

www.ifrc.org  
Saving lives,  
changing minds.

# Emergency Plan of Action Final Report

## Hungary: Storm

 International Federation  
of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

<b>DREF operation final report</b>	<b>Operation n° MDRHU007</b>
<b>Date of issue: 23 March 2020</b>	<b>Glide number: n° FL-2019-00075-HU</b>
<b>Date of disaster: 27 June 2019</b>	
<b>Operation start date: 27 June 2019</b>	<b>Operation end date: 8 December 2019</b>
<b>Host National Society: Hungarian Red Cross (HRC)</b>	<b>Operation budget: CHF 230,067</b>
<b>Number of people affected: approx. 150,000</b>	<b>Number of people assisted: 7,200</b>
<b>Red Cross Red Crescent Movement partners currently actively involved in the operation: IFRC</b>	
<b>Other partner organizations actively involved in the operation:</b> National Directorate General for Disaster Management (NDMA), municipalities in the affected areas, Caritas Hungary, Hungarian Charity Service of the Order of Malta and Hungarian Reformed Church Aid. -	

## A. Situation analysis

### Description of the disaster

Devastating storm cells hit Eastern Hungary on the afternoon of 27 June 2019, leaving 80 settlements affected by damages caused by strong wind and heavy rainfall. According to the National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA), 2,560 rooftops (160 public and 2,400 private properties) were damaged. The Hungarian Red Cross immediately started the coordination of the assistance with relevant authorities. According to the assessments, the most affected settlements were Pusztadobos, Nyírkarász, and the town of Nyírmada, where 80 per cent of private homes suffered damages.

Trees fell on electrical aerial cables and caused blackouts in 93 settlements leaving more than 50,000 households without electricity for two or more days, when finally electricity has been restored in all affected households. The NDMA indicated that more than 30 families (114 people) were evacuated due to life threatening structural damages, all of whom have been sheltered in municipal homes or at relatives and have not been able to return to their homes. In total, 2,400 households suffered damages (approx. 7,200 people) with the scale of damage on a wide spectrum.

The Hungarian Government officially requested assistance from the National Society through the Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg county's government office. Damages have been reported continuously by citizens to the municipalities, the registration of the number of affected households and population is coordinated by the Authorities. Hungarian Red Cross county branch staff and volunteers were on the scene and coordinating with local and central authorities to identify the most affected and vulnerable people to work with. The region affected is challenged with multidimensional poverty, many households face poverty due to low income.

### Summary of response

#### Overview of Host National Society

Hungarian Red Cross Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg county branch started to assess the needs and planning the RC response immediately after the disaster. The county branch coordinated the assessment with the local and central authorities (municipalities and central governmental agencies – County DM Directorate and County Government Office). National Headquarters contacted other charities working in the country (Members of the National Committee of Charities, detailed below) to coordinate the efforts and avoid parallel actions. Local Branch mobilized its current NFI stocks including clothes and furniture to replenish losses occurred in the homes during the first days of the operation, incorporated to the general operation of the County Branch. HRC discussed the situation with main stakeholders and met with the most affected households during the on-site assessments described above. Establishing contact with the families made initial psychosocial support possible and they welcomed the opportunity to talk out their fears and uncertainties. Staff of HRC's local office and volunteers are also assisting with non-skilled tasks in response activities, eg. clearing roads and cutting branches of fallen trees.

Hungarian RC is the largest civil society organisation (NGO) in the country with 55,000 paid membership, and a main partner for Disaster Management authorities. In the last ten years, HRC was involved in all disaster situations in the country both during response and recovery actions. The National Society DM department implemented Emergency Plan of Actions with DREF and EA assistance in the recent years responding to floods, blizzards, population movement and (hail) storm damages. HRC RDRT trained volunteers are assisting the assessment and planning activities.

### **Overview of Red Cross Red Crescent Movement in country**

Colleagues of IFRC ROE participated in the press conference in July, as well as the distribution and field visit done on the same day.

### **Overview of non-RCRC actors in country**

National Directorate General for Disaster Management (NDMA) coordinated the technical rescue activities: firefighters responded immediately after the storm hit the region to more than 1,500 calls related to the event received via the central emergency number (112). Professional and volunteer firefighters arrived to the affected area from all around the country, and fire brigades from neighbouring countries also mobilized their assets to work on the damaged houses, trees and infrastructure. Local authorities and municipalities were working to collect information on the damaged households and coordinate the support from civil society organisations.

Contrary to the original plans, municipalities were able to secure other sources to assist the families in need, some of them mobilized own resources, or asked to divert other earmarked rural development funds. The central government provided support in various forms, including support to 81 houses with approx. CHF 800,000 through municipalities, set out in a governmental resolution, which has been implemented in various methods by the municipal offices (eg. provision of second hand or new materials). Concerning the municipal elections in October 2019, many municipal offices were focusing to resolve any problems and issues in their respective responsibility areas within their competences and own resources. Municipalities therefore channelled non-disaster related funds into the response (e.g. rural development fund), as well as organised ad hoc actions to cover the rooftops. Central government mobilized various sources, while municipalities also provided different new and reused cover materials for the affected people. Maltese and Reformed Church Aid charities were active on different settlements, mainly with the provision of limited number of rooftop materials and non-food items. As currently there is no systematic approach laid down in the legislation for the compensation of disaster related losses in Hungary, partners also experienced challenges due to the ad hoc efforts of the different political actors.

Other civil society organisations also assessed the situation in hand, collected and distributed donations to assist the affected population. HRC coordinated the relief operation with Caritas Hungary, Hungarian Charity Service of the Order of Malta and Hungarian Reformed Church Aid.

### **Needs analysis and scenario planning**

Hungarian Red Cross carried out multiple assessments through this operation (on 27 and 28 June, 2 and 18 July, and 10 October). Branch volunteers and staff were immediately on the scene after the event, and HRC NHQ made several assessment and coordination visits together with the field coordinator. The first on-site assessment, which was carried out during the first 24 hours, identified the scale of the event, the gaps of the ongoing response and needs. During further assessments HRC identified the current and anticipated further needs, changes in the operational environment, as well as coordinated with the authorities, met with municipal officials and community members.

The original Emergency Plan of Action had to be revised in the light of the changing operational environment due the higher involvement and independent activity of municipal offices, which became clear only by mid-September. Although the vast majority of the physical shelter needs were covered by different means - either by the municipalities or by the affected households themselves by end of September - long lasting needs caused by the disaster were not met by these actions. As the area affected by the storm is located in a socially and economically challenged region, many affected settlements face complex deprivation. Due the large social vulnerability of the affected communities, the storm caused long lasting needs, including the need for food assistance.

Despite the support for the rooftop repairs, the affected households experienced losses in their food stocks, as explained in the "needs analysis" section of the original EPoA. Families needed to divert their income and resources, therefore assistance with food packages were still needed and counted on. Discussions with municipal leaders and with the affected people also confirmed the need for the food packages. HRC therefore focused its assistance on the distribution of 2,400 food parcels, reaching up to 7,200 people.

According to the Beneficiary Satisfaction Survey conducted by HRC, majority of the sample received aid from RC and local authorities. Almost all of them were aware of the activities carried out by HRC and have been asked about their needs by either the local authorities or HRC. The relief provided by HRC has been found relevant and sufficient (see details later). The date and place of the distributions have been found to be adequate, as the venues were within half an hour of travel for all respondents. According to the answers, HRC colleagues and staff were visible, and their

behaviour was appropriate. HRC carried out semi-structured discussions both with the beneficiaries and with the partners. Beneficiaries described the assistance received in a positive manner, they appreciated the support from HRC and from the municipalities as well. Local citizens mostly acknowledge the major's office as primary contact in case of a disaster, and they know the officers of the municipalities by name.

### Risk Analysis

During the operation HRC faced two unexpected challenges, which had to be addressed. Although in the initial market survey they have confirmed their capacity to provide a quote, during the procurement process, general suppliers in the country were not able to provide the needed quantity and quality of materials needed for the relief packages. On one hand their transport and warehousing capacities were fixed, and they were not able to provide the complete parcels. This has been mitigated with the identification of a wholesale company in late September, which usually supplies public bodies (e.g. military) with food and household items, and had pre-packed food parcels on stock ready to distribute.

Did the support provided cover your initial needs?



Figure 1 – Result of the Beneficiary Satisfaction Survey

The other challenge was the changing operational environment. During the first assessments and coordination with municipalities, large number of households in need of rooftop coverage have been identified. As the operation proceeded, HRC found out that municipalities decided to mobilize different resources to assist the population, which put a hold to the procurement of the materials. As the needs for shelter materials were covered by these means, HRC had to reduce shelter-related actions.

## B. Operational strategy and plan

### Implemented strategy

The Hungarian Red Cross assisted 2,400 families (approx. 7,200 people) affected by the storm and heavy rains through the provision of 2,400 food kits and provided technical assistance for minor rooftop repairs for seven houses.

Hungarian Red Cross carried out the initial assessment after the disaster with the participation of branch colleagues and volunteers, visiting affected settlements and meeting with relevant stakeholders (e.g. community and municipality leaders and affected families). HRC NHQ contacted NDMA directly, and initiated coordination with other organisations operating in Hungary. HRC received information from the County Disaster Management Directorate, initial planning was based on both findings of the field visits and the data received from the partners of the organisation. Further field assessments have been done with the participation of the field coordinator, the branch and NHQ colleagues throughout the whole operation, as described above in the needs analysis section.



Image 1- Distribution at a kindergarten. Photo: HRC

HRC raised questions during the coordination meetings related to the different potentially relevant sectors in order to gain deep understanding of the situation. Households had to report their damages and losses to the municipalities, which were in direct contact with them. HRC visited several damaged houses during the field assessments to identify needs and preferences.

The organisation built the food kit distribution on existing community networks and on local knowledge of municipal social and health workers (e.g. family support officers and health visitors) who assisted in the distributions, which itself took place mostly in community areas (community centre, library, municipal office building, etc.).

The originally proposed strategy has been changed in the light of the above-mentioned changes and the findings of the repeated assessments. In the [operation update](#) issued on 31 October 2019, HRC had to revise the provision of materials for rooftop coverage, as the majority of the houses received support from other sources (see below), causing a major reduction in the budget. The Hungarian Red Cross worked to assist the affected population in coordination with the relevant authorities and charity organisations operating in the country. HRC's strategy was to provide assistance with means related to food assistance and sheltering. To meet the food needs of the affected population, the HRC distributed

a total of 2,400 food rations (nationally standardized food kit, weight up to 24 metric tons) in consultation with the local authorities and other charities. Direct in-kind assistance is the preferred way currently in Hungary. Goods have been procured by local commercial actors on the local markets providing certified goods in line with national legislation.

Aid distribution has been assisted by local authorities and communities. As municipal offices were in direct contact with the affected population, HRC organised the delivery with the support of the municipalities. Municipal buildings, such as community centres, kindergartens, library or the municipal office building served as distribution points, while in one settlement (Mátészalka) the municipality provided transportation and social service support personnel for door to door distribution. Municipal assets proved very efficient also in the dissemination of information related to the distribution among the affected population.

HRC implemented Beneficiary Satisfaction Survey, (anonymous survey, which has been filled by 39 beneficiaries), and three focus group discussions have been held on 21 November 2019. According to the focus groups, the assistance given by HRC was needed and appreciated. The content of the packages was known by the beneficiaries, as it was a standardized parcel used by the authorities. The sites of the aid distributions were known and found to be easy to access. People knew the local municipal buildings and the workers assisting the distribution, and vice versa, local social workers and municipal officers proved to be precious assets as they knew the faces and names of the beneficiaries, which made the on-site distribution quicker.

According to results of the anonymous survey, the location of the distribution sites was easy to access, all responders were able to reach it within 30 minutes. All responders were aware that they received support from HRC, 68% found the assistance given sufficient, while for 32% it covered most of their initial needs.

## **Operational Support Services**

### **Human resources (HR)**

Assessment activities were led by the HRC County Branch, including field visits, meetings with people affected by the emergency and representatives of governmental and local governmental actors.

On-site operations have been assisted by a field coordinator (experienced in DREFs) and an operation finance coordinator (based at NHQ), who was hired for the period of the operation to ensure the timely and proper implementation of all planned activities.

The field operations coordinator was specifically responsible for the coordination with other organizations and groups involved in the response to prevent duplication and facilitate inter-agency communication, while the county branch held regular consultations with the local authorities and local groups. Direct personal and technical support was provided by the HRC NHQ to enhance staff capacities at the branch level in a surge support scheme.

HRC volunteers also joined forces with other local associations and groups (such as local volunteer firefighters and non-formal voluntary groups).

### **Logistics and supply chain**

Local procurement procedures have been challenged due the fact that regular HRC suppliers were not able to participate in the tendering process due to the lack of logistics to transport the goods to the site in the required number and time. HRC identified a supplier for the food parcels, which supplied food packages for national governmental aid programs (EU FEAD standardized parcels).

After consultation with IFRC ROE on the package content, HRC re-initiated the bidding process. Slate material procurement was cancelled due the changing number of houses to be assisted. Houses with major damages have been covered by governmental and municipal means, as well as by own capacities. Procurement lessons have been mainstreamed into lessons learned activities in order to provide opportunities for a better operational implementation in the future.

### **Communications**

HRC organised a press conference in July to direct attention for the needs of the disaster.

The HRC communicates all operations through its website, social media site and national media broadcasts. HRC's Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg county branch started to collect cash and in-kind donations to assist the affected population – HRC NHQ ran the campaign country wide to boost its result. The donation campaign can be accessed under this link (<http://voroskereszt.hu/adomanyozas/kampany-tamogatasa/adomanygyujtes-a-szabolcsi-viharkar-enyhitesere/>), at the time of this report HRC received CHF 335 from individuals.

### **Security**

During the implementation of the operation, no security or safety incidents have been reported. HRC takes safety and security as a serious factor, therefore all volunteers and staff working in the operation have been briefed on the relevant

prevention measures. The field coordinator constantly kept in mind safety and security considerations during the assessment and implementation activities.

Hungarian legislation does not allow unskilled volunteers to work at specific heights due to safety regulations in the country. HRC therefore mobilized volunteers with fire-fighting and rope technique backgrounds from its existing roster. Regular HRC volunteers (non-skilled in construction) assisted in non-skilled tasks, e.g. relief distribution to ensure that their safety and security is not compromised.

### Planning, monitoring, evaluation, & reporting (PMER)

HRC NHQ conducted a Beneficiary Satisfaction Survey with anonymous surveys and moderated focus group discussions.

A lessons learned workshop has been organised with the participation of the relevant internal actors (due other business responsibilities, invited external partners were not able to attend), participants identified gaps and ways to avoid challenges identified through the operation (e.g. reshaping procurement documents).

IFRC ROE Senior Disaster management officer was visiting the county, together with the operations' coordinator of the HRC at the occasion of the distribution taking place.



**Image 2-** BSS and focus group discussions.  
Photo: HRC

## C. DETAILED OPERATIONAL PLAN



### Shelter

**People reached: 49**

Male: 21

Female:28

Indicators:	Target	Actual
# of households provided with support	10	7
# of families assisted with rooftop coverage	10	7
Technical guidance adopted	1	10
# of volunteers mobilized	50	5

### Narrative description of achievements

Majority of the affected households have received temporary repairs from the municipality sources, therefore vast majority of shelter needs have been covered. HRC identified 10 houses with partial repair needs, meaning holes on the rooftops covered only by simple plastic sheets. HRC volunteers (5) and the field coordinator were able to assist 7 households in Ajak with minor repairs and provision of used materials.

Due the changes in the operational environment and the coordination with others, both, the type of distribution and number of people to be reached have been changed. HRC identified in October a remaining 10 houses for which tiles were provided by a partner charity. The repairs have been done by 9 November. Transportation of the tiles was arranged by HRC, as well as physical assistance from the trained HRC volunteers.

### Challenges

During the operation, the operational environment changed, as municipalities found new ways to channel resources to cover the shelter needs of the affected population. Number of households to be assisted became uncertain and had to be reduced, which had an impact on the overall operation.

### Lessons Learned

Lessons learned have been widely discussed during the LL workshop at the end of the operation. Agreements with municipalities should be formed in a written way in the future to ensure that the previously agreed implementation plan can take place. Contingency stocks should be developed by HRC, including stocks of cover sheets and fixing materials to provide immediate rooftop cover after disasters. Agreements with providers of rooftop materials should be initiated as a preparedness action before disasters, in order to make procurement processes quicker. Procurement

documents should be simplified. Trainings for local branch colleagues about disaster procurements could be organised, as well as pre-identified local supplier lists should be developed.



## Livelihoods and basic needs

**People reached: 7,200**

Male: 3,456

Female: 3,744

Indicators:	Target	Actual
# of families to whom food rations are distributed as in-kind assistance	2,400	2,400

### Narrative description of achievements

The storms damaged household's rooftops and affected food stocks. Many families lost vegetables, crops and fruits in their kitchen gardens. These losses underline the need for food assistance to the affected population. Hungarian Red Cross organised the relief distribution in 33 settlements reaching 2,400 households.

### Challenges

Local procurement procedures have been challenged due the fact that regular HRC suppliers were not able to participate in the tendering process due to the lack of logistics to transport the goods to the site in the required number and time. HRC identified a supplier for the food parcels, which supplied food packages for national governmental aid programs (EU FEAD standardized parcels).

### Lessons Learned

Lack of capacities of the regular HRC suppliers has to be addressed. As discussed during LL workshop, HRC has to revise the emergency procurement procedure in order to make it more efficient. Procurement documents should be simplified. Trainings for local branch colleagues about disaster procurements could be organised, as well as pre-identified local supplier lists should be developed. NHQ will identify possible procurement partners and put fast procurement options in place. (E.g. frame offers that are available upon certain currency rate.)

## Strengthen National Society

Indicators:	Target	Actual
# of volunteers and staff insured	50	10
# of volunteers and staff provided with PPE	N/A	10
# of post distribution monitoring conducted	1	1
# of lessons learned workshops	1	1

### Narrative description of achievements

HRC conducted safety and security measures according to the local legislation and RCRC standards. Although the IFRC volunteer insurance scheme was not initiated, volunteers involved in the operation have been covered with a different, local scheme. HRC provided PPE procured during previous operations and projects, extended with helmets procured in the frame of this DREF operation (10 pcs).

A Beneficiary Satisfaction Survey has been conducted, with a survey developed and conducted by HRC NHQ colleagues. The delivery of the sampling has been supported by HRC County Branch office and municipal officials in the selected locations. BSS survey was extended with semi-structured discussions both with beneficiaries and partner organisations. A lessons learned workshop have been organised at HRC's NHQ in November with the participation of the involved colleagues and the Sr DM Coordinator of IFR ROE (external partners have been invited, but were unable to attend).

### Challenges

The implementation area, the volunteers and the staff working in the operation are located in a wide geographical area, therefore their participation in the Lessons Learned Workshop was limited. During BSS survey sampling, inclusion of illiterate respondents were ensured by reading out the questions and registering their answers.

### Lessons Learned

The Lessons Learned workshop identified many possible steps to taken in the future, described in the relevant sections above and below.

## Influence others as leading strategic partner

Indicators:	Target	Actual
# of people reached with the donation campaign on social media	N/A	5,040
<b>Narrative description of achievements</b>		
HUF 105,500 (approx. CHF 335) was raised through the online donation surface. Facebook posts reached more than 5,000 people, through 137 shares and 687 visible engagements. HRC discussed advocacy-related issues with partners including other NGOs, and decided to advocate for a better insurance coverage for deprived households in the future.		
<b>Challenges</b>		
Media coverage of storms are very fast – news outlets mostly report storm damages on the day of occurrence, therefore donation campaigns to support the affected communities usually have very limited turnout in Hungary.		
<b>Lessons Learned</b>		
During the negotiations with other NGOs, HRC found that low turnout of donation campaigns is a general issue for all charities. Charities therefore should rely more on their volunteer networks to reach out more possible donors.		

## D. Financial report

The budget for this DREF Operation was CHF 230,067. After finalizing the operation, there remains a balance of CHF 175,833 which will be returned to the DREF account. [Please refer to the Final Financial Report for details.](#)

*The major donors and partners of the Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF) include the Red Cross Societies and governments of Belgium, Britain, Canada, Denmark, German, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Norway, Republic of Korea, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland, as well as DG ECHO and Blizzard Entertainment, Mondelez International Foundation, and Fortive Corporation and other corporate and private donors. The IFRC, on behalf of the national society, would like to extend thanks to all for their generous contributions.*

## Contact information

Reference documents



Click here for:

- [Emergency Plan of Action \(EPoA\)](#)
- [Operations Update](#)

**For further information, specifically related to this operation please contact:**

**In the Hungarian Red Cross:**

- István Tamás Kardos, Secretary General, email: [titkarsag@voroskereszt.hu](mailto:titkarsag@voroskereszt.hu)
- Brigitta Sáfár Dr., Head of DM, email: [Brigitta.safar@voroskereszt.hu](mailto:Brigitta.safar@voroskereszt.hu);

**IFRC Regional Office for Europe**

- Seval Guzelkilinc, Disaster Management Coordinator; phone: +36 1 888 45 05; email: [seval.guzelkilinc@ifrc.org](mailto:seval.guzelkilinc@ifrc.org)
- Agnes Rajacic, Senior Disaster Management Officer; phone: +36 1 888 4537; email: [agnes.rajacic@ifrc.org](mailto:agnes.rajacic@ifrc.org)

**IFRC Country Cluster Support Team for Central and South-Eastern Europe**

- Seija Tyrninoksa, Head of CCST, phone: +36 70 953 7705 email: [Seija.tyrninoksa@ifrc.org](mailto:Seija.tyrninoksa@ifrc.org)

**In IFRC Secretariat, Geneva**

- Antoine Belair, Senior Officer, Operations Coordinator; email: [antoine.belair@ifrc.org](mailto:antoine.belair@ifrc.org)
- Karla Morizzo, DREF Senior Officer; email: [karla.morizzo@ifrc.org](mailto:karla.morizzo@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 (NGOs) 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**.

# DREF Operation

FINAL FINANCIAL REPORT

Selected Parameters			
Reporting Timeframe	2019/07-2020/02	Operation	MDRHU007
Budget Timeframe	2019/07-2020/02	Budget	APPROVED

Prepared on 31/Mar/2020

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

## MDRHU007 - Hungary - Storm

Operating Timeframe: 09 Jul 2019 to 08 Dec 2019

### I. Summary

Opening Balance	0
<b>Funds &amp; Other Income</b>	<b>230,067</b>
DREF Allocations	230,067
<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>-54,234</b>
<b>Closing Balance</b>	<b>175,833</b>

### II. Expenditure by area of focus / strategies for implementation

Description	Budget	Expenditure	Variance
AOF1 - Disaster risk reduction			0
AOF2 - Shelter	147,715	54,232	93,484
AOF3 - Livelihoods and basic needs	64,646		64,646
AOF4 - Health			0
AOF5 - Water, sanitation and hygiene			0
AOF6 - Protection, Gender & Inclusion			0
AOF7 - Migration			0
<b>Area of focus Total</b>	<b>212,361</b>	<b>54,232</b>	<b>158,129</b>
SFI1 - Strengthen National Societies	16,481		16,481
SFI2 - Effective international disaster management			0
SFI3 - Influence others as leading strategic partners	1,012		1,012
SFI4 - Ensure a strong IFRC	213	3	210
<b>Strategy for implementation Total</b>	<b>17,706</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>17,703</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>230,067</b>	<b>54,234</b>	<b>175,832</b>

# DREF Operation

FINAL FINANCIAL REPORT

Selected Parameters			
Reporting Timeframe	2019/07-2020/02	Operation	MDRHU007
Budget Timeframe	2019/07-2020/02	Budget	APPROVED

Prepared on 31/Mar/2020

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

## MDRHU007 - Hungary - Storm

Operating Timeframe: 09 Jul 2019 to 08 Dec 2019

### III. Expenditure by budget category & group

Description	Budget	Expenditure	Variance
<b>Relief items, Construction, Supplies</b>	<b>196,400</b>	<b>41,874</b>	<b>154,526</b>
Shelter - Relief	400		400
Construction Materials	100,000		100,000
Food	60,000	41,874	18,126
Other Supplies & Services	36,000		36,000
<b>Logistics, Transport &amp; Storage</b>	<b>3,500</b>	<b>2,230</b>	<b>1,270</b>
Transport & Vehicles Costs	3,500	2,230	1,270
<b>Personnel</b>	<b>13,975</b>	<b>6,510</b>	<b>7,465</b>
National Society Staff	9,600	4,947	4,653
Volunteers	4,375	1,563	2,812
<b>Consultants &amp; Professional Fees</b>	<b>500</b>		<b>500</b>
Consultants	500		500
<b>Workshops &amp; Training</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>310</b>
Workshops & Training	500	190	310
<b>General Expenditure</b>	<b>1,150</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>1,030</b>
Travel	600		600
Information & Public Relations	350	117	233
Financial Charges	200	3	197
<b>Indirect Costs</b>	<b>14,042</b>	<b>3,310</b>	<b>10,732</b>
Programme & Services Support Recover	14,042	3,310	10,732
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>230,067</b>	<b>54,234</b>	<b>175,832</b>