



International Federation  
of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

## Zambia Floods MDRZM008

### DREF review



10 – 17 July 2013

**Facilitators:**

Melanie Ogle, IFRC Africa Zone Disaster Management Unit  
Stanley Ndhlovu, IFRC Southern Africa Regional Office  
Viggo Aalbaek, British Red Cross



## Table of contents

Executive Summary: .....	3
Methodology: .....	4
Key Findings .....	5
Quality, relevance and accountability: .....	5
Effectiveness and efficiency of management: .....	9
Capacity of the National Society: .....	11
Summary and Recommendations: .....	11
Recommendations: .....	12
Annexes.....	15
Annex 1: Terms of Reference: Zambia Flood Disaster MDRZM008 .....	15
Annex 2: Persons interviewed as part of the DREF review process.....	20
Annex 3: Timeline of the DREF operation.....	22
Annex 4: Agenda for lessons learned workshop .....	25
Annex 5: Participants recommendations on the DREF operation.....	26
Annex 6: Participants in the lessons learned workshop .....	32
Annex 7: Lessons Learned Workshop – participant evaluation form.....	33
Annex 8: Post distribution Monitoring .....	36



**Executive Summary:**

Heavy rainfall started mid-January 2013 in Zambia. The rains continued for a month, causing damage to houses, infrastructure such as schools and roads, and destroying crops and livelihoods. The most affected area was Mumbwa district. According to anecdotal feedback, at its peak, flood water was about 40 cm around the houses and between 60-70 cm in the surrounding fields.

In response to the floods, ZRCS requested DREF support to respond to the situation. Delays were encountered in preparing this request for several reasons: slow launch of the DREF was due to poor early warning systems, lack of funds to conduct initial rapid assessment and start up activities, lack of local branch structure and trained volunteers in Mumbwa district; and low understanding of DREF procedures. The National Society also faced challenges in terms of human resources, while under pressure to respond immediately.

Lack of early warning and funding for assessment are a crucial issues: the ZRCS had to rely on online news updates on the flooding situation in Mumbwa. The community had not experienced a similar situation and considered the rainfall to be much needed until it led to serious flooding. The National Society was reliant on the national Disaster Management and Mitigation Unit to support assessment costs. As a result, until the joint rapid assessment was undertaken, the National Society lacked data to support a DREF request. The DREF documentation was ultimately submitted on 15 February and was approved on the 26 February.

Despite challenges, the National Society has shown great commitment and a number of steps have already been taken to address the initial setback: through support and mentoring of the deployed RDRT, through the support of the analysis provided by an intern from the RCRC climate centre, NDRT training, and through this DREF review.

Despite delays, the DREF operation was well planned: modest in size and realistic in terms of capacity, and the operation was well executed. The operation received initial start-up support from the IFRC's Southern Africa Regional Office, which continued with RDRT support for one month of the operation.

There is no existing branch in Mumbwa, however the Lusaka-based headquarters was able to select and train volunteers (with the support of the MoH and the District Disaster Management Committee). These volunteers were involved in distributions, which by all account went very smoothly and included post-distribution monitoring.

The operation was undertaken in close collaboration with other stakeholders. This DREF has successfully raised the profile of the Zambia Red Cross Society within the DDMU, government line ministries such as the and the Ministry of Health, the district-level District Disaster Management Committee, other stakeholders (namely, World Vision), supplier, and the local community. The affected community is now keen to establish a branch and has strong support after this operation.

The DREF operation has very effectively addressed the risk of water-borne diseases, focusing on door-to-door hygiene promotion with volunteers targeting "at risk" families. This component should be sustainable, through the Ministry of Health, after the end of the DREF operation. There was an outbreak of swine flu during emergency phase which threatened



the implementation of DREF activities at one point as door-to-door activities were suspended for a month until district health authorities gave the all-clear for activities to resume.

This review has identified ongoing food insecurity in the Mumbwa district, however according to the Government and the current VAC report, this district is not considered food insecure. Many of the flood-affected families are subsistence farmers, who lost their crops, grain stores and seeds in the floods. While the operation provided some food (World Vision also distributed food, however not to the same community members), communities stressed that they are hungry. While food is available in the market, the prices are rising beyond the limited means of those most affected. This food crisis needs to be brought to the attention of the Government as a matter of urgency, and further Movement response options discussed.

### **Methodology:**

The review team comprised three members, a Disaster Management delegate from the Africa zone office, the Southern Africa Regional Disaster Management Coordinator and a representative from British Red Cross.

The review team spent one week in Zambia. One day was spent interviewing key headquarter staff (including the Acting Secretary General, the Disaster Management Coordinator, the Health and Care Coordinator, the Accountant and the Logistics Volunteer). The team spent two days in Mumbwa district conducting stakeholder interviews with volunteers, beneficiaries, traditional leaders, and local health specialists. The team visited the site of the Government's relocation camp and interviewed a family recovering from the floods. The team also met with World Vision, the District Disaster Management Committee (DDMC) for Mumbwa, and the Disaster Management and Mitigation Unit (DMMU). A full list of people interviewed as part of the review can be found in Annex 2 to this report.

Following the review, the team facilitated a day and a half lessons learned workshop in Lusaka. The workshop was attended by 26 participants, including headquarters staff, the Voluntary Aid Unit (a branch under formation) supervisors and volunteers. The workshop was fully participatory, and details of the agenda, workshop participants, group exercises and workshop feedback can be found in Annexes 4 – 7.

The team would like to express their thanks to the National Society headquarters of the Zambia Red Cross Society for making arrangements for the review. We are grateful to all members of the National Society headquarters, Voluntary Aid Unit and volunteers for participating in the DREF review and their full and open engagement in the lessons learned workshop. It was a privilege to work with the National Society and to engage in focus group discussions and interviews with community members and local authorities. The team would like to thank British Red Cross for their support of the review, and the contribution of a valued team member, Mr Viggo Aalbaek. The team would also like thank Ms Kanmani Venkateswaran, an intern with the RCRC Climate Centre, for participating in the field visit and assisting to facilitate the stakeholder interviews.



## Key Findings

### **Quality, relevance and accountability:**

A rapid joint assessment was undertaken by the Government Disaster Management and Mitigation Unit (DMMU) <sup>1</sup> and the Red Cross on 12 -13 February despite increased rainfall starting almost a month earlier (see Annex 3 for a timeline of the operation). The rapid assessment was funded by the DMMU. The Government ministries are responsible for in-depth assessments of longer-term needs, such as health, social protection, education, infrastructure and water and sanitation. It is not clear from the meeting with the Government whether these assessments have been undertaken at the time of the review.

The joint rapid assessment captured a snapshot of the flood situation. According to the rapid assessment, 1,600 households were affected by the floods. Some 85 affected families were selected for immediate assistance based on the availability of prepositioned non-food items and criteria focused on households with total collapse of houses / structures and level of vulnerability. The initial Government distributions of tents, chlorine solution and mosquito nets was done by the Government's District Disaster Management Committee (DDMC) without clear beneficiary selection guidelines. The Government gave five tents to each village head for distribution within their village. Distribution of these Government items was done without using a standardised recording system. As a result, ZRCS was tasked by DMMU to register beneficiaries post distribution.

This DREF operation focused on the most affected district of Mumbwa, which according to the rapid assessment had some 300 affected families. While emergency shelter was initially included, this was removed during the preparation of the DREF as the Government had already provided some emergency shelter items. At the time, the shelter needs were covered, however later on as more areas became accessible, it was discovered more people needed shelter support.

The DREF bulletin was prepared based on the initial rapid assessment, which did not take into account the evolving situation. As the flood water persisted, the number of affected families increased as homes were eroded by the flood waters. While the DREF was used to reach those initially affected, it did not take into account those subsequently affected or further needs such as emergency shelter, kitchen utensils and bedding material. However, the DREF operation was of a size and scale that was within the capacity and expertise of the National Society (in particular the hygiene promotion component).

A press briefing was used to publicise the ZRCS DREF operation. The launch included the District Commissioner, the district MP, World Vision and the ZRCS Acting Secretary General, and introduced the scope of the operation. Theatre groups were used to draw communities to the event. This event helped to raise the profile of both the operation and the National Society at the national level.

---

<sup>1</sup> DMMU has the legal mandate to coordinate all disaster response activities (floods, drought etc.) including rapid and detailed assessment with the exception of health-related issues such as cholera, swine flu, H1N1, typhoid etc. The Ministry of Health takes a lead and have an Epidemic Preparedness Committees at all levels - national and districts. For pest infestations or crop diseases, DMMU works with Ministry of Agriculture.



## International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

Under the Red Cross DREF response, community meetings used traditional channels such as the village heads, to explain that the distribution of food and non-food items (NFIs) was a one off. Door-to-door hygiene promotion activities helped to sensitise communities about the broader operation (including the distribution of NFIs). The door to door hygiene promotion raised expectations by all households that they would receive NFIs and as a result volunteers received complaints from people who did not receive NFIs. This highlights the need for better support volunteers working in the communities to manage beneficiary expectations.

ZRCS used assessment tools to capture the name, age, gender, location, village head, types of vulnerability of beneficiaries and the number of people per household. Soap and food were distributed according to family size, although a threshold of six family members was established, where families that numbered more than six did not receive additional items. For NFIs, distribution was standardised to three items per family, regardless of family size.

The first Red Cross distribution targeted some 300 families based on an average family size of six (1,800 individuals), however following registration it became apparent that the families reached tended to be smaller than initially anticipated. This resulted in a surplus of items that had been procured with the DREF, and a second distribution reached an additional 59 households. A third distribution was made to beneficiary organisations, including the local hospital (blankets), the local school (jerry cans, soap and mealie meal) and the police (mosquito nets). This highlights the advantage of registering beneficiaries in advance of distributions.

Volunteers were selected at district level, from the two target areas of Kabulwebulwe and Nangoma, with a supervisor appointed in these two areas to manage and monitor activities. Implementation was report to ZRCS headquarters through daily and weekly reports. The RDRT provided a two-day training in post-distribution monitoring which was given to volunteers. Regular monitoring helped to flag challenges, for example too much chlorine solution had been distributed and people were not aware how to use it correctly and that food rations were not sufficient (a lot of complaints were received about this). The post-distribution monitoring exercise helped to manage expectation of future assistance. The results of the post-distribution monitoring can be found in Annex 8.

It normally takes one month for a family to rebuild their homes. Families rebuild their houses using traditional materials, as most don't have money to purchase alternative materials. The Government does not resettle people, instead they provide emergency shelter (tents), which is taken back during the recovery phase and stored at the District Commissioner's office. The village head (and the broader community) are responsible for assisting the most vulnerable people to rebuild their houses; an obligation that is ingrained in Zambian culture, however this was not evident from the community members (including elderly and disabled) that the team met. In future, ZRCS should ensure that the Government and community leaders take responsibility for assisting vulnerable households into permanent housing, in advance of the tents being returned.

Before the government tents arrived, affected families were living with host families. Most of the affected families were subsistence farmers, who had lost their crops, grain stores and seeds. Coping mechanisms currently employed until the next harvest by communities



## International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

include borrowing from others, burning charcoal, catching fish, housework (cleaning, washing clothes and child minding) and piecework on behalf of others. Most women interviewed during a focus group said that they had reduced the number of meals that they eat (most eat just one meal per day); however no one had yet resorted to selling assets.

The option of providing cash transfer activities was discussed with beneficiaries and agreed that they preferred to receive the food and non-food items rather than cash. The rationale was that food and NFIs were shared by the whole family, while cash would also need to be shared amongst the family (and may prove more attractive than the non food items distributed). Cash transfer was also discussed with volunteers and Village Heads, who also agreed that NFIs were better than cash, as cash could be a source of tension within the family.

Overall, the Red Cross response was relevant to the needs of affected communities. Beneficiaries generally seemed satisfied with the food and non-food items that were received from ZRCS under this DREF operation, although there was negative feedback on the quality of some items. The review also highlighted that there is a need for recovery and DRR activities, including ongoing food support and livelihood needs in some communities and ZRCS should consider advocating for further government support for the affected areas.

In total, some 25 volunteers were trained in hygiene promotion (which included distribution management, Red Cross Red Crescent Fundamental Principles, beneficiary selection, branch development and basic disaster management) in two locations. The criteria used for volunteer selection is the ability to read and write, be permanent residents in their respective villages and have the desire to be a ZRCS volunteer. The volunteers selected were a mixture of community members including some health personnel, community health workers and government health workers. The training was conducted by the ZRCS health and care coordinator and the Environmental Health Technician from the local hospital (who was himself a Red Cross supervisor). The topics were shared with the MoH in advance of the training and included cholera, typhoid, dysentery, chlorination, malaria, and HIV/AIDS. The National Society has a good working relationship with the MoH, and this seems to have been further enhanced during this operation.

An outbreak of the H1N1 influenza ("swine flu") impacted the door-to-door hygiene promotion and hygiene promotion activities had to be suspended. The suspension lasted around 25 days. Fortunately the outbreak was mild and did not have long term impact on hygiene activities. According to the operation's update number one (second objective), volunteers were provided with personal protective equipment to prevent the spread of swine flu, however according to feedback from volunteers this was not the case.

Door-to-door visits were monitored using tracking sheets, which identify the family name, household members disaggregated by gender, and captures the topics covered during the visits. Volunteers are expected to visit five households each per day. Over the three month operation, some 5,200 sessions were undertaken.

A positive outcome of the door-to-door hygiene promotion visits was that it led to return of unneeded mosquito nets and surplus chlorine solution from beneficiaries to the volunteers. Door-to-door hygiene promotion is an important tool in this context because communities



lack radios and many families are illiterate, thus the word of mouth transmission is the most appropriate.

According to the local Environmental Health Technician, the hospital prepares in advance of the rainy season for health related issues. His feedback on the door-to-door hygiene promotion was very positive. According to the anecdotal evidence, there was no spike in waterborne diseases (including cholera and typhoid) despite fears of this as a result of the floods. Four children were admitted with diarrhoea. The National Society will follow up with the Ministry of Health on official statistics, as it would be useful if the final report could verify this assertion.

After the DREF operation, volunteers reported that health promotion activities are still ongoing within their communities, which implies that this intervention is still relevant to the needs and sustainable after the end of the DREF.

There was a limited number of agencies that responded to the floods in Mumbwa. At the national level, the DMMU is responsible for coordinating disaster management. Since the Unit became operational in 1998, it plays a coordinating and facilitating role, however it does not implement activities directly. The DMMU has offices at provincial level and has a vision of enhancing capacity down to the district level. At the district level, disaster response is coordinated by the District Disaster Management Committee (DDMC) and is made up of local government officers, the Red Cross and other NGOs (in this case World Vision International). At this time, the DDMC lacks resources to prepare, mitigate or respond to disasters and meets only when sufficient funding permits. Several coordination meetings were held directly after the flooding occurred however subsequent meetings were not held regularly. The DDMC coordinated contributions received from various stakeholders, including transport provided by the District commissioners office and security of NFIs at distributions was provided by the police at the Red Cross distribution.

Feedback from the DMMU and the DDMC was that Red Cross actions complemented the Government intervention and that the operation was in line with the Government response for floods. The DMMU felt the Red Cross response was timely and the DDMU was grateful for the support. World Vision International, present in some of the affected district, also provided positive feedback on the collaboration with Red Cross on the ground. Distributions were done jointly using common selection criteria, sharing resources such as logistics and transportation of items. Also active within the districts are Government agricultural extension workers (whose promote agricultural techniques in rural communities, however this resource was severely overstretched and most volunteers and beneficiaries had not met these workers).

The National Society has links with the Meteorological Department and the Department of Water Affairs for early warning of natural disasters, however these links seem weak, given that the National Society was alerted by an online news article of the flooding situation in Mumbwa district. The link with the Meteorological Department and Water Affairs should be developed further, with early warning systems at various levels integrated into ZRCS contingency plans.

One of the key issues in terms of early warning is the absence of a ZRCS branch in Mumbwa District; which could have facilitated timely two-way communication on the evolving



situation. This issue was flagged with headquarters in the review debrief, as volunteers and community members have expressed interest in establishing a branch in Mumbwa District.

The DMMU felt that while there is information on early warning, these warnings need to be more user friendly, as the majority of people do not act upon them. Community-centred early warning systems need to equip communities with motorbikes, mobile phones and training. A government sponsored pilot was carried out in upstream communities incorporating indigenous knowledge, which the government plans to roll out.

The government has contingency plans for disasters, with floods coming under the DMMU and health outbreaks being managed by the Ministry of Health, however there are no contingency plans at the district level; as this is undertaken by ministries. While ZRCS had a contingency plan for floods and cholera, to cover the October 2012 to April 2013 period, based on the 2012-13 rainfall forecast, the document had some structural gaps and was of limited use in preparing the DREF plan of action. SARO has taken a strategic lead in improving the quality of contingency plans for all southern African National Societies.

#### **Effectiveness and efficiency of management:**

In the first instance, there were challenges in getting the DREF approved, including both the narrative and budget as there was a disconnect between the National Society's expectation and with the IFRC's focus on SPHERE standards.

Negotiations between the Regional Office, Zone and National Society took time to rationalise the number of items requested in the DREF in line with SPHERE standards (IFRC may consider above SPHERE standards if the government declares certain standards or cluster had agreed to higher standards for specific reasons). The original plan was to provide each of the 1,800 beneficiaries with one blanket each, which is above the normally approved SPHERE standard of two per family of five. The original budget for blankets was CHF 19.50 for local procurement (the price of a woollen blanket in the IFRC's emergency items catalogue is between CHF 5 - 6 per blanket). Since the National Society did not provide solid justification for a higher priced blanket and high quantity of blankets the number of blankets and price were reduced. The DREF was approved providing three blankets per family at a cost of CHF 8 per blanket and IFRC should ensure that when changes are made to the operational plan or budget during quality assurance phase, that a full and clear rationale is provided to the National Society.

The SARO provided start-up support by deploying the Regional Disaster Management Coordinator. One of the main priorities was to start-up the procurement process. This proved challenging as a number of suppliers refused to provide items to ZRCS on credit. The call for tenders did not receive a good response, and had to put out to tender a second time. Three quotations are required by the National Society, and a tender committee, (which includes the logistics volunteer, finance, the acting Secretary General, and one other independent person), is responsible for procurement decisions. As a result of ZRCS reputational issues, procurement was done locally with payments being made by SARO directly to suppliers for large quantities of items (this includes blankets, food such as beans and cooking oil, chlorine and mosquito nets). For those suppliers that demanded immediate payment, such as the supplier of maize meal, DREF operational funds were used.



## International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

There were challenges as the amount of items procured were not correct, specifically personal protective equipment, mosquito nets and blankets. For example, the number of rain coats and rain boots procured was 250 rather than the 50 budgeted for. As a result, ZRCS needed to renegotiate to have these items returned to the suppliers.

The initial planning was based on the assumption of six household members per family, being the national average. The next step carried out an actual physical registration which showed that most households were below six hence the surplus. Ideally if registration was done in advance, the planning would have been adjusted in time for distribution.

Gaps were identified in terms of emergency shelter; tents were provided by the Government, however there were not sufficient tents for all affected households, which would have been highlighted by more detailed assessments. The 2,000 tarpaulins originally planned for were removed from the operational plan between the draft submitted on the 16 February and the subsequent draft submitted on the 18 February. It is not entirely clear from the email chain, why tarpaulins were removed, unless it was presumed that the government would provide more emergency shelter in addition to the amount initially distribution. The DREF operation could be revised to include emergency shelter (such as tarpaulins, with fixings and poles) once the need for additional shelter support was evident. It also appears that families lost kitchen utensils, replacement of which can also be included in the DREF operation.

An Regional Disaster Response Team (RDRT) member was deployed for one month to support the operation. The RDRT arrived two days after the SARO RDMC left Zambia. The RDRT went straight to Zambia, which meant that the RDRT did not get a laptop, mobile phone, briefing or advance for accommodation and per diem. The reimbursement of these expenses was somewhat delayed, which has added to the financial strain of the National Society. If possible, it is important to ensure that there is sufficient time for a handover in-country (although with a number on prevailing emergencies in Southern Africa and the limited resources of SARO at the time, this may not always be possible). Feedback from the RDRT was that a one month deployment is sufficient. From the RDRT perspective, the volunteers worked hard and did the distributions very well. The RDRT reported positive joint planning with technical departments for the plan of action and the distributions. The RDRT developed distribution cards and monitoring templates.

There were issues with transfers from the SARO to the National Society, which impacted on operational implementation. Part of the conditions agreed in the joint operational response strategy was that an RDRT be deployed and that IFRC pay directly for large procurements. The first tranche of the funding was used to procure mealie meal and blankets, as suppliers refused to extend credit to ZRCS. Returns for the operation were sent on 27 March to SARO for reimbursement. The transfer meant to replenish these purchases was delayed due to problems with the IFRC's UK bank account (these issues should now be rectified as SARO is now using a third party as guarantee for transfers). The second tranche arrived at ZRCS headquarters a month later, on the 30 April. RDRT costs advanced by the National Society was requested on the 26 April, however funds were received two months later; on the 21 June.

The National Society does not have dedicated logistics personnel. A previous ZRCS staff member volunteered to provide logistical support for this operation. His contribution was valuable, however he feels that a clear terms of reference is required for the logistics



position along with clearly outline the role and expectations. For future operations, ZRCS could consider planning and budgeting for RDRT support in logistics (note, that, depending on need, it is possible that more than one RDRT can be deployed in a single operation).

Challenges were encountered in the transportation of food and NFIs to the field for distribution as the relief items were only taken to the field on the day of distribution, however in hindsight they should have taken the items early before the distribution (one day early) as trucks broke down; which delayed the distribution.

#### **Capacity of the National Society:**

At the onset of the floods, there was no established branch in Mumbwa district. The development of the DREF was hampered by the lack of branch on the ground. New volunteers had to be recruited and the volunteers were partially trained with an abridged curriculum (the training included who/what is a volunteer, the Fundamental Principles, health and hygiene promotion, door to door campaigns, distribution and monitoring). As a result of this DREF operation there has been a terrific response from the general public to become volunteers. The ZRCS headquarters should engage the Voluntary Aid Unit in discussions regarding branch formation; at least the Voluntary Aid Unit should retain the list of potential volunteers and contact details so that they contact volunteers at the onset of future floods or in case of future disasters. Volunteers and their supervisors have demonstrated their commitment to the Red Cross and the Fundamental Principles.

This operation has helped to raise the profile of the National Society as one of the first and only responders to the floods. The National Society organised a press launch of the operation, and highlight the operation for the wider general public.

This is the first operation for a number of ZRCS staff (including the acting Secretary General: note that DM and the acting Secretary General have been involved in a previous DREF operation but not in a leading role). It has been an important learning and capacity building experience. The National Society has a very small core staff, and does not include communications (undertaken by the SG), PMER, HR or dedicated logistics. For the DREF operation, the National Society brought in a previous member of staff for a month to act in a voluntary capacity of logistics.

The RDRT participation helped to build capacity in his National Society counterpart in terms of distribution and post distribution monitoring tools and templates.

Moreover, this operation has been successfully implemented; it has developed and reinforced the National Society capacity to respond to floods. It is hoped that this operation will be a spring board for renewed investment from partners and government counterparts.

#### **Summary and Recommendations:**

- Overall the operation seems to have gone well. Very positive feedback received from all stakeholders, particularly from beneficiaries and volunteers.
- Consider strengthening **early warning systems**, contingency planning and preparedness
- Further work is still required to improve ZRCS image with suppliers, ZRCS should try and capitalise on the DREF operation to continue to build their reputation



## International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

- Anecdotally the **hygiene promotion activities** seem to have been very successful, with no major outbreaks reported in waterborne diseases. It would be good to get government statistics for the final report to back up these assertions
- Information presented in **operations update** number one was misleading, and needs to be clarified in the final report, for example, PPE and chlorine distribution and second/third distributions and the selection of beneficiaries.
- **Coordination** was good, and improved the Red Cross reputation and profile with in country stakeholders include the national level DMMU, the District level DDMC, Ministry of Health and World Vision International
- **Financial procedures** in the SARO need to be reviewed and streamlined where possible. It seems that Southern Africa are going to use Global Currencies – a foreign exchange trading account, which should allow for faster transactions between the Regional office and the National Society.
- As a **Movement**, look at why it takes a DREF so long to get approved. Consider creating a roster or pre-agreement of whom is best placed to support a National Society, including IFRC Regional, Zone and Partner in the event of an emergency.

### Recommendations:

#### *IFRC (SARO and Africa zone office)*

**1. Assessment:** National societies need access to funds in order to undertake independent rapid assessment. Sometimes these funds may be available already in country through partner national Societies, Embassies, UN coordination or the Government. In this instance, the National Society was reliant on joint assessment of the situation with the Disaster Management and Mitigation Unit (DMMU), which delayed the emergency response (and the preparation of the DREF). Consider:

- 1.1 Should consider amending DREF procedures and guidelines to allow a separate fund for assessments
- 1.2 Fast track approval of assessment costs in advance of DREF being launched; or
- 1.3 An alternative assessment fund administer by SARO
- 1.4 Identify, as part of the contingency planning process, sources of potential funding for immediate assessment and prearranged, in advance of a disaster

**2. Planning:** During quality control of the DREF documents, the zone and regional office should:

- 2.1 Ensure that any changes to the plan or to the budget are clearly justified and documented and shared with the National Society undertaking the operation.
- 2.2 Remember that changes made to the operational plan or budget in order to meet the DREF guidelines may impact on viability of activities and be prepared to revisit plans and budget if this should prove the case

**3. Financial processes:** As with other DREFs in the region, timeliness of transfers from SARO to the National Society was slow and this has affected the operation's implementation rate. Suggest:

- 3.1 SARO to closely monitor the processing of transfers, notably by tracking requests and following up delays, particularly when piloting the new 'Global Currencies' exchange tool



## International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

**3.2** Use the above mentioned tracking to highlight issues in returns, which can lead to training/mentoring opportunities for the National Society in order to ensure timely process of acquittals and transfer

**3.3** Follow up proactively, sending remittance advice and following up with the bank and budget holder whenever delays are encountered

**3.4** Consider making just one transfer for DREF operations, particularly when DREFs are for small amounts, given the time limitations of a DREF operation

**4. RDRT support:** Was crucial during this operation in terms of bolstering the national society's capacity and resources to respond to the flooding disaster. The Regional/Zone office should take into account:

**4.1** That during planning of DREF operations that RDRT capacity (either generalist or specialist) be considered and discussed with the National Society on a case by case basis in advance of launching DREF

**4.2** That the disaster does not impact overly on other ongoing programmes and that business continuity is considered.

**5. PMER:** A general gap in PMER practices is becoming visible in these DREF reviews. Recommend:

**5.1** IFRC should prioritise including programme managers in planning, monitoring and reporting through trainings, materials, tools and support.

**5.2** One off trainings are not necessarily successful in building capacity, training should be followed up with ongoing support and should include all departments within a National Society, including finance, food security, health.

**6. Preparedness:** Ensure future NDRT training, already planned for the last week of July 2013, includes:

**6.1** Branch development or consolidation of Voluntary Aid Unit (VAU).

**6.2** Contingency planning training for the National Society

**6.3** Robust community and national based EWS

**6.4** Community Based Disaster Preparedness Action Teams

**6.5** Systems and procedures including protocols for decision making

**6.6** Comprehensive contingency plans for common disasters

### **Zambia Red Cross Society**

**7. Early warning systems:** An important piece of work has just been completed by Kanmani Venkateswaran, an intern from the RCRC Climate Centre on improving flood risk management in Zambia. Suggest building recommendations from this important piece of work into ZRCS plans:

**7.1** Develop partnerships with communities and related organizations, ensure collaboration

**7.2** Contingency planning at all levels

**7.3** Develop a disaster management communication protocol

**7.4** Designate roles to all disaster management-related actors; clarify roles

**7.5** Training at all levels

**7.6** Sensitize communities

**7.7** Monitor all DRR and preparedness activities

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

**8.1** Using contingency plans as the basis for planning future DREF operations

**8.2** Identify, in advance of a disaster, which Movement partner is best placed to provide support to the National Society in planning the operation and preparing the DREF



## International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

documentation (including resources such as the SARO, Africa zone and the Africa DREF officer)

**8.3** Consider undertaking detailed assessments, building on the rapid assessment

**9. PMER:** Capacity in the National Society is stretched, and does not have a specific PMER officer to support the monitoring and evaluation function. Recommend:

**9.1** Consider monitoring the impact of the volunteers, and the quality of their door to door sessions along with knowledge, attitude and practices of beneficiaries reached.

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

**10.1** Following on from this DREF operation, engage the VAU in discussions about potential for establishing a Branch in Mumbwa district

**10.2** Provide volunteers with identification (t-shirts, caps) and timely personal protective e) for better Red Cross visibility and recognition in the community as well as to increase volunteer motivation.

**10.3** ZRCS should consider recruiting younger volunteers, including youth and students who can reach out to peers for greater coverage of the affected communities

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

**11.1** DM team should provide regular weekly updates to ensure SARO is aware of current operations and challenges (and can provide appropriate support).

**11.2** Ensure PNSs and other stakeholders are kept aware of the DREF ongoing operations (including the sharing of the DREF document and updates).

**11.3** A copy of the DREF bulletin should be available for staff and volunteers, translated into local languages if possible (If not the whole bulletin, then at least an overview and objectives, bearing in mind that Zambia has 73 local languages).

**11.4** While coordination is primarily the responsibility of the local authority, ZRCS should support the DDMC to fulfil their responsibility in terms of coordination and reporting on contributions made in disaster response.

**12. Beneficiary communications:** Build in a formal system for beneficiary complaints and feedback mechanisms throughout all activities in future DREF planning and monitoring, including how beneficiary feedback will be followed up and addressed. Consider:

**12.1** Convening distribution committees representative of local leaders and beneficiaries, reflecting the diversity of the community. These committees will ensure two way flow of information on distributions to the communities and from beneficiaries back to the national society (note that this operation had established local committees, but made up of volunteers rather than local leaders and beneficiaries).

**12.2** Ensuring that volunteers doing door-to-door activities have a complete overview of the operation and know how to manage expectations of beneficiaries.

### ***DREF management***

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

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

**13.2** Clarify around when assessment costs can be included in a DREF operation, particularly for rapid assessment.

**13.3** Considering if separate funding source for DREF assessment



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

## Annexes

### Annex 1: Terms of Reference: Zambia Flood Disaster MDRZM008

#### Terms of Reference: Zambia Flood Disaster MDRZM008

##### DREF Review

**Date:** 25<sup>th</sup> June, 2013

**Time frame of mission:** July 10<sup>th</sup> - 17<sup>th</sup> 2013

**Location:** Lusaka, Zambia (& field visit to Mumbwa District)

**PNSs expressed interest in participating:** British Red Cross, Canadian Red Cross and Netherland Red Cross

**Evaluators:**

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

Reviewer TBD, IFRC Southern Africa Regional Office

#### 1. Background:

DREF Operation Floods (MDRZM008). DREF allocated: CHF 84,691 revised upwards to CHF 93,951.

<http://www.ifrc.org/docs/Appeals/13/MDRZM008.pdf>

<http://www.ifrc.org/docs/Appeals/13/MDRZM00801.pdf>

<http://www.ifrc.org/docs/Appeals/13/MDRZM00802.pdf>

Zambia experienced heavy rains In January and February 2013, resulting in heavy flooding particularly in the Nangoma and Kabulwebulwe areas of Mumbwa district in the Central Province. The heavy rains caused the loss of two lives and water logging, which destroyed agricultural fields and caused destruction to infrastructure and property, including houses, roads and sanitation facilities in the affected areas.

A joint rapid needs assessment carried out by the Zambia Red Cross (ZRCS) and National Disaster Management and Mitigation Unit (DMMU) reported (1) 300 families were left homeless with collapsed houses and (2) more than 75% of Mumbwa was using unprotected water sources, therefore contamination due to the rising water table, flood waters and destroyed pit latrines was a great concern. In addition (3) waterlogging occurred with significant hectares of the main staples of maize and cassava crops which households relied on for food and their livestock and (4) school pit latrines had flooded causing a health hazard affecting potentially 5,060 pupils. Finally, some road infrastructures and bridges were damaged and impassable.

The DREF operation was launched to (1) respond to the emergency needs of these 300 families (18,000 beneficiaries), through the provision of basic household items and food assistance for one month. The ZRCS was also to (2) provide water, sanitation and hygiene support through water treatment, health education, and hygiene promotions using the PHAST methodology. Finally, (3) access to clean water was also to be addressed through provision of water treatment education and products.

This operation was expected to be implemented over a period of three months, ending on 30<sup>th</sup> May 2013. The budget was revised upwards on 17<sup>th</sup> April to include a deployment of a Regional Disaster Response Team (RDRT) member to strengthen the National Society's response. In addition, an extension for 1.5 months was requested to accommodate for this lessons learned workshop and internal review. Therefore the DREF will be completed on the 15<sup>th</sup> of July 2013. A Final Report will be made available three months after the end of the DREF (by 15<sup>th</sup> October, 2013).



## 2. Purpose and scope of the Review:

The purpose of the mission is to perform a review in order to examine if the MDRZM008 DREF operation has achieved its planned goals and outcomes, and assess outputs against the plan. Furthermore, the review intends to assess key achievements, challenges, and provide an opportunity to capture the lessons learned from the involved staff and volunteers. The review will provide recommendations for future DREF operations.

The review will be performed in following locations: Lusaka and the Mumbwa District

- Key staff and volunteers from the ZRCS will be interviewed, as well as IFRC regional/zone office/logistic centre, and other relevant RC/RC movement partners (involved in the DREF operation or present in the area).
- Beneficiaries from the Mumbwa District target areas will be interviewed, ensuring taking into consideration gender, age and persons/groups with special needs (vulnerabilities) in beneficiary representation.
- A selection of other institutions and agencies involved in emergency response to the disaster, such as government institutions (i.e. National Disaster Management and Mitigation Unit (DMMU), Ministry of Health (MoH) and other appropriate ministries, District Disaster Management Committee (DDMC), Village Committees), UN agencies and international organizations and NGOs (if applicable) can be included in the interviews and asked to provide secondary data.

Limitations: Translators needed for local language.

## 3. Objectives of the review:

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

## 4. Methodology:

- Desk review and review of secondary data.
- Key informant interviews (e.g. National Society (NS), IFRC regional units, disaster coordinating forums, other actors/organizations etc).
- Field visit and group interviews with the communities that received assistance through the DREF operation.
- Lesson Learnt Workshop with the NS HQ and branches involved in the response operation.
- Follow-up (to address the outputs of the review).

## 5. Guideline questions for interviews:

### 1. *Quality, relevance and accountability:*

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

### 2. *Effectiveness and efficiency of management:*



## International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

- Was the operation outcomes (expected results) reached in an efficient and effective way?
  - How was the DREF request process managed? As a new management, were the NS aware of DREF procedures etc?
  - How did the regional delegation support the NS (i.e. look at the deployment of DM Coordinator and the RDRT)
  - How effective were the NS/IFRC systems and processes in supporting the operation (e.g. management decision making and approval, logistics system, financial system, etc).
  - How they did do local procurement (with support from RDRT)?
  - What NS/IFRC mechanisms and tools were used to promote good practice (e.g. SPHERE, Better Programme initiative, emergency assessment tools, Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment etc)?
  - How effective were the operation's processes for planning, priority setting, and monitoring, reporting and quality management? What tools were used to systematically monitor the operation? (excel sheets? Logframe matrixes, tables, finance programmes etc?)
  - How well was the operation planned in regards to finance? Costs and expenditures as planned and expected? Where there new or other needs that the NS would have wanted to use resources for? (even if the operation is not completely finalized, the NS might have an idea of this.). What kind of support did you receive from the IFRC?
  - How both Secretariat and NS are ensuring proper and timely financial reporting is taking place?
  - Was there adequate integration across the different programs? (e.g. Emergency health, relief, WATSAN, etc)
  - How well did the country (if applicable)/regional/zone/Geneva Secretariat support the operation – from preparation of DREF documentation and approval, throughout the DREF operation until the end of the operation?
  - How was the volunteer managed? Where they insured? Where the volunteers provided with relevant training and equipment for their activities performed during the operation?
  - Was there effective coordination with Movement partners / other actors? And how appropriate and effective were the inputs of partner organizations in the implementation of the operation?
  - Was a contingency plan used in the operations? (early evacuations, use of prepositioning relief supplies, were volunteers prepared or were they new volunteers that needed training?). Can learning from the DREF operation be fed into CP?
3. *Capacity of the National Society:*
- Where there any gaps in capacity of the National Society to implement the operation that needs to be addressed? Are there any plans in the National Society to address the gaps? Have these plans been incorporated in the National Society's long term/yearly planning?
  - What changes in capacity, capability, understanding and learning have occurred within the National Society as a result of the ongoing operation? Are these appropriate?
  - What important lessons have been learned which can improve future disasters response? What would the National Society do differently in future DREF operations?
- 6. Draft agenda for the Lesson Learnt Workshop:**
- Opening remarks
  - Introductions
  - *Timeline of the operation:* A participative exercise where participants contribute their input into the operation. This exercise is designed to help refresh memory of the operational timeframe, what went well and where there were delays or blockages.
  - *Quality self-assessment:* An individual exercise ranking various aspects of the operation and provide justification. This will be followed by a group discussion.
  - *Participatory group work:* On a flip chart discuss in small groups what went well, what the challenges were and what recommendations for each topic. After thirty minutes, you must swap groups and discuss another topic. What recommendations and conclusions can we draw from this operation? What would you do differently? What are the lessons learned? Findings will be discussed in plenary, and other participants will have a chance to contribute their own thoughts.
  - *DREF guidelines:* Short presentation on DREF guidelines, what is eligible and what is not eligible under DREF, when to use a DREF or an Emergency Appeal, templates and the new plan of action.



- Participant evaluation of the workshop
- Closing remarks

#### 7. Outputs:

- Review/evaluation report including executive summary, key conclusions and recommendations. The draft report will be submitted approximately 2 weeks after the conclusion of the review, and final report submitted no later than four weeks after the review (with days allowed for feedback).
- A feedback session with NS, IFRC country office (and possibly interested PNS) outlining the key preliminary findings and recommendations.

#### 8. Schedule:

It is envisaged for the review to take place during (10-16 July 2013) with the following schedule (including drafting and finalization of report):

<b>Activity Review Flood operation</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Date</b>
<p><i>Arrive to Lusaka</i> Visit to SG/Programs Coordinator (Patricia Nambuku)</p>	TBD (based on arrival times)	10 July 2013 (Wed)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Briefing with National Society (all DREF relevant staff)</li> <li>• Individual meetings/interviews/discussions with NS HQ relevant staff</li> </ul> <p><i>Fin, Logs &amp; PMER to bring documents &amp; receipts to be reviewed</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DM Coordinator (Wisford Mudenda)</li> <li>- Health &amp; Care Coordinator (Priscilla Nsama)</li> <li>- Finance (Josephine Bwalya &amp; DREF accountant - Teddy Kasuba?)</li> </ul> <p>(Lunch)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Logistics focal point (Kondjashili Mhanda)</li> <li>- WASH focal point (?)</li> <li>- PMER focal point (?)</li> <li>- OD (Rodnet Cloete) &amp; Branch Dev Coord (Mwenya Gilead)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 08:00-09:00</li> <li>- 09:00-10:00</li> <li>- 10:00-11:00</li> <li>- 11:00-12:00</li> <li>- 13:00-14:00</li> <li>- 14:00-15:00</li> <li>- 15:00-16:00</li> <li>- 16:00-17:00</li> </ul>	11 July 2013 (Thurs)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting with National Disaster Management and Mitigation Unit (DMMU) who coordinated the response nationally.</li> <li>• Meeting with Ministry of Health</li> <li>• <i>Travel to Field</i></li> <li>• Group meeting with District Officials</li> <li>• Group meeting with Local ZRCS Branch</li> <li>• Group meeting with Volunteers (involved in different DREF operations)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 08:00-09:30</li> <li>• 09:30-11:00</li> <li>• 11:00-13:00</li> <li>• 13:00-14:30</li> <li>• 14:30-16:00</li> <li>• 16:00-17:30</li> </ul>	12 July 2013 (Fri)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting with District Disaster Management Committee (DDMC) who coordinated district response with ZRCS</li> <li>• Group meeting with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Community Leaders (TAs, maximum 6)</li> <li>- Key officers (WASH, Health, Logs,etc)</li> <li>- Village Committee Members</li> <li>- Women beneficiaries (6 women)</li> <li>- Men beneficiaries (6 men)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Visit to affected area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 08:00-09:30</li> <li>• 10:00-18:00 (allow 1.5hrs for each group meeting)</li> </ul> <p>NOTE: concurrent sessions will occur (split between interviewees)</p>	13 July 2013 (Sat)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Travel back to Lusaka</i></li> <li>• Branch members &amp; volunteers travel to Lusaka</li> <li>• Preparations for Lessons Learned Workshop</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 09:00-11:00</li> </ul>	14 July 2013 (Sun)



## International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Lessons Learned Workshop (includes HQ staff, branch &amp; volunteers)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 08:00-17:00</li></ul>	15 July 2013 (Mon)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Lessons Learned Workshop (continued)</li><li>• Branch members &amp; volunteers travel back to Mumbwa District</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 08:00-14:00</li><li>• Afternoon</li></ul>	16 July 2013 (Tues)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Debrief with NS HQ on preliminary findings</li><li>• <i>Depart from Lusaka</i></li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• TBD (based on dep times)</li></ul>	17 July 2013 (Wed)
Present the draft report		2 August 2013
Comments and feedback on draft report		2-7 August 2013
Final report		9 August 2013

### 9. Review Team

The preferred team composition will consist of two IFRC persons, each with clear roles and responsibilities defined. The British Red Cross, Canadian Red Cross and Netherlands Red Cross have also shown interest and may also participate (TBD). The team members will have the following skills:

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

### 10. Budget for review mission

Available funds remaining for the lessons learned workshop (budget line 680) are to be confirmed by the National Society, however are anticipated to be 2,604CHF as of 24 June. An additional 3,000CHF funds remain from the evaluation support (budget line 700) and 3,631CHF remain from the IFRC regional support missions (budget line 700) are accessible. Therefore it is anticipated that the total available funds will come to **9,235 CHF**.



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

National Society Staff		
Patricia Nambuka	Acting Secretary General	ZRCS HQ
Wisford Mudenda	DM Coordinator	ZRCS HQ
Pricilla Nsama	Health and Care Coordinator	ZRCS HQ
Josephine Bwalya	Accountant	ZRCS HQ
Chishimba Crispin	Logistics volunteer	ZRCS HQ
Disaster Management and Mitigation Unit meeting		
Yande Mwape	Head Research/Planning	National Government
Nyambe Simaskiu	Senior Logistics and Warehouse Officer	National Government
Interviews with District Disaster Management Committee stakeholders		
Hampende HC	District Admin Officer	Mumbwa District
Webby Chilombe	Community Development Officer	Mumbwa District
Phornus Mbunni	OP	Mumbwa District
J Miti	District Social Worker Officer	Mumbwa District
Kabui Mutti	Traditional Affairs Officer	MOC TA
Lungu M. Richard	Deputy Officer In-Charge	Zambia Police
J. Sikazwe	District Works Supervisor	Buildings
Moses G. Samakayi	Sponsorship Facilitator	World Vision
Targeted meeting		
Hubert Siame	the Environmental Health Technician	Mumbwa Hospital
Focus group discussions in volunteers		
<b>Volunteers Kabulwebulwe (8):</b> Mudenda Edgar (M) Munachilimba Gracious (F) Dominic Namushi (M) Hamasondi Malukua(M) Chilukutu Rokett (M)	Overall volunteers were very positive about their experience. The volunteers training was facilitated jointly by ZRCS Health and Care and MoH. The training was abridged due to time constraints (the training was just 4 days, when it is normally 14 days). The volunteers were anxious to know if they would receive the balance of their training, which they found very useful. The other pertinent issue was the personal protective equipment (PPE) promised to volunteers, including gum boots and raincoats. It seems that by the time the PPE was procured it was no longer needed, as flood water had subsided. The PPE are now prepositioned in a container at ZRCS HQ for future floods operations. The volunteers are disappointed that they did not receive these items.	
<b>Volunteers Nangoma (5):</b> John Nkhoma (M) Joseph Shamboze (M) Joshua Mwangala (M) Precious (F) Petronella Jama (F)		
Focus group discussions		
<b>Women Beneficiaries (7):</b> Musama Brenda	Women discussed what how they had been affected by the floods. Almost all were subsistence farmers who lost their	



Mbewe Mutsuke Shamakona Betty Muchimwa Salome Inambao Mwangala Mulambi Durical Zibawaiya Ketty	whole corp. Most lost their houses, their food stores and household items such as plates, pots and bedding. All had vulnerable people within their households. Most were satisfied with what they received from the Red Cross, although many reported that the jerry cans that were provided were damaged and the beans took a long time cook (up to a day and a half; using local fire wood). Women said that the food and NFIs were more useful than cash, although some were worried about how school fees were going to be paid.
<b>Male Beneficiaries (8):</b> Hurbert Siame Gabriel Inambao Nyamibe Fribay Nkhomya John Chimena Ackson Mateom Mwepu Davies Chleshe Jonny Kakumbi	The group confirmed that they had received items supposed to receive except for one person who informed me that his family of 6 only received 5 bags of mealie meal. They also informed us that all distributions were carried out by a joint team of Govt., ZRCS (and WV) Group recommended that NFIs should be distributed according to family size like the food items. They complained that the beans took the whole day to cook. Pleaded for continued assistance until next harvest Lessons learned from the floods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o Need to build permanent structures on solid foundations – but no money for that</li><li>o Move houses to higher ground, not in depressions – can be done without moving away from current locations</li><li>o Grow other crops in a more sustainable way but need more knowledge. Want training from Red Cross</li><li>o Try early planting – but realise that this is a risky strategy</li><li>o Try growing rice, try poultry but no funding</li><li>o Winter planting</li><li>o Irrigation</li></ul> The community is not growing any winter crops at the moment. A few vegetables but nothing to speak off. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><input type="checkbox"/> Request for training in better agricultural practices</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> More people should have benefited from the operation</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Red Cross project should continue (till next harvest)</li></ul>
<b>Village Head focus group (4):</b> Derrek Nweete (M) Geofrey Nkolomona (M) Jonathan Lubanze (M) Febby Kabaya (F)	Lessons learned: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Keep some of the bumper harvest in case of disaster</li><li>• Don't wait too late to plant crops – early planting means that crops are less likely to be destroyed</li><li>• Build houses on platforms, if you have the money</li><li>• Diversify maize with other crops such as cassava, millet and sorghum</li></ul>



### Annex 3: Timeline of the DREF operation

January	Rain starts, including continuous rainfall for two weeks
6 February	Inspection of Kasalu basic school
8 February	Inspection of Kabulwebulwe school
9 February	Online Article regarding floods in Lusaka Times
10 February	First meeting at headquarters
11 February	Kasalu basic school closes
12 February	Kabulwebulwe school closes Nangoma receive tents and mosquito nets from the DMMU
12 -13 February	Rapid assessment undertaken include Red Cross and DMMU
13 February	Nangoma distribution of tents
14 February	First DREF draft submitted from ZRCS to IFRC.
15 February	DREF request submitted in wrong template – put into correct narrative (Africa zone) and budget template (SARO finance - Budget now comes out to CHF 148,780). Documents returned with initial questions on operational logic/design to SARO from Africa zone. Initial budget CHF 130,088 (Including tarps 2000 pieces), subsequently revised same day by ZRCS to budget CHF 139,699.
15 February	Distribution of tents in Kabulwebulwe
23 February	Preparatory meeting at HQ – including health, DM, finance etc.
16 February	DREF documents, with questions sent from SARO to ZRCS (using revised budget of CHF 148,780. ZRCS acknowledge receipt.
18 February	ZRCS responds to some of the questions raised in DREF documentation, and raises others. DREF request currently CHF 189,029 for 300 families. Tarpaulins removed from the budget.
19 February	SARO follows up on status of DREF
20 February	ZRCS resends same documents as initially shared on 18 February. On same day Africa zone resends comments in tracked changes. ZRCS acknowledges receipt and intention to share with SG.
21 February	DREF documentation resent from ZRCS to SARO. Shelter component (ie tarpaulins removed) removed. Blankets budgeted as 1 per person, at a cost of CHF 19.5 each. Forwarded to Africa zone. DREF documentation circulated for technical input (WatSan, shelter, food, logistics communications, security and health ). Budget currently 169,939.
22 February	WatSan, logistics, communications and security respond. Africa zone suggest that livelihoods component be removed due to the time limitations of a DREF operation. Consolidated feedback sent to ZRCS. Budget is CHF 156,271.
23 February	Feedback from shelter provided (Africa zone shelter delegate on mission in Zimbabwe) – no shelter objective in operation, shelter removed from operation because government was covering. Africa zone questions 10%



International Federation  
of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

	admin budget, not allowed under DREF guidelines.
24 February	Feedback on documents/operation sent to ZRCS. Budget now CHF 73,396. ZRCS refines narrative and budget and resends back to Africa zone. Operational costs reduced: including lessons learned and support missions to reach 60/40 split between direct relief to beneficiaries and operational costs.
25 February	Soap recommended to be included in the operational plan and budget. ZRCS agrees and the documentation is amended accordingly. Budget checked by SARO and sent to ZFU finance analyst for validation. Slight amendment made to the budget by finance analyst and finalised documents submitted to Geneva Senior DREF officer for approval, budgeted at CHF 84,691. By the time of submission, blankets were budgeted at CHF 8 per piece and 3 rather than 6 per household. No change in the initial price or quantity of mosquito nets (550 to complement the government's 350)
26 February	First update to SARO DREF approved Preparation of DREF action plan
27 February	Cash request sent from ZRCS to SARO
27 February	Mobilising volunteers in both target locations
28 February	Planning at the office
1 – 4 March	Enquiries sent to suppliers
5 March	Mobilising various messages on hygiene
6 March	Cash received from SARO
6 – 15 March	SARO DM support mission to start-up operation
7 March	Arrival of supplies Enquiries to suppliers resent
8 March	Mobilisation of distribution committee
8 -13 March	Tender committee meeting
9 – 12 March	Orientation workshop in Nangoma Orientation workshop in Kabulwebulwe Coordination with other partners including DDMC and DMMU
10 – 17 March	Beneficiary registration in Nangoma and Kabulwebulwe Baseline survey undertaken
11 -13 March	Training for volunteer workshop
14 March	Door to door hygiene promotion starts in Nangoma
15 March	NFIs arrives – Mosquito nets, gum boots, blankets and chlorine SARO DMC and REC come to Kabulwebulwe to verify
17 March	RDRT officer arrives in Zambia
18 March	Briefing of the RDRT officer at the HQ
20 March	Preparing warehouse and packing items
21 – 22 March	Food items arrive Transportation of items to the field
22 March	Distribution commences with 'flag off' ceremony
23 March	Distribution continues Orientation training report
	Door to door hygiene promotion continues to date DREF weekly updates from ZRCS to SARO
27 March	Returns sent from ZRCS to SARO finance
15 April	Post distribution monitoring by RDRT and volunteers
17 April	RDRT officer finishes his mission Operations update 1 published
18 – 24 April	Registration of beneficiaries for second distribution (goods left over from the



International Federation  
of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

	first distribution due to smaller family sizes than anticipated)
26 April	RDRT expenses submitted by ZRCS to SARO
30 April	Second tranche of funding received by ZRCS from SARO finance
	Ongoing weekly updates to SARO
1 May	ZRCS finance follow up on funding tranche
2 May	Request for refund on gum boots sent by ZRCS to supplier (250 ordered rather than the 50 planned)
9 – 15 May	Items received for second distribution
14 May	Email sent from SARO admin confirming ZRCS bank details
15 May	ZRCS finance confirm bank details
15 May	Second distribution to one point in Nangoma (Kabulwebulwe was not include due to logistics) for 59 families
16 May	Third distribution of remaining food and NFI to institutions (Police, local school, hospital)
25 May	Request to extend the operation up to 30 July
30 May	Operations update 2 posted
21 June	Refund for RDRT expenses received from SARO
10 July	DREF review team arrives in Zambia
11 July	Review starts
15 – 16 July	Lessons learned workshop



## **Annex 4: Agenda for lessons learned workshop**

Purpose of the workshop:

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

### **Opening ceremony**

#### **Introductions**

Day 1:

##### **Timeline of the operation**

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

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

##### **Quality self-assessment**

Used the prepared template to rank the various aspects of the operation and provide justification

This will be followed by a group discussion

##### **DREF guidelines**

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

##### **Participatory group work**

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

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

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

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

Day 2:

##### **Feedback on Participatory group work**

A representative to feed back on the group work in plenary, other participants will have a chance to contribute their own thoughts and allow for additions, amendments and clarifications

##### **Participant evaluation of the workshop**

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

### **Closing ceremony**



**Annex 5: Participants recommendations on the DREF operation**

Volunteers	Strengths	Challenges	Recommendations
	<p>Involved in the implementation and monitoring</p> <p>Selection criteria for volunteers, local leaders involved in selection process</p> <p>Training for this disaster response was adequate</p>	<p>Some volunteers were involved in the assessment</p> <p>Quality of volunteers – level of skill, inadequate training</p> <p>Training was in English</p> <p>Lack of personal protective equipment</p> <p>Lack of transport for volunteers (also at HQs)</p> <p>No Red Cross Branch, no existing volunteers</p> <p>Communication from HQ to volunteers on the operational plans</p> <p>Using own credit for airtime</p>	<p>More training for volunteers before a disaster occurs (in terms of First Aid and DM)</p> <p>Provide volunteers with adequate tools, PPE and materials</p> <p>Improve on communication (branch, airtime and copy of the DREF bulletin)</p>
Finance	Strengths	Challenges	Recommendations
	<p>Adequate start-up funds</p> <p>All refunds were returned on time (7 May)</p> <p>Accountability</p> <p>Competent accounts staff</p> <p>Coordination with other members of staff was efficient – branch development, DM and health</p>	<p>Implementation delayed as transfers were not received on time from SARO</p> <p>Lack of supplier confidence</p> <p>Late feedback on returns</p> <p>Late receipt of transmission copies from the SARO office</p> <p>Misplaced returns by SARO office</p> <p>NS lacks funds for disaster resources</p>	<p>Funds should be disbursed on time (target 3 days)</p> <p>Rebuild image of ZRCS with suppliers</p> <p>SARO office to assist NS to rebuild image with donors</p> <p>SARO needs to provide timely feedback on returns</p> <p>Communication process and protocols need to be clear for everyone</p>
Distribution	Strengths	Challenges	Recommendations
	<p>Availability of trained HR</p> <p>Headmen involved in the distribution</p> <p>Involvement of other stakeholders including Zambia Police and WVI</p> <p>95% of beneficiaries received all items (not 100% because of packaging not according to the</p>	<p>Mobilisation of HR</p> <p>Language barrier</p> <p>Chiefs need to be approached, so that Headmen can be involved, not always available</p> <p>More people were affected by the floods than planned for</p> <p>Shortage of cooking oil because of packaging</p> <p>Not enough incentive for</p>	<p>Formation of a Red Cross Branch in Mumbwa</p> <p>Encourage communication between different tribes (consider us of interpreter or selection of local people)</p> <p>Use the DC to communicate directly with the traditional leaders</p> <p>Encourage self-awareness and using early warning systems</p>



	<p>plan) Volunteers monitored the distribution using a template Good collaboration over the distribution</p>	<p>volunteers Impassable roads hampered distribution to communities</p>	<p>Use local knowledge in terms of planning for distribution Look at alternative distribution models when considering packing issues (e.g. shared distribution) Increase volunteer incentives from K30 to K50</p>
<b>Distribution on behalf of others</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Challenges</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
	<p>Fundamental Principles Standard operating procedures Wider volunteer network Legal mandate from the government Indicative/Protective emblem provides visibility Collaboration with government, NGOs, UN system</p>	<p>No existing MoU with DMMU and World Vision Potential compromise of the Fundamental Principles and procedures Compromise on the quality of commodities for distribution Balance between keeping the partnership and meeting agreed standards</p>	<p>MoU should be agreed before an operation starts Educate stakeholders on Red Cross operation and Fundamental Principles, Emblem and SPHERE standards Be prepared to say no if goods or terms contradict RC Principles (particularly around bad food or with political branding) Encourage partners to give cash rather than in-kind</p>
<b>Capacity</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Challenges</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
	<p>DREF funds available Partners including DMMU, WVI and DDMC Trained community health volunteers Existing stock in the warehouse Skilled staff at the HQ</p>	<p>Attribution of staff at HQ Lack of branch Delay in securing supplies from suppliers Short duration of training for volunteers Lack of transport in the field and at HQ</p>	<p>Retain staff where possible, but also consider sharing knowledge, creating a manual, adequate handover process and staff rotation Engage suppliers now to insure good rapport, should capitalise on the DREF operation Conduct further training for volunteers Consider procuring bicycles Training for VAU in first aid</p>
<b>Planning</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Challenges</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
	<p>Consultation with village Headmen, DC, DDMC and volunteers Involvement of the IFRC DMMU funded the</p>	<p>Limited trained volunteers in Mumbwa district Under budgeting of market prices of commodities Rapid assessments were delayed</p>	<p>Create a local assessment fund, consider resource mobilisation and partnerships with DMMU, who have funds for assessment</p>



	assessment and involved in planning HQ	Limited logistics and transport Delay in preparation/refining the DREF operation and plan	DREF training or support in budgeting Support Mumbwa district to be well prepared
<b>Early Warning Systems</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Challenges</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
	Forecast of rains on TV Actions taken during rains - Reinforced inner walls with wooden poles - Raising ground of house - Protect homes with sandbags - Dig drains	Forecasts not specific for certain areas People didn't have access to TV and community radio Forecasts in English and not in local languages Lack of local knowledge about rains or floods No flood gauges/alert mechanisms No dissemination of forecasts First time to experience such floods	Need preparedness and risk reduction training for volunteers Introduce systems for forecast dissemination - PA system - Door to door - IEC material Information should be packaged appropriately Monitoring water table levels (well water level etc.) Sensitisation of Met Dept. to provide more useful information Met Dept. should be invited to training Encourage building of permanent structures
<b>Communication</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Challenges</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
	Meetings with DDMC and local chiefs Security was provided through communication Motorbikes borrowed from World Vision for communication Door to door sensitisation Network of trained volunteers Communication between HQ and supervisors	Certain areas lacked mobile network service providers Lack of transport for supervisors Some areas impassable Door to door was difficult	Airtime to be provided to supervisors Consider sharing information of the DREF operation with volunteers, community leaders and government counterparts – this will help to increase understanding of the operation and reduce complaints (a relief committee can also help facilitate communications with communities)
<b>Coordination</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Challenges</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
	Regular meetings at HQ Regular field communication Coordination meetings with DMMU, DDMC and stakeholders	Long information chain Long distances Language barriers Coordination didn't always take place in a timely manner	Suggest regular meetings to provide clear information on the operation Formation of branches/contact details for volunteers in affected areas Coordination costs should be built into the plan and



			budget
Monitoring	Strengths	Challenges	Recommendations
	<p>Monitoring tools in place</p> <p>Meetings with key stakeholders</p> <p>Timely updates</p> <p>Field visits</p> <p>Training for volunteers on monitoring tools</p> <p>Work planned revised based on monitoring (e.g. swine flu)</p> <p>Post distribution monitoring</p>	<p>Follow up of activities</p> <p>Lack of adequate transport</p> <p>Impassable roads and long distances</p>	<p>Transportation should be adequately planned and budget for</p> <p>Sim cards or Airtime for volunteers in inaccessible areas</p> <p>Impact of hygiene promotion should be monitored</p> <p>Monitoring quarries and ditches and chlorine use</p>
Hygiene Promotion	Strengths	Challenges	Recommendations
	<p>Mobilised sufficient, trained volunteers</p> <p>Support from community leaders</p> <p>No outbreak of waterborne diseases</p> <p>Adequate support and good collaboration from HQ</p> <p>The planned activities met the needs of affected communities</p> <p>IFRC tools such as CBHFA</p>	<p>Lack of learning aids</p> <p>Duration of training was too short</p> <p>Long distances and lack of transportation</p> <p>High illiteracy levels</p> <p>Inadequate funds for CBHFA</p> <p>How much does a CBHFA manual cost?</p>	<p>Provide for adequate training tools</p> <p>More time needed for training</p> <p>Provide reliable transport</p> <p>Translate literature in local languages</p> <p>Ensure costs are adequately budgeted for</p> <p>Could consider including psychosocial support for beneficiaries and volunteers</p>
Shelter	Strengths	Challenges	Recommendations
	<p>Shelter were erected corrected (army and community volunteers assisted)</p>	<p>Shortage of tents (provided by the Government) 185 provided compared with 300</p> <p>Number of families grew as flooding continued</p> <p>Family size was larger in reality</p> <p>Took a long time to verify who received the tents – no documentation</p>	<p>Shelter should have been included in the DREF operations</p> <p>The number should be adequately calculated and budgeted for</p> <p>Advocate for the use of standard beneficiary selection criteria</p> <p>Explore appropriate shelter options, tents vs. tarpaulins</p> <p>Senior HM received tents, and had to distribute to VHM the same day. DC instructed that there should be 5 tents per</p>



			village regardless of the number of people affected. 5 tents per VHM. VHM chose who should receive the tents – the most vulnerable. VHM did the monitoring afterwards to see if those beneficiaries were the most affected. Got names and forwarded to the DC
<b>Food</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Challenges</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
	Food procurement timely Adhered to Red Cross guidelines for distribution	No enough for affected families Some families were bigger than standard family size (does not take into account polygamous families)	Should consider increasing the budget in order to reach the number of affected people Other food items should be included including salt, sugar etc. Calculation of family size should be based on the number of people Should consider food for children under five
<b>Beneficiary feedback mechanism</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Challenges</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
	Mostly positive feedback received from communities	Beans took too long to cook and jerry cans were damaged Communication challenges with beneficiaries/communities Formal beneficiary feedback mechanism not established	Use local volunteers/relief committee to disseminate messages to beneficiaries Follow up on beneficiary feedback regarding the quality/quantity of items Consider clear and transparent mechanism and clear communication strategy to minimise complaints
<b>Beneficiary selection</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Challenges</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
	Baseline survey undertaken Trained volunteers Use of Headmen and community leaders Support from RDRT, SARO, HQ, DDMC and World Vision Selected beneficiaries recorded systematically	Timing and distances involved in rapid assessment Temptation of bias Inadequate training for selected volunteers Inadequate HR Transport challenges for HQ to verify selection	Red Cross beneficiary selection criteria should be shared with government stakeholders (government did not have clear beneficiary selection criteria for initial distribution of tents, chlorine and mosquito nets Templates should capture issues of vulnerability, gender and age
<b>NFIs</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Challenges</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>



	Good response to affected families Most items were in good conditions	Family sizes vs. quantity of NFIs was not sufficient – capping contributions for big families (insufficient blankets for families, tents were not enough, meaning that families had to be separated due to cultural practices) Quality of jerry cans was sub standard	Plan affectively for needs and family size Consider alternative jerry cans or buckets (consult beneficiaries on their need/preference) Consider distribution points when distributing NFIs and parcel size in terms of transporting good by beneficiaries
<b>Speed</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Challenges</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
	Managed to implement most of the distributions within one month Support and coordination with Govt., WVI ( assisted in volunteer selection and transport) Support from IFRC in timely RDRT deployment Coordination at HQ deployment	Timeliness could have been improved No branch Supplier confidence – few suppliers responded to tenders No prepositioned stock Delay in transport Lack of adequate warehousing capacity NS lack funds to undertake assessment/ start up implementation	Consider establishing a Red Cross branch in Mumbwa Image building of the NS Consider prepositioned stock in Lusaka Plan and budget for sufficient vehicles Pre-agreement with approved suppliers Prepositioning of regional stock
<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Challenges</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
	Rapid, joint assessment by DMMU, included geographically disbursed areas Standard templates used Right people involved and timely assessment	Impassable roads – some areas difficult to reach Unavailability of funds or partners to fund ZRCS assessment	Consider contact trained volunteers in advance of flooding to check availability Provide sim cards/air time to facilitate timely early warning/assessment Expand Red Cross network/branch; if appropriate
<b>Water and Sanitation</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Challenges</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
	Assisted with chlorine, jerry cans and door to door sensitisation Trained volunteers	Contamination of water supplies due to flooding Insufficient latrines due to flooding and total collapse	Continue with door to door sensitisation (supported by MoH)
<b>Logistics</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Challenges</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
	Everything ordered on time Jerry cans already in stock Good coordination Support from SARO	Transportation during procurement process Loss of confidence in the NS – credit facilities denied by supplies Lack of own transport and storage facilities in the branch and district	Plan and budget for appropriate logistics in the DREF operation Improve NS image through prompt payment of debts Employ or deploy RDRT in logistics



			Consider use of exceptional standards in logistics and distributions Adequate provision of workspace, equipment etc.
--	--	--	---

### Annex 6: Participants in the lessons learned workshop

	Name	Title	Area/District
1	Mudenda Wisford	DM Coordinator	ZRCS HQ
2	Priscilla Nsama	Health and Care	ZRCS HQ
3	Kanmani Venkateswaran	DM Intern	ZRCS HQ
4	Josephine Bwalya	Finance officer	ZRCS HQ
5	Gilead Lamba Mwenya	BD Coordinator	ZRCS HQ
6	Teddy Kasuba	DREF Accountant	ZRCS HQ
7	Mathew Chizu	Assistant Accountant	ZRCS HQ
8	Chishimba Crispin	Volunteer Logistics	ZRCS HQ
9	Muswaili Clifford	Volunteer Logistics	ZRCS HQ
10	Division Phiri	First Aid Supervisor	ZRCS HQ
11	Cleopatra Nsamu	First Aid	ZRCS HQ
12	Victor Sikombe	First Aid	ZRCS HQ
13	Mate Muzyamba	First Aid Trainer	ZRCS HQ
14	Mulenga Boyd	First Aid Trainer	ZRCS HQ
15	John Nkhoma	Supervisor	Nangoma VAU
16	Siame Herbert	Supervisor	Nangoma VAU
17	Edgar Mudenda	Supervisor	Kabulwebulwe VAU
18	Gracious Muna Chilimba	Supervisor	Kabulwebulwe VAU
19	Chilukutu Rocket	Volunteer	Kabulwebulwe VAU
20	Namushi Dominic	Volunteer	Kabulwebulwe VAU
21	Malukwa Hamusonde	Volunteer	Kabulwebulwe VAU
22	Alvin Mwiinga	Branch Leader	Mumbwa
23	Jospeph Shamboze	Volunteer	Nangoma VAU
24	Joshua Mwangala	Volunteer	Nangoma VAU
25	Petronella Jama	Volunteer	Nangoma VAU
26	Jim Chila	Driver	ZRCS HQ



**Annex 7: Lessons Learned Workshop – participant evaluation form**

**DREF for Zambia**

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

1 – poor      2 – average      3- good      4 – useful – 11      5 – excellent – 14

Comments:

It is very useful. I have learned a lot from the workshop.  
 I have learned a lot of new things and acquired new knowledge and have met a lot of people  
 More days for the workshop  
 I have understanding of things that I never knew and also we got to mingle with one another  
 Really useful for understanding how the response played out  
 Because we have learned a lot such that in the event we have another disaster, there will be  
 knowledge on how to manage a DREF  
 It was very educational and has really my eyes on DREF and IFRC operations  
 Too short, good accommodation, no out of pocket allowance  
 Was more educative than evaluation. An eye opener into the requirements and  
 preparedness of DREF activities  
 I have learned a lot about the DREF  
 Because it was educative  
 It was useful because we learned a lot about distribution in disasters  
 It was beneficial. I have learned new and a lot of things I never knew about DREF  
 Because it was very educational  
 The workshop highlighted to us a lot of things which are beneficial to us participants: how to  
 respond to DREF disasters  
 It helped me understand the fields or areas that I never took part in and assisted in terms of  
 knowledge  
 It was nice training because I didn't know about DREF which now I know  
 We were made to understand the operations of DREF and its purpose  
 The workshop was very educational  
 Knowledge of the DREF operation and how to go about acquisition of funds  
 Very useful learning on challenges that volunteers and staff face  
 It was very useful because I learned more things than what I knew  
 The workshop made everyone who was involved in the operation shared information  
 adequately  
 New ides came up on how to respond to a disaster

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



International Federation  
of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

Too long      Too short – 10      Enough time – 15

How do you rate the facilitators?

1 – poor      2 – average      3- good – 1      4 – useful – 5      5 – excellent – 19

How well was the workshop prepared?

1 – poor      2 – average      3- good – 9      4 – useful - 4      5 – excellent – 12

What was the most useful session and why?

Distribution workgroup, because I did distribution as a volunteer  
The group work session because everyone participated and shared their views. We got to express our views about what should be done  
Purpose of the DREF operation  
Presentation of group work because we are able to know each and every person's understanding on the DREF programme  
Group discussions/presentations about the different elements of the floods response – provided a holistic picture and critique of the response in Mumbwa, the timeline activity was great too  
Early warning systems, because people tend not to put into consideration of whatever warnings may occur in readiness of a disaster  
The most exciting session is the one where we were put into groups and discussed various topics concerning DREF/IFRC/NS operations  
Plenary on various topics in the groups  
Group work exercise  
Early warning preparedness  
The group discussion because it enabled participants to give different views on how the DREF operation was conducted  
Know more how to recover goods and well organised  
Group work and explaining strengths, challenges and recommendations. I learned a lot about DREF activities from other groups  
The most useful session was the group work, because it was so encouraging and nicely presented. At least each one had to contribute.  
The presentation session was useful to me because it brought out issues that were going on the ground where the activities were carried out. Why? Due to full participation.  
The importance of DREF, because the process itself is transparent and assist affected households  
The most useful was on DREF and Emergency Appeal details  
All of them were useful  
Group work: since it has made me able to know what should be done first that, strengths – challenges – recommendations  
The group work session because we were able to experience ideas with others  
How to be ready the new time (preparedness) especially won the request approval and gaps in the capacity of the National Society  
Plenary discussions, because of the discussions  
Every session was most useful because very important points were brought, especially from volunteers (people on the ground)  
Where participants brought up strengths, challenges and recommendations

How was the food?

1 – poor      2 – average – 1      3- good – 11      4 – useful - 3      5 – excellent – 10



How could we improve the next DREF lessons learned workshop?

Increase funds for DREF exercise

Improve in time (i.e. give more time) and provide learning materials, so that each participant may take a copy for the sake of revision.

The lessons learned were very good

By increasing the number of days so that we can at least tackle all the issues

A lot more time for group presentations

Timing on the number of days should be looked into for this was just too short but participatory

By conducting such workshops which are inclusive before the outbreak of any emergency involving all stakeholder at every level of a DREF operation

Provide out of pocket expenses, workshop to be at least 3 – 5 days

Allocate more time rather than rushing through them to catch up with time

Funds to come on time for DREF

By sending facilitators to different fields

You should improve by adding more lessons and communication

By extending the time

By sending facilitators to different fields

The next DREF lessons learned workshop: I propose that the workshop be held before the action is taken or before the disaster, for the purpose of preparation

Need more information and to be sensitised to various Provinces in readiness for disasters

We should invite other volunteers from other branches, if resources are available

To bring nations with disasters together to learn from each other

The lessons were okay. In the next DREF lessons learned there is a need for the provision of a manual of whole topics to be given to participants for the next operation

By letting people write on what they thought of the failure and successes without putting names on the papers or sheets on which they write

Make it a two day workshop

By making sure that everyone is involved from the beginning of the DREF

Sometimes it can be good to bring other countries with similar disasters together so that there can be information shared even among countries in the region

Extend time/days



## Annex 8: Post distribution Monitoring

### POST DISTRIBUTION MONITORING INTERPRETATION

S/No.	Question	Response	Comment
1.	Were you explained the reasons for which you or other beneficiaries were selected to receive Food/NFIs?	70% said yes	This means that the majority of the beneficiaries were fully aware of the selection criteria.
2.	Yes, by whom?	56% said they were informed by ZRCS.	This means that the staff and volunteers of ZRCS did a fair job in terms of passing information to the beneficiaries.
3.	Where you informed about the distribution and quantities of items to be given before the distribution day?	61% said they weren't informed.	The beneficiaries in this location were staying far apart; this means passing of information to the beneficiaries was not effective.
4.	Was the distribution method well organised?	79% said the distribution was well organised.	This means that the method used for distributing relief items was good and should be maintained in future distributions.
5.	Was there shade while you waited?	79% said there was shade.	It is a good practice to assemble beneficiaries under a shade while distribution is done in the open; this is a good method of crowd control.
6.	Was there any confusion over who should receive what?	86% said there was no confusion.	This means that the majority of the beneficiaries were informed of what they were to receive.
7.	Did you feel that you had to wait for an unnecessarily long time?	67% said they didn't wait for a long time.	This means that the distribution method was well organised and should be maintained in future interventions.
8.	Was it clear where you should wait?	93% said it was clear where they should wait.	This means that information process was effective.
9.	Was the assistance of food and NFIs timely?	96% said the assistance was timely.	This means that the response was timely and should be maintained in future interventions.
10.	Are there any risks to your safety related to the distribution method?	97% said there no risks.	This means the community understood the plight of the beneficiaries.
11.	Was there any rushing or pushing by people to get the Food/NFIs?	100% said there was no rushing.	This means crowd control was very good.
12.	Time waiting from start of distribution until items received?	98% waited between 1- 2 hours.	This means that the distribution method was very efficient and should be maintained in future distributions.



International Federation  
of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

13.	Was the distance to the distribution point near to your house?	59% said the distance was not near.	The beneficiaries in this location were staying far apart, others were 15-25 kilometres away from the distribution point.
14.	Was there fighting between beneficiaries, or with host community, while waiting for the distribution?	100% said no.	This means security was ok
15.	Was there rushing or pushing during the distribution?	100% said no.	This means security was ok
16.	Was there looting by beneficiaries, host community or guards during distribution?	100% said no.	This means security was ok
17.	Was anyone killed or injured during distribution?	100% said no.	This means security was ok
18.	Was there fighting between beneficiaries over Food/NFIs after the distribution?	100% said no.	This means security was ok
19.	Was there fighting between beneficiaries and host community over Food/NFIs after distribution?	100% said no.	This means security was ok
20.	Was there looting of beneficiaries, or other violence, by host community or unknown persons after distribution?	100% said no.	This means security was ok
21.	Was anyone killed or injured after distribution?	100% said no.	This means security was ok
22.	What were the NFIs you received?	100% received the planned NFIs.	This means that the beneficiaries received all the planned NFIs.
23.	How was the quality of NFIs you received?	97% said the quality was good.	This means NFIs distributed were of good quality.
24.	What was the most useful NFI?	81% said blanket	The majority of beneficiaries indicated that blanket was the most useful NFI.
25.	What was the least useful NFI?	68% said soap.	The majority of beneficiaries indicated that Jerry can was the least useful NFI
26.	Was the quantity of NFIs given sufficient?	62% said the qty was sufficient.	This means that sphere standards were observed.
27.	What did you do with the NFIs you received?	96% said they used the NFIs.	This means that the NFIs distributed were the most needed by the beneficiaries and they made good use of them.
28.	If sold, what was the reason?	100% said they didn't sell NFIs.	This means none of the beneficiaries sold the NFIs they were given.
29.	What should have been included in the NFI kit?	80%	The majority of beneficiaries indicated that Kitchen sets, clothing, cash and WatSan cleaning equipment among others should have been included in the kit.
30.	What were the food items you received?	4% said that they didn't get beans.	This means that some beneficiaries missed beans because of over scooping.
31.	How was the quality of the food you received?	100% said the quality	This means food distributed was of good quality.



		was good.	
32.	What was the most useful food item?	84% said M/Meal.	The majority of beneficiaries indicated that M/Meal was the most useful food item.
33.	What was the least useful food item?	62% said beans.	The majority of beneficiaries indicated that beans were the least useful food item.
34.	Was the quantity of food given sufficient?	64% said was sufficient.	This means that sphere standards were observed.
35.	What did you do with the food you received?	100% said they used the food.	This means that the food items distributed were the most needed by the beneficiaries and they made good use of it.
36.	If sold, what was the reason?	100% said they didn't sell the food.	This means none of the beneficiaries sold the food they were given.
37.	What should have been included in the food basket?	80%	The majority of beneficiaries indicated that kapenta (small fish), salt, sugar, cash and rice should have been included in the food basket.