* 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>B. Opening Balance</b>							
<b>C. Income</b>		270,909				270,909	
<b>E. Expenditure</b>		-250,162				-250,162	
<b>F. Closing Balance = (B + C + E)</b>		20,747				20,747	

## Disaster Response Financial Report

## MDRZM010 - Zambia - Population Movement

Timeframe: 26 Sep 17 to 26 Feb 18

Appeal Launch Date: 26 Sep 17

Final Report

## Selected Parameters

Reporting Timeframe	2017/9-2018/6	Programme	MDRZM010
Budget Timeframe	2017/9-2018/2	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	
<b>BUDGET (C)</b>			<b>267,300</b>			<b>267,300</b>		
<b>Relief items, Construction, Supplies</b>								
Shelter - Relief	25,230		16,481			16,481	8,750	
Construction Materials	3,150		8			8	3,142	
Clothing & Textiles	40,656		45,126			45,126	-4,470	
Water, Sanitation & Hygiene	40,750		50,158			50,158	-9,408	
Medical & First Aid	5,200		4,952			4,952	248	
Other Supplies & Services			184			184	-184	
<b>Total Relief items, Construction, Sup</b>	<b>114,986</b>		<b>116,907</b>			<b>116,907</b>	<b>-1,921</b>	
<b>Logistics, Transport &amp; Storage</b>								
Storage			585			585	-585	
Distribution & Monitoring	9,720		3,443			3,443	6,277	
Transport & Vehicles Costs	16,050		13,494			13,494	2,556	
Logistics Services			328			328	-328	
<b>Total Logistics, Transport &amp; Storage</b>	<b>25,770</b>		<b>17,850</b>			<b>17,850</b>	<b>7,920</b>	
<b>Personnel</b>								
International Staff			584			584	-584	
National Society Staff	28,200		18,155			18,155	10,045	
Volunteers	53,405		46,080			46,080	7,325	
<b>Total Personnel</b>	<b>81,605</b>		<b>64,819</b>			<b>64,819</b>	<b>16,786</b>	
<b>Workshops &amp; Training</b>								
Workshops & Training	5,120		5,975			5,975	-855	
<b>Total Workshops &amp; Training</b>	<b>5,120</b>		<b>5,975</b>			<b>5,975</b>	<b>-855</b>	
<b>General Expenditure</b>								
Travel	11,125		16,832			16,832	-5,707	
Information & Public Relations	3,810		8,297			8,297	-4,487	
Office Costs	660		1,260			1,260	-600	
Communications	7,030		2,226			2,226	4,804	
Financial Charges	880		434			434	446	
Other General Expenses			292			292	-292	
<b>Total General Expenditure</b>	<b>23,505</b>		<b>29,342</b>			<b>29,342</b>	<b>-5,837</b>	
<b>Indirect Costs</b>								
Programme & Services Support Recove	16,314		15,268			15,268	1,046	
<b>Total Indirect Costs</b>	<b>16,314</b>		<b>15,268</b>			<b>15,268</b>	<b>1,046</b>	
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURE (D)</b>	<b>267,300</b>		<b>250,162</b>			<b>250,162</b>	<b>17,138</b>	
<b>VARIANCE (C - D)</b>			<b>17,138</b>			<b>17,138</b>		

**Disaster Response Financial Report****MDRZM010 - Zambia - Population Movement**

Timeframe: 26 Sep 17 to 26 Feb 18

Appeal Launch Date: 26 Sep 17

Final Report

**Selected Parameters**

Reporting Timeframe	2017/9-2018/6	Programme	MDRZM010
Budget Timeframe	2017/9-2018/2	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
<b>BL2 - Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people</b>							
Disaster management	267,300		270,909	270,909	250,162	20,747	
Subtotal BL2	267,300		270,909	270,909	250,162	20,747	
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>267,300</b>		<b>270,909</b>	<b>270,909</b>	<b>250,162</b>	<b>20,747</b>	