



International Federation
of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

Malawi Floods, MDRMW009 DREF Review May 2013



23 - 30 May, 2013

Facilitators:

Melanie Ogle, IFRC Disaster Response Delegate, Africa Zone Office

Janet Porter, IFRC Operations Manager, Southern Africa Regional Office



Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Introduction	4
Review Challenges	4
DREF Intervention Strengths & Challenges	5
Key Findings	6
Quality, relevance and accountability	6
Effectiveness and efficiency of management	7
Capacity of National Society	8
Recommendations	9
IFRC SARO	9
Communications	10
MRCS Headquarter & DREF Management	10
Annexes	12
1. Terms of Reference for the review	12
2. Persons interviewed	17
3. Lessons Learned Workshop – Agenda & Participants	18
4. Lessons Learned Workshop – Timeline of Operation	19
5. Lessons Learned Workshop – Operations Self Assessment	22
6. Lessons Learned Workshop – Participants Recommendations on the DREF Operation	25
7. Lessons Learned Workshop – Participant Evaluation Form	31



Executive Summary

During the review, the team held interviews with key informants and focus group discussions, as well as visited the affected district and community in Mangochi. The field visit gave the opportunity for those directly involved in operations to share the challenges faced as well as how activities were coordinated and implemented in response to the floods. This was followed by a one-and-a-half day internal lessons learned workshop involving key members of the MRCS headquarters, Mangochi Branch and volunteers.

Overall the Malawi Flood DREF operation was well implemented and generally on track for achieving the outputs. The National Society and Mangochi Branch have an effective rapid response system in place (although lacking immediate start up resources and funds). Positive feedback was received by the district, branches, volunteers, village leaders and beneficiaries on the Malawi Red Cross Society's (MRCS) response to the disaster as well as there was strong collaboration between MRCS headquarters and branch with the district.

The DREF process and timing generally worked well. A timeline of the process can be found in annex 4 of this report. However, the number of households reached with shelter assistance and NFIs was reduced to 1421 (from the originally planned 1600) due to verification of registered households by the district. Registration techniques coordinated by the district held potential biases and no concrete monitoring tools were in place, resulting in possible beneficiaries being missed. Although efforts were made by MRCS, data collected did not meet IFRC standards (i.e. breakdown by gender and various vulnerabilities). It was also stated that the UNFPA has asked and funded the government to redo the registration of the communities. This implies support in the concern of the registration and potentially missed beneficiaries.

The visibility of MRCS was hampered by volunteers receiving Red Cross stickers rather than t-shirts and bibs for identification (although this was budgeted for). However, trainings of volunteers provided by the DREF operations (erecting shelters, first aid, hygiene promotion and community based management of water, sanitation and hygiene facilities) contributed to the increased capacity in responding to disasters. A very positive outcome of the DREF operation is the regeneration of a MRCS branch and generation of sub divisions. As a result of the operation, the number of volunteers and members have dramatically increased.

Transport has been a large challenge for the DREF including impassable roads, volunteers struggling to get to far-to-reach areas (often putting in their own funds) and the MRCS truck breaking down; transportation costs were also not adequately budgeted for. Overall MRCS monitoring and evaluation components were weak and in need of greater support. A general lack of understanding of M&E existed and how it can feed into good operational response and quality reporting.

Three separate IFRC monitoring missions were performed over the DREF, a SARO financial, a PMER/Zone visit and a SARO operations visit, which has hopefully contributed to the support of the operation.

Overall, the operation has gone very well, particularly given that the National Society has an ongoing Emergency Appeal for food security and additional development work. The review team was very impressed with the performance and professionalism of the MRCS, and this review acknowledges their response to the floods in Malawi in 2013, and the opportunity to potentially improve future responses.



Introduction

Flood DREF Operation MDRMZ009

Budget: CHF 326,090

Alert: From inter-agency meeting held on 14th January; on DMIS 16th January 2013

DREF approved: 7 February 2013

Target number of beneficiaries: 16,370 people (or 3,274 families) in Mangochi District

Duration: Originally a 3 month operation. The timeframe was extended a month with a revised budget to undertake this in-depth review and lessons learned workshop, finishing on 7th June 2013.

<http://www.ifrc.org/docs/Appeals/13/MDRMW009.pdf>

<http://www.ifrc.org/docs/Appeals/13/MDRMW00901.pdf>

Malawi Red Cross Society (MRCS) is an active partner, respected as a 'first responder' in disaster management in Malawi. During four months, the MRCS responded to the Mangochi floods with the support of a DREF operation.

As the closure of 2013 DREF flood operations in the Southern Africa region generally coincide, the Federation decided to convene a review of the operations in Malawi, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Namibia and Botswana. The Malawi review was conducted jointly with the Africa Zone Office and Southern African Regional Office, and covered the process and utilization of the DREFs in response to the disaster, as well as the lessons learnt workshops with the National Society.

The purpose and objectives of the review and lessons learned workshop were to:

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

The review was conducted in Lilongwe as well as the Mangochi District where the flood occurred. The review involved interviews with key informants and focus group discussions. The list of people interviewed during the review is annex 2 to this report. A one day lessons learned workshop brought together the MRCS Headquarters, Mangochi Branch and volunteers. The workshop was participatory and required those present to analyse the strengths and challenges of the operation from different perspectives and develop their own recommendations for future operations. The full list of participants in the workshop is annex 3 to this report.

The evaluation team would like to express their thanks to the National Society Headquarters, Mangochi Branch and volunteers for facilitating the DREF review and their full and open participation in the lessons learned workshop. It was a privilege to work with the National Society and to discuss with community members and local authorities.

Review Challenges

Due to time constraints and availability a few key informants were not interviewed. This included representatives of the DoDMA national forum as well as other NGOs involved in the Mangochi flood response (i.e. Save the Children, World Vision).

However, taking into consideration travel logistics and the limited time available in the field, the MRCS accommodated for changes in the schedule to allow for proper interview times with various stakeholders. As a result, the review team has been able to get an understanding of the achievements and limitations of the MRCS, IFRC and other stakeholders in carrying out the DREF operation. The positive recognition MRCS received from the district, community and beneficiaries is also acknowledged.



DREF Intervention Strengths & Challenges

Strengths

- *Previous experience in DREFs:* A number of the MRCS headquarter staff had previous DREF experience.
- *First Responder:* MRCS was the first organization to visibly respond on the ground.
- *Door-to-door verifications:* brought respect from the community toward the MRCS processes.
- *Revitalization of Branches/Volunteers:* Mangochi is a relatively new community for MRCS, as they had never had a program there. The DREF operation has revived branches and volunteers (i.e. in Monkey Bay), and has built a sound base for the Icelandic RC CBHFA program in the district.
- *Renewed interest in MRCS and membership:* MRCS receiving increased requests for community members to join (50 people in one area, 35 in another); the challenge remains for the Branch to manage this new interest, expectations and support.
- *Overcome environmental challenges:* Considering the severity of the floods and large geographic coverage, the MRCS did a good job in accessing the far to reach areas and providing much appreciated assistance.
- *Strengthened:*
 - o Relationships between MRCS Headquarter and Branch members.
 - o Relationships between hospital and health staff with the RC volunteers.
 - o Teamwork between district, health office, MRCS headquarters and branch.
 - o Coordination and perception of volunteers in the communities
 - o Recognition of MRCS in the communities (by community members, leaders and other stakeholders)

Challenges

- *DM Team overstretched:* The MRCS DM team was initially overstretched balancing regular programs, former Karonga earthquake operations and the government's pressure to respond to the floods initially identified in multiple districts. Then there were some districts affected by windstorms and a few others suffered from partial droughts. This contributed to the decision to bring the Population Movement and Emergency Manager as lead for this DREF operation, in order to balance DM operations.
- *Fuel volatility and availability:* Due to fuel shortages, MRCS was sometimes forced to pay excessive prices to keep operations going.
- *Devaluation of the Malawi kwacha:* This caused challenges in quotations – normally they are valid for 7 days, however the situation caused suppliers to not guarantee quotations for a period of time; this often resulted in prices higher than what was originally budgeted.
- *Finance Team:* The Project Accountant assigned to the DREF was also overstretched and responsible for ongoing programs with the Swedish, Netherlands and Norwegian RC as well as the concurrent Food Security Emergency Appeal. The financial team is currently five, and two more will be added soon to provide extra capacity for future operations.
- *Pre-qualified suppliers list:* A number of NGOs use a pre-qualified suppliers list, however MRCS has been operating with general open-tenders which lengthen time of procurement; the MRCS are in the final stages of securing a pre-qualified list to efficiently secure stock in emergencies (transport suppliers not included).
- *Transport:* The MRCS truck was included in the DREF, however it broke down and was unusable; alternate solutions were created including in-kind transport contributions from MPs and contracting external transport (competition with the Tobacco transport season tended to raise costs).
- *No active volunteers in some of the affected areas:* Although the Mangochi branch was active, volunteers and their response had to be assembled at the district level in areas lacking active volunteers.
- *Travel Distances:* The flood areas covered great distances, causing challenges for volunteers to reach sites and return within a day (often going without food or safe drinking water, returning late into the evening).
- *Communities' knowledge in disaster response:* Being the first disaster of this type/magnitude, the community was not prepared nor were there response structures in place (i.e. Village Civil Protection Committees existed and did not have the skills/knowledge on how to respond).
- *Agency coordination:* Contributions with other agencies was not well coordinated (i.e. duplication of blankets); local authorities have not maintained a complete list of agency contributions (what was distributed and when).
- *Changing environment:* The unexpected wind storm during the DREF period brought about additional shelter (roofing) needs in the community beyond the DREF.



Key findings

Quality, relevance and accountability

Overall the operation was relevant and met the affected communities' needs. MRCS items were considered applicable and of high quality providing a sense of pride for beneficiaries. Beneficiaries identified were verified as vulnerable (included houses destroyed or damaged beyond repair), however due to the process and decisions in registration completed by the district, there are concerns of political influences in the selection, thereby some households and areas were missed in initial registration.

A number of committees to ensure smooth implementation of the operation were formed. A Camp Elected Committee of 10 people was formed (5 men & 5 women beneficiaries from 4 villages, of which 2 women were Muslims) to (a) assist in receiving and distributing items from various NGOs in the 4 camps, (b) to select camp security and (c) to collect camp contributions from well-wishers. This was created as a result of a request from Medicine sans Frontiers (the first to come in with medical supplies). This committee was locally elected by the villages. The MRCS also asked the villages to form a Red Cross Committee that worked closely with the Camp Elected Committee to assist in verification of beneficiaries. Three Water Point Committees were set up including volunteers and community members who are trained in the maintenance of the refurbished boreholes. To provide financial support, a 50 MK fee per month per family has been recommended depending on the community (although this is not compulsory, it is based on capacity). This system is aligned with the government's Water Development Policy, where communities are empowered with bylaws (tariffs) to ensure community members are included based on abilities.

After the floods, three assessments were carried out:

- District-led assessment: an initial list of affected households was provided; selection involved local leaders and a headmaster in an unreachable area; no data collection standard or template was used.
- Inter-agency assessment: identified 3,274 flood affected households, with 1,600 requiring shelter and NFIs (the assessment involved the MoH and local MRCS branch).
- Final MRCS verification/registration for shelter & NFIs: 1,421 of the 1,600 successfully verified due to double registering, false information, etc.

Concerns were widely expressed that people were left out (as more information came in from different areas). The review could not conclude that the assessment was done systematically and included all communities, however in the end the District made the decision to use the initial list of 1,600 as the final list. MRCS relied on the DC to communicate to the potentially missed communities. The MRCS also discovered some pockets not covered in the assessment (through complaints to the Red Cross volunteers), and added more beneficiaries once verified with a visit (included in the 1,421).

Initially volunteers tried to verify households at the camps; however they came into challenges with identifying people and vulnerabilities. It was decided to visit homes with a formal checklist/form to rectify any discrepancies. This also screened for those who falsified the initial registration records and ensured those remaining fit the vulnerability criteria.

The government/district identified the needs through the initial assessments with community consultations. The MRCS DM Population Movement and Emergency Manager also verified this with beneficiaries (the Camp Elected Committee). The water and sanitation facilities assessment identified four boreholes in need of refurbishment, however DREF funds only allowed for three. One of the two identified in Sokole was selected for refurbishment involving discussions with the village headmen and school subjects.

Red Cross items were perceived as very appropriate by beneficiaries and the highest quality of all NFIs provided (it did not demoralize the beneficiaries as some items provided by others); items were kept by families, not sold in local markets. In addition, the general consensus was that beneficiaries received items timely. Some items were not sufficient or missing from the operation. This included a shortage of tarpaulins (all needs were not covered as most houses are grassed thatched and leak), as well as food identified by volunteers (not include in operational plan).

Challenges were faced in the camps where it was difficult for Muslim practices to be adhered to (i.e. in bathroom facilities and sleeping arrangements); initially the Muslim community was separated (in a different



International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

community), however the government decided later on for all flood-affected families to be together and moved the Muslim families to the camps with other beneficiaries.

Women beneficiaries stated the camp arrangements were not sensitive to women's needs (spaces initially were not demarcated by families, and young boy children were asked to sleep alone, they experienced challenges with menstrual issues when surrounded by men from other villages); while this was not the decision of MRCS, they should be aware of this feedback for future operations. Later in the operations one tent was provided for 'women only'; women came from other camps to join this. Finally, there was no provision of light in the camps, holding a security concern.

Other agency responded to the floods. This includes support from the Government in terms of tents, chlorine and malaria drugs, livelihoods support in terms of seeds and fertiliser (distributed through an existing programme that targets farming clubs), food and NFIs. UNICEF contributed tents and UNFPA health kits (condoms, menstrual kits, razors, toothpaste, toothbrushes, soap), jerry cans, buckets, chitenges (wraps for women); funding for assessment training (2 areas were missed in this training). Further contributions were received from Medicine sans Frontiers (medical kits, mosquito nets, clothes, buckets, and small blankets), Save the Children (1 tent, temporary food items) and Population Services International (PSI) (chlorine, Panadol, condoms). The faith communities also provided maize meal and relish in the first stages of the camp.

The district did not use any tools in the tracking and monitoring of the flood response by stakeholders. A 'District Assistant Disaster Risk management Officer' was assigned to collect input from all players and compile update reports to be submitted and shared monthly; although it was stated these reports existed, there was little evidence to support that this was a reality on the ground. There is scope for improving information and better coordination between the District and Area Civil Protection Committees. Communication between District and Area CPCs seems to involve only distribution reports during disaster responses.

A collaborative effort was made in various activities to ensure the MRCS strategies were in line with the Government and District; i.e. the water supply and sanitation facilities assessment was done in collaboration with the Health and Water Department; borehole activities were completed with a MRCS HQ technician and a Government Nthakataka Water Officer.

Effectiveness and efficiency of management

Overall the operation met and completed the majority of the planned activities in the allotted time frame. The operation was extended for one month to allow for the DREF review and internal lessons learned workshop, which also gave some flexibility to finalize the remaining activities. The review did not see any monitoring information or templates used during the operation. The review is awaiting further information provided in the final report to be submitted 6 August 2013.

Due to staff turnover since previous DREFs, some staff were not conversant with DREF processes and information gaps appear to exist in IFRC/DREF system procedures. A MRCS cross-department DREF task force was set up to work together to plan and implement the DREF operation. The team included the DM Population Movement and Emergency Manager, WASH manager, PMER manager, project accountant and logistics officer (with consultation and supervision from the Director of Programmes & Development). Meetings were held every two weeks (minimum). A procurement committee was created to open and evaluate the bids when needed; consisted of DM Population Movement and Emergency Manager, WASH manager, Director of Finance, project accountant and logistics officer.

NFIs were budgeted and distributed per family and the number of family members were not necessarily taken into account. As a result, SPHERE standards were not always met. For example, in the case of mosquito nets where a family would receive only one. However distributions seemed to go smoothly. The involvement of MRCS in distribution was noted as very positive, reducing the political influences. Post distribution monitoring was not formally done, and could improve further operations. No formal beneficiary feedback/complaints mechanism was in place.

There was no evidence that specific tools were used in the initial registration of beneficiaries (the District collected lists from village leaders). The MRCS PMER Manager created a template to record information including the head of household name & sex, female headed, child headed, number in the household, children



International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

<5, disabled, elderly, orphans, chronically ill, and destruction degree of home (and latrine); two teams of 3-4 volunteers carried out the verification. Note, this information was only collected for the households identified in the communities, and not residents of camps. Camp residents were only disaggregated by gender and age.

A lessons learned workshop was held with various stakeholders from the government/district (water department, environment, ministry of health), community members, volunteers, as well as the MRCS headquarters (DM Population Movement and Emergency Manger. WASH Manager, Logistics Officer, PMER Manager, DM Manager). It would be good to get a copy of the workshop report to see if the recommendations overlap with those of this review.

Late submission and gaps in required financial documents were experienced by IFRC SARO, resulting in delays of cash releases for other programmes. The list of IFRC minimal financial documents was re-sent to MRCS to provide better guidance for future operations.

There was confusion in the replenishment of prepositioned stock, as the original plan was for some stock to be procured through IFRC, however the entire DREF funds were transferred to MRCS. This was not caught until late during distribution, with MRCS securing the final stock replenishment locally. Previous stock used in the Karonga emergency response was to be replenished by IFRC regional stock in 2012. Initially MRCS planned to use this stock in the DREF response (replenishing with DREF funds), however the stock has never arrived.

Feedback from volunteers is that they had to work without proper protective gear. Protective gear and items to identify volunteers with MRCS (i.e. t-shirts or vests) were not provided. Volunteers were encouraged to bring their own clothes and were given stickers to identify them as Red Cross. Volunteers were also unaware that they were insured. In addition, Volunteers did not contribute to the response plans. However, the pride of Red Cross volunteers interviewed was strong; they sited desires to assist those in need and to provide first aid, to network with others in solving problems, and pride in being a part of a neutral and global body with longevity in the community (with memories of the Red Cross in primary school and on TV).

The local PNSs (Danish, Finnish and Icelandic) were involved in the drafting of the DREF to a small degree. In addition MRCS participates in national and district level coordination mechanisms including the DoDMA WASH Sector Cluster and the Camp Management Cluster. The District WASH Technical Committee does exist, however it is not active. Feedback from the UNDP Disaster Coordinator encouraged the MRCS to strengthen their participation in national forums, including the Humanitarian Country Team as Red Cross plays a leadership. The DREF operation trained MoH staff on how to administer the cholera kits (that were provided by MRCS). At this stage, no MoU was prepared, however this would have been useful. Other NGOS, such as Save the Children and World Vision on the ground in Mangochi, however there was no direct response coordination with MRCS.

Capacity of National Society

The capacity of the NS has been strengthened as a result of this DREF operation. The Mangochi branch appears to have strong leadership and capacity to work independently. It could do with reinforcement of infrastructure to support regular operations and the influx of interest in membership from distant areas.

Gaps in capacity identified:

While the MRCS normally use Emergency Response Action teams to respond in disaster prone areas; Mangochi District did not have a team as it was not considered disaster prone. A district version of this team was created (involving chosen volunteers from the branch).

Contingency Plans are needed for the District level, along with practical simulation exercises. The Government is currently discussing a programme to develop Contingency Plans for disaster-prone districts; the MRCS DM Manager is involved in these discussions.

Prior to the DREF, on January 8th, 10 members of the Area CPCs (which covers the entire TA) were trained in Disasters and their roles during a disaster. This was facilitated by the District (Health & Youth) and had MRCS involvement. Although the Area CPC roles were discussed, only a list was provided without any tools or explanation on how to implement. The ACPC role was identified to:

Organize area assessments according to DCPC



International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

ID & prioritize for assessment between localities
Consolidate and analyse data, and estimate relief requirements
Coordination & verification of registration of beneficiaries
Arrange security & transport of distribution of relief supplier in cooperation with DCPC
Monitor distribution

Changes in capacity/capabilities/understanding/learning:

At the management level, the DREF experience improved coordination and implementation skills by management (including the involvement of input from other sector staff) and improved capacity and experience of the Population Movement and Emergency Manager's management for future DREFs; as this was his first experience with a DREF. In addition, the WASH Manager's knowledge in coordination (i.e. in use of multichannel radios to communicate to communities) has also been built. Finally, MRCS HQ understanding of needs and field conditions has improved with site visits, thereby being better equipped to provide solutions.

Various trainings were conducted as part of the DREF operation including shelter training (25 volunteers trained) and first aid training (24 trained out of the planned 36, the reduced number is due to the Kwacha devaluation). Volunteers and communities have improved knowledge in maintenance of boreholes. Capacity of MRCS Mangochi branches has improved in terms of knowledge in registration & verification processes. Meanwhile community experience with disasters, their understanding of how victims are affected and how they can overcome the challenges is evident.

At the District level, an increased understanding came from the operations that development and use of partnerships are paramount. In addition, increased knowledge was experienced in data capturing tools and types of data needed as used by other NGOs (including the MRCS).

Lessons Learned:

It was expressed that MRCS cannot always rely on the government and districts; it is the responsibility of everyone to assist each other in a disaster. The missed opportunity to add disaster kits (DM equipment at MRCS division level) was also recognized.

At a community level, this flood experience has shown that use of certain materials in homes (i.e. unburnt bricks) are more susceptible to disasters/floods; burnt bricks and cement provide better security (yet the dilemma with firewood to burn and deforestation exists). Finally, the community recognized that the flooding was impacted by deforestation in higher grounds (as this is the first time flood waters came from upland), identifying the need to address deforestation in certain areas.

Recommendations

IFRC SARO Recommendations:

Operations Manager: An operations manager (or capable NDRT/RDRT) is strongly recommended to be deployed in future DREFs, to support existing overstretched capacity of the national society and to transfer skills and knowledge in DREF processes and program management on a day-to-day basis.

Strengthen NS's knowledge in program management and DREF system processes: This includes effective planning & budgeting, communication, capturing relevant vulnerability data and indicators, setting targets and increasing quality of monitoring and evaluation. For example:

- Provide more clarity to the NS on DREF system processes (i.e. user friendly step-by-step guidance, DREF timeline and milestones, roles & responsibilities, IFRC counterpart contacts)
- Provide NS with further program management and PMER trainings and/or resources including sources and proper use of tools. One-off trainings on their own are not effective in retaining knowledge, they must be backed with regular communications and support.
- **DMIS:** Ensure relevant MRCS staff have regular access and knowledge of IFRC's DMIS system and are able to navigate through the webpage to access current disaster information, documents, guidelines, tools, as well as use the system to report disasters.

Emphasize and share IFRC policies & procedures: Ensure that the NS has access to current valuable reference documents (i.e. IFRC list of minimum financial document required) and stress to specific MRCS departments



International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

(finance, logistics, programs) the necessity of adhering to IFRC procedures at the commence of every disaster response and throughout the operations.

Communication Recommendations

Strengthen MRCS/IFRC financial & DM interdepartmental and interoffice communication. Consider:

- More regular touching base in emergency operations (between both IFRC & NS departments)
- In key communications regarding DREF budget/finances, ensure budget holders & appropriate finance people (both IFRC & NS) are copied.
- *DM Weekly updates:* Provide active participation in weekly updates from DM team to ensure SARO is aware of current operations and challenges (and can provide appropriate support).

Strengthen DM team coordination and collaboration: information exchange between emergency response (DREF operations) and recovery preparedness (EA operations) should be strengthened; there is a need for greater encouragement of knowledge and communication exchange between different operations.

MRCS Headquarter & DREF Management Recommendations:

Contingency Planning: Ensure MRCS has a contingency plan in place and it is regularly updated, with support provided through SARO if needed (including the prepositioned of stock). Consider:

- *Contingency Fund:* Investigate the possibility of setting up a buffer-fund for immediate access to respond to disasters and reduce delays in waiting for DREF funds; communicate to SARO to ensure used buffer-funds can be included and reimbursed in the DREF budget.
- *Raising MRCS capital:* Encourage fundraising activities at national and branch levels to increase autonomy and be able to draw on finances immediately to disaster response.
- *First Aid Kit maintenance:* Ensure sufficient starter kits are available at time of disaster and are replenished; Build potential supplier relationships (local hospitals & pharmaceutical companies).
- *Pre-identified suppliers list:* Activate the pre-identified suppliers list (inclusive of transportation services) to hasten up procurement process & build relations with reliable and qualified suppliers.

DREF Planning: Ensure the proper budgeting and planning in DREF responses.

- Consider the need and budget for psychosocial support in future DREF planning
- Factor in currency fluctuations into DREF budget.
- Emphasize the importance and benefits of linking RC responses/structures with existing structures and traditional structures (not to work in isolation)
- *Transport:* ensure adequate budget reflects transport needs (including contingency needs).

DREF Document Sharing: Translate future DREF documents (or a key summary) into the local language and share with all stakeholders including the government, district, cluster participants, responding organizations, community leaders and volunteers. This will ensure there is a collective understand of the MRCS's response and activities, volunteers will be better equipped to respond to community questions and it will provide the base for monitoring operations by all involved.

PMER: Ensure program monitoring & evaluation is ongoing throughout the operation (including in assessment, registration and pre/post distribution). Use proper planning, and monitoring & evaluating tools throughout the operations (capturing demographic & vulnerability data as well as other key indicators). Consider:

- Setting up stakeholder focus groups to provide feedback (separated into various represented groups i.e. women & children)
- Using the Camp Management Committee to get beneficiary feedback
- Investigating the District's capacity for PMER & tools (and encourage CPCs and DEC to collect and share information from all stakeholders)



International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

National and Regional Disaster Forums: Strengthen MRCS participation, support and relationships with national and regional disaster forums as well as with other stakeholders. For example:

- Increase MRCS participation and build on relationships within cluster meetings (low patronage to meetings was reported at national level);
- Reactivate participation and relationships in the Humanitarian Country Team forum.
- Lobby for the District to support and provide Area Civil Protection Committees with tools and knowledge on how to actively respond to disasters in their defined role that was covered in the recent January 2013 Area CPC trainings.

Volunteers: The volunteers showed interest in being involved & engaged, which is very positive and should be encouraged. Consider volunteer motivation when planning and implementing DREF responses. For example:

- Provide volunteers with identification and protective gear (t-shirts, rubber boots, etc.) for better RC visibility and recognition in the community as well as to increase volunteer motivation.
- Provide certificate of acknowledgement to volunteers for their response
- Ensure volunteers are aware of the provision of insurance (this is standard in all DREF and Emergency Appeal operations) and how to access it should the need arise.
- Volunteer feedback mechanism: provide a mechanism for volunteer to feed into the operations (volunteers are the closest and most knowledgeable to the communities and can provide valuable information to the ongoing operations)

Systematic data collection: Ensure there is systematic data collection in assessments, registration, selection and distribution. Consider:

- *Standard Assessment Tool:* Lobby the Government to adopt the standard draft assessment tool to ensure consistency in data collection (to be used by all stakeholders); advocate for gender data & RC vulnerability interests to be included in district/government assessments and registration.
- *Vulnerability Criteria:* MRCS to ensure gender and selected vulnerabilities are reported and verified for each beneficiary in future disaster responses, to ensure the program targets the most vulnerable; beneficiary data should also be immediately entered into a database to allow for better verification, monitoring and gender/vulnerability reporting to donors.
- *Registration:* MRCS advocate for & sensitize stakeholders for registration to include all community households to ensure transparent (unbiased) selection.

Beneficiary communications: Build in a formal system for beneficiary complaints and feedback mechanisms throughout all activities (not just registration, verification and distribution) in future DREF planning, monitoring and operations. Include how complaints will be followed up and addressed. Each community member should know who to go to with questions or concerns regarding the MRCS response and be assured that concerns will be addressed. Consider:

- *Beneficiary Feedback Mechanisms:* Explore methods of communication to the communities and beneficiaries about the ongoing DREF activities. Allow for feedback from the community and beneficiaries. I.e. Community radio can be used to transmit messages and receive feedback in local languages; can include groups of stakeholders to give unified feedback/messages to the community. Broader messages can increase awareness of the operations, thereby reducing confusion in the community (and complaints).

Camps & Security: The review revealed a number of beneficiaries' discomforts in the setup of the camp not addressing family, women's or Muslim-specific needs. Ensure differences (i.e. cultural, gender and age) are taken into account when setting up and running of the camps as well as proper security for beneficiaries and resources are in place. Consider:

- Strengthening coordination with Camp Elected Committees
- Identifying alternative solutions for security of stock at temporary depots
- Providing of lighting/electricity for camps in future DREFs to ensure safety particularly for women and children.

For recommendations emerging from the lessons learned workshop (and the participants made up of staff HQ, Mangochi Branch, and volunteers, please see annex 6



Annexes

Attachment 1. Terms of Reference: Malawi Flood Disaster MDRMW009

Date: May 17th, 2013

Time frame of mission: May 23rd to May 30th 2013

Location: Lilongwe, Malawi (& field visit to Mangochi)

Evaluators:

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

Janet Porter, Operations Manager, IFRC Southern Africa Regional Office

1. Background:

DREF Operation Floods (MDRMW009). DREF allocated: CHF 326,090.

<http://www.ifrc.org/docs/Appeals/13/MDRZW007.pdf>

Starting in December 2012, Malawi received heavy and continuous rains resulting in severe floods, loss of lives, injuries and destruction of infrastructure including roads. Many homes were damaged or destroyed, crops and livestock lost, and water sources contaminated. The Southern Region of Malawi was the most affected, particularly in districts of Mangochi, Phalombe, Nsanje and Zomba.

The Department of Disaster Management Affairs (DoDMA) indicated the total number of households affected throughout Malawi was 12,877, with four deaths as of February. An initial assessment done by the Mangochi District in particular listed that the rains and flooding from the 6th to 11th of affected 3,274 households (16,370 individuals) in Mangochi alone. This included Traditional Authority (TA) Nankumba, Mponda and Chimwala.

The DREF operation was launched (1) to support the emergency needs of these 3,274 Mangochi households with shelter and basic household items. The MRCS was also (2) to provide emergency health support through community mobilization activities in cholera and other disease prevention, CBHFA and hygiene promotion trainings and distribution of disease prevention IEC materials, thereby reducing health risks for affected families. Finally, (3) access to clean water was also to be provided to the affected families through the provision of water treatment products, hygiene promotion campaigns and rehabilitation of the community boreholes (three boreholes).

All operations were expected to be implemented in the Mangochi district for a period of three months, ending on the 7th of May 2013. However an extension for one-month was granted to accommodate for this lessons learned workshop and internal review. Therefore the DREF will be completed on the 7th of June 2013. A Final Report will be made available three months after the end of the DREF (by 7th September, 2013).

2. Purpose and scope of the Review:

The purpose of the mission is to perform a review in order to examine if the MDRMW009 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: Lilongwe and Mangochi

- Key staff and volunteers from the MRCS 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).



International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

- Beneficiaries from the Mangochi 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. DoDMA, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Housing, MDF, DCPC), UN agencies (i.e. WFP, United Nations Population Fund, UNICEF, UNDP), international organizations and NGOs (i.e. Save the Children, Médecin Sans Frontières, Muslim Brotherhood, World Bank) 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) DOPD, DM Manager, Population Movement and Emergency Manager, PMER Manager, Wash Manager, Financial Unity, Logistics Officer; IFRC regional finance unit, 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:

- Was the operation outcomes (expected results) reached in an efficient and effective way?
- 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.).
- 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.)?



International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

- 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.)
- 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?

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 ceremony.
- Introduction of workshop participants.
- Presentation of workshop objective: explanation of the methodology and workshop outcome to participants.
- Overview of the DREF operation.
- Review of the DREF operation: objectives and activities planned with the DREF and problems/concerns identified per activity. For this exercise, participants will separate into groups (e.g.: per branches). Each group will review their activities and experiences and identify problems and concerns.
- Presentations of previous exercise and general discussion. The main identified concerns/problems will be discussed per group. Each group will present recommendations for these concerns.
- SWOT analysis (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats/Challenges)
- Evaluations of the DREF review methodology (general discussion to improve the methodology to evaluate DREF operations).
- Closing ceremony.

7. **Outputs:**

- Review/evaluation report including executive summary, key conclusions and recommendations. The draft report will be submitted 14 days after the conclusion of the review, and final report submitted no later than four weeks after the review (with seven 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 (23-30 May 2013) with the following schedule (including drafting and finalization of report):

Activity Review Flood operation	Time	Date
Arrive to Lilongwe Visit to SG	TBD (based on arrival times)	23 May 2013 (Thurs)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Briefing with National Society • Individual meetings/interviews/discussions with NS HQ relevant staff <i>Fin, Logs & PMER to bring documents & receipts to be reviewed</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Director of Programs & Development (Hastings Kandaya) - Population Movement and Emergency Manager (Joseph Moyo) - PMER Manager (Franklin Yonamo) (Lunch) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WASH Manager (Colex Chapendeka) - Finance Unit (Chifundo Kalulu and Horas Mwakalinga) - Logistics Officer (Richard Ngwira) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 08:00-09:00 - 09:00-10:00 - 10:00-11:30 - 11:30-12:30 - 13:30-14:30 - 14:30-16:00 - 16:00-17:00 	24 May 2013 (Fri)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travel to Mangochi (Lunch) • Work session with District Officials • Work session with Volunteers (6 directly involved in operations) • Work session with Local Branch 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 08:00-12:00 • 13:30-15:00 • 15:00-16:00 • 16:00-17:00 	25 May 2013 (Sat)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travel to field site • Meeting with Community Leaders (TAs) • Group meeting with women beneficiaries (6 women) (Lunch) • Group meeting with men beneficiaries (6 men) • Meeting with local health officer • Visit to affected area • Travel back to Mangochi 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 08:00-09:30 • 09:30-10:30 • 10:30-12:00 • 13:00-14:30 • 14:30-15:30 • 15:30-16:30 • 16:30-18:00 	26-27 May 2013 (Sun-Mon)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work session with Stakeholders (Oxfam/Goal, etc.) • Travel to Lilongwe (including 5 branch members/volunteers) • Preparations for Lessons Learned Workshop 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 09:00-11:00 • 11:00-15:00 	27 May 2013 (Mon)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lessons Learned Workshop (includes HQ staff, branch & volunteers) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 08:00-17:00 	28 May 2013 (Tues)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lessons Learned Workshop (Lunch) • Branch members & volunteers travel back to Mangochi • Meeting with National Disaster Response Forum • Meeting with Humanitarian Country Team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 08:00-12:00 • Afternoon • 14:00-15:00 • 15:30-16:30 	29 May 2013 (Wed)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debrief with NS & IFRC on preliminary findings • Depart from Lilongwe 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 09:00-11:00 • 11:00 	30 May 2013 (Thurs)
Present the draft report		14 June 2013
Comments and feedback on draft report		14-18 Jun 2013
Final report		19 June 2013

9. Review Team

The preferred team composition will consist of two persons, each with clear roles and responsibilities defined. 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



Annex 2. Persons interviewed

National Forum		
Atupele Kapile	UNDP Humanitarian Affairs Disaster Coordinator	Lilongwe
National Society		
Hastings Kandaya	Director of Programs & Development	HQ - Lilongwe
Joseph Moyo	DM Population Movement & Emergency Mgr	HQ - Lilongwe
Colex Chapendeka	WASH Advisor	HQ - Lilongwe
Richard Ngwira	Logistics Officer	HQ - Lilongwe
Franklin Yonamo	PMER Manager	HQ - Lilongwe
Horace Mwakalinga	Project Accountant	HQ - Lilongwe
Linda Mwambakulu	First Aid Coordinator	HQ - Lilongwe
Violet Kamwiyo	Vice Chair	Branch - Mangochi
Stephen Naziki	Council Member	Branch - Mangochi
Syviour Chitawo	Treasurer	Branch - Mangochi
Matthews Kantunda	Information Officer	Branch - Mangochi
Leyson Mbwana	Disaster Officer	Branch - Mangochi
Juliet K. Chindenga	RC Volunteer – Registration/Distribution	Branch - Mangochi
Buba Lakalaka	RC Volunteer – Tents/Shelter	Branch - Mangochi
Beatrice Masache	RC Volunteer – Registration/Distribution	Branch - Mangochi
Joyce Andrea	RC Volunteer – Water & Sanitation	Branch - Mangochi
Beatrice Kanjira	RC Volunteer – Registration/Distribution	Branch - Mangochi
Veronica Ali	RC Volunteer – Registration/Distribution	Branch - Mangochi
Mangochi District/Area (Government)		
Ernest	Acting Director of Planning & Development	District - Mangochi
Mr Chiwindo	District Officer	District - Mangochi
Jonas Salim	Water Monitoring Assistant (Ministry of Water & Irrigation) - Inter-Agency Assessment participant - Water mechanics trainer (boreholes) - Borehole reconstruction surveillance	Mangochi
Gracious Zofune Moses	Health Surveillance Assistant - Chlorine distribution - Malaria drug kit & nutrition provision	Mangochi
Fat Nkhoma	Head teacher Nkhatakata	Mangochi
Nelson Kaputa	Agriculture Extension Coordinator - Area Civil Protection Committee member	ACPC - Mangochi
David Sizika	Area Community Development Assistant - Area Civil Protection Committee member	ACPC - Mangochi
Mangochi Communities		
Women Beneficiaries (6) Stella Idana Teleza Banda Enifa Maluwa Evelyn Saidi Maria Chitenje	Representatives of affected communities	Mangochi
Men Beneficiaries (6) Oscar Kalembo Charles Kapitawo Julius Ngalazuka Peter Makaika Misfortune	Representatives of affected communities	Mangochi



International Federation
of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

Augustine Mangani		
Group Village Headmen) GVH Chizula GVH Nagoma GVH Namakoma GVH Pakamwa GVH Mwanyama	Village leaders (focus group)	Mangochi
(Traditional Authority Nankumba Senior Chief Nankumba & Group Village Head Mazodzo	Senior village leaders	Mangochi



Annex 3. Lessons Learned Workshop – Agenda & Participants

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

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

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

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

Closing ceremony



Workshop Participants

Facilitators: Melanie Ogle & Janet Porter

Name	Title (role in DREF response)
Hastings Kandaya	Director of Programs & Development
Joseph Moyo	DM Population Movement & Emergency Mgr
Leyani Nyangulu	DM Program Assistant & Health
Colex Chapendeka	WASH Advisor
Richard Ngwira	Logistics Officer
Steve	Mangochi MRCS Council Member (coordination & distribution)
Leyson Mbwana	Mangochi MRCS Disaster Officer
Masache Beatrice	Mangochi MRCS Community & Social Welfare Officer (registration & distribution)
Immanuel Wyson	Volunteer (first aid & tents)
Christopher Chiwawa	Volunteer (first aid & tents)



Annex 4 Lessons Learned Workshop – Timeline of Operation

Timeline of the Operation:

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

Italicized responses - added through review interviews (district council, etc.)

Week	Dates	Events
-1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rains started • Signs of floods
Disaster		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas affected : Sokole, Chantulo, Malembo, Mtakataka, Nkhudzi, Nkope, Makawa, Mpondasi, Malombe, Chimwala, Namalaka, Kadangu • The MP for the affected area came to report about the disaster • Disaster District Team in action • <i>Village Chiefs reported disaster and statistics to Agricultural Office (who informed the DC)</i> • <i>Villages heads advised by Area Development Committee (ADC) to make joint appeal letter to submit to the DC</i> • <i>Mangochi District Executive Council (DEC) called for support (to Government, MRCS, World Vision & Save the Children)</i>
1	4-10 Jan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6-11 January : Heavy rainfall lead to flood disasters • 9 January: People moved to schools • Training for Area Civil Protection Committee (from Government) • Ministry of Health organized stakeholder meeting in LL on disaster (MRCS participated) • Reporting and assessment (District) • DREF appeal development (internal MRCS meeting)
2	11-17 Jan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reporting and assessment District) continues • Provision of first cholera kits, tarpaulins and jerry cans (MRCS stock) • Mounting of tents from Government • Inter-agency Assessment team activated and sent to District (RC could not participate at LL level) • Cluster Meeting (Wash/Health) • 15 Jan : First update from MRCS sent to SARO • 16 Jan : DMIS posted
3	18-24 Jan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mounting of tents from Ministry & Government (continued) ; this prompted shelter training to be included in DREF • DREF documents prepared by MRCS
4	25-31 Jan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DREF document prepared by MRCS (continued) • Final registration list completed • 26 Jan : DREF draft document received by SARO • 27 Jan : DREF draft document sent to ZONE by SARO • 27-28 Jan : Feedback by ZONE on DREF to MRCS • 29 Jan : MRCS response to DREF comments
5	1-7 Feb	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cluster Meeting (Wash/Health) • 1-3 Feb : Feedback from ZONE Technical Dept. on the DREF • 5 Feb : DREF finalized between MRCS-SARO-ZONE final comments
6	8-14 Feb	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joseph Moyo goes to Arusha for DRR for 7 days • 7 Feb : DREF approved • 8 Feb : Finances requested to Geneva from SARO



		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 11 Feb : Cash request sent to SARO from MRCS
7	15-21 Feb	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Communication between MRCS HQ and ER Manager• 16 Feb : Finance transfer from SARO to MRCS• 18 Feb : Branch distributes on behalf of Government (ongoing)
8	22-28 Feb	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 25 Feb : Briefing of DEC Mangochi• 25 Feb : Meeting with stakeholders (MoH, Water, DC, Branch)• Cluster Meeting (Shelter)• 23 Feb: Funds received by MRCS• 28 Feb : DREF Plan of Action shared by Geneva with MRCS• 28 Feb – 1 Mar : IFRC ZONE Melanie Ogle & SARO Jane Gordon Visit
9	1-7 Mar	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Assessment for water & sanitation facilities• MRCS registration & verification (early March)
10	8-14 Mar	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Meeting on procurement of rehab material for boreholes & actual procurement• Procurement meeting & procurement of (1) cholera kits (2) first aid kits (3) safety garments for staff
11	15-21 Mar	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Meeting on procurement of NFIs (soap, basins, nets)• Stock delivered (for borehole rehabilitation in Mangochi)
12	22-28 Mar	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Delivery of cholera kits (Blantyre & Mangochi)• 27 Mar – 5 Apr : Rehabilitation of boreholes
13	29 Mar – 4 Apr	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Rehabilitation of boreholes (continued)
14	5-11 Apr	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Supervision visit by DPAD (Hastings)• 9-11 Apr : Training of First Aiders• 11-17 Apr : Transportation of relief materials (shelter kits, tarpaulins, basins, nets, soap, kitchen sets)• 11 Apr : Official launch of relief items distribution• Training of Water Point Committees
15	12-18 Apr	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 13 Apr : Tents removed in two camps• 16 Apr : Tent removed in one camp• Distribution of relief items• Training in Hygiene Promotion using PHAST methodology
16	19-25 Apr	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 18-26 Apr : IFRC SARO Stanley Ndlhovu and Janet Porter Ops Visit• 20 Apr : Drama performances by first aid volunteers in Nkhatata• 20 Apr – May : Red Cross Campaign Activities
17	26 Apr – 2 May	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Distribution of first aid kits• Distribution of poles, ropes, axes, sickle (in Sokole)• 17 Apr : Training in Shelter Construction• 2-3 May : Stakeholders Lessons Learned Workshop (facilitated by MRCS)
18	2-9 May	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Meeting on procurement of replenishment of stocks & actual procurement (tarpaulins, kitchen sets, jerry cans)• May 6 : End of DREF operations (funds spent)
19	10-16 May	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• May 14 : DREF Operations update approved (for 1mos extension)
20	17-23 May	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• n/a
21	24-30 May	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 28-29 May : RC Internal Lessons Learned Workshop (facilitated by IFRC)



Annex 5. Internal Lessons Learned Workshop – Operations Self-Assessment

Quality Self-Assessment

Various aspects of the operation were ranked by participants (A being the highest ranking, B average and C being the lowest ranking), with examples or evidence to support their rating. A group discussion followed.

Relevance meaning was the activities planned under the DREF appropriate for the types of needs.		
	Rate	Reasons
50%	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RC was unable to provide emergency shelters • The NFIs were the much needed items • The WASH, Health & First Aid were life saving • The program managed to meet people’s needs. The essential needs were met in line with people’s livelihoods • The beneficiaries had houses collapsed and needed to set up structures and at the same time the shelters were of importance as people could not easily access grass for roofing. • People had no shelter so they were provided with this. • First Aid training to volunteers • Distribution of NFIs especially the shelter kits met people’s needs • Hygiene promotion is very important where a lot of people are staying together (to sensitize on avoiding water borne diseases) • They were relevant as it addressed basic needs of victims. The activities were aimed at alleviating suffering and improve hygiene.
40%	B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is so because victims met the planned DREF for the type of needs such as blankets, kitchen utensils, mosquito nets and tarpaulins • The beneficiaries are really appreciative for the support but still this does not reach the maximum of their needs for it is their first time to experience it. Hence it is good also to ask the beneficiaries on what they need before giving them. • Most of the materials were appropriate, however there was also need to provide food items.
10%	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People got items which they appreciated but their main worry was food which was not included in the activities
Efficiency meaning was the relief provided timely, with minimal costs, and optimal utilization of resources		
20%	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The relief was provided timely, with minimal costs and optimal utilization of resources such as mosquito nets and chlorine. • Timely in the sense that Red Cross responded soon after the disaster strike using items in stock that were later replenished by the DREF.
60%	B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some delays were made because of rains and funds transfer (re : DREF to MRCS), even in purchasing itself, some items could not easily be found. • There was optimized resource utilization • The beneficiaries targeting was the most affected • The relief was provided a bit late • There was a bit of a delay to assist the vulnerable as at least a month elapsed before the implementation. • The relief was not timely provided, it took a long time to reach the beneficiary. • We need to do better in timing, except on chlorination and first response but not general distribution. Procurements delayed.



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes the relief items were provided, though a bit late. As soon after receiving the items people moved away from the camp to their homes and constructed shelter using the items they received from RC.
20%	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They got the items late due to funding delay • It took almost a month for the relief items to be delivered considering that the victims were lacking many things, though shelter was provided timely.
Effectiveness meaning, did the activities contribute to the immediate alleviation of suffering of the victims		
40%	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I feel that soon after the distribution, people were able to move out of camps and start their new life again. • Because none of the NGOs gave them what they received. • Blankets and kitchen sets as some victims had lost their belongings to the floods. • With the cholera kits, contributions to the prevention of cholera occurrences as had been usually the case in other related disasters. • The provision of bed nets will help protect people from malaria attack
60%	B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments provided. • The relief was not holistic to the needy • What was provided fitted well with the gaps • The support covered psychological needs • Of course some of the activities contributed to the immediate alleviation but some came a bit late due to the fact that they were coming from afar. • They got what they cannot afford on their own and the package was also impressive compared to what they got from other organizations, but it was already late. • There were misunderstandings between politicians and some people of good will, because they wanted to take things for political campaign reasons. Hence some people were forced to go to the tents so that they could be involved in some beneficiary activities. • With households, not really. People wanted this support earlier.
Sustainability meaning can the activities and service provided be sustained by the volunteers and communities and possible to replicate		
30%	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relief activities were in line with routine • Capacity build-up of local volunteers • The branch now has technical support services unit • Almost everyone is aware on what to do about disasters and they will be able to do whatever it takes and be alert in all times of the season, due to training of volunteers who are campaigning in their different communities. • Yes in the sense that the trained will be able to impact knowledge to other on the first aid, shelter construction and tent mounting in cases where we have such occurrence • The trained volunteers can ably sensitize others on sanitation and health related issues
60%	B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes they can be sustainable since some of the volunteers and communities are trained. • There is more to be done in support i.e. sensitization of civil education on disaster early warning signs and its management ; First Aid trainings to almost 100 volunteers from respective areas ; Monitoring to be done before the next rain season • Some activities/services are able to be sustained while others cannot do. • There were no volunteers in some areas affected by the floods, but some people were able to use or make tents using their own experience.



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need of monitoring the volunteers who can take part in constructing tents. • No comments provided. • Those volunteers who were trained in First Aid can use the skills in time of need. • Those trained in shelter construction will be useful in their communities if the event reoccurs. • WASH activities only can be sustained • WASH can be replicated • First Aid trainings and mounting of shelter trainings has a potential to replicate • Reactivation of the volunteers/branch
10%	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We don't have active branches/volunteers in affected areas and it requires funding.
<p>Impact meaning, did the activities make long term/ or have potential to have long term impact to the lives of the people.</p>		
80%	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relief items distributed used to support needs • Water points, CBM • No comments provided. • The activities have potential to have long term impacts because people have lost a lot of food due to the floods and they need to be trained on how they can handle such a situation. • They need first aid training which can help them in time of disasters. • Materials are of high value that they can last longer. • Rehabilitation of boreholes provided safe drinking water to the communities thereby reducing water borne diseases resulting in good health. • First Aid training skills imparted to volunteers will be helpful to the community as well as MRCS as a whole. • Provision of shelter kits & WASH facilities have an impact in terms of disease prevention. First Aid and water pump training imparted skills and knowledge to beneficiaries for long-term use. • Some of the materials like tents and pots are long lasting which alleviate the plight at household level. • Activities help people to know what they did through the exercises, like first aid training which will lead to saving lives. • Improvement in peoples standards of life due to some awareness campaigns, i.e. health and hygiene
10%	B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to long term as it desires much effort to be put in order to achieve this. Put some permanent measures like shifting people to uplands, construction of permanent houses, river source considerations.
10%	C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No, but they have potential to have long term to the lives of the people.



Annex 6. Lessons Learned Workshop – Group Work

Group Work : Activity strengths/challenges/recommendations

Planning	Strengths	Challenges	Solutions/Recommendations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability of skilled manpower • Link with national task force • Experience in DREFs • Availability of buffer stocks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unavailability of funds to respond to disasters/ emergency – no buffer funds for emergency assessment • Lack of standardised tools for assessment • Work overload for the response team 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explore means of fundraising in order to be self-reliant 2. Establishment of subdivisions in every corner of the country 3. All managers were consulted in the planning, including Ministry of health, water and DoDMA, however the DEC should be more involved in planning 4. Engage a relief officer to perform the duties 5. Deploy RDRT for the particular operation 6. Lobby DoDMA for adoption of the draft standardised assessment tool for universal use
Monitoring	Strengths	Challenges	Solutions/Recommendations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring led by skilled personnel (PMER manager) • Presence and participation of volunteers in monitoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited number of skilled staff and volunteers (only one M&E trained person – gap of knowledge in PMER) • PMER capacity at headquarters was overwhelmed, as a result tools were not developed in time • High transport costs – not budgeted for in the operation for monitoring 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Training project team in M and E 2. Organisation should provide resources such as vehicles 3. Branches staff and volunteers need to have the DREF document in order to be able to monitor 4. Monitoring tools should be developed in advance of disaster or at the planning stage 5. Monitoring should be ongoing throughout the operation cycle (including pre and post distribution monitoring and include focus discussions with aggregated stakeholder groups, consider using camp management committee or beneficiary committee to represent groups views) 6. Investigate District capacity for PMER and tools 7. Investigate IFRC PMER tools
Capacity	Strengths	Challenges	Solutions/Recommendations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ability to conduct (1) First Aid training (2) tent mounting (3) shelter construction using tarpaulins (4) managing of disaster (5) water and sanitation training (6) registration & verification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few individuals were trained • Lack of knowledge on registration & verification tools • Lack of knowledge in early signs & disaster management • Monitoring • Small number of first aid starter packs 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Train additional volunteers in disaster management (including first aiders) 2. Provide enough first aid kits as started packs 3. MRCS help the district develop capacity in areas of disaster management and tools. 4. Further build capacity of newly recruited volunteers in subdivisions 5. Build the capacity in monitoring
Coordination	Strengths	Challenges	Solutions/Recommendations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability of human resources at Branch and Headquarter level • MRCS structures in place • Regular meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficult to meet as the people involved had to travel long distances • Lack of sub branches in the affected areas as well 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mobility needs to be improved (and potentially using other communication tools) 2. Set up more sub branches and recruit more volunteers in places where there are none 3. To improve on planning of meetings and improve



International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MRCS involved in shelter and health cluster 	<p>as volunteers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of planning in terms of meetings at division level and HQ (often last minute) Low patronage of the cluster members at national level 	<p>on timely updates</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Decision makes encourage MRCS staff to participate in clusters
Early warning systems	Strengths	Challenges	Solutions/Recommendations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community radio was able to reach out to a lot of people within a short period of time As a result of the early warning system, loss of life was marginal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not everyone has access to a radio The early warning system in Mongochi was not well developed Inadequate resources to develop and roll out an early warning system 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage people to share messages heard from the radio The system should be available at all levels and people should be aware of the system Stakeholders should provide the needed resources for an early warning system
Beneficiary Selection	Strengths	Challenges	Solutions/Recommendations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Registration of eligible beneficiaries by MRCS, Malawi Government officials, CPC and communities through open vote Able to reach all disaster affected areas Criteria used for selection Enough human resources to carry out the registration/verification exercise at the grass roots 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria are not standardised - is this consistent with Franklin's spreadsheet??? Means of transportation to reach affected areas Volunteers worked long hours, travel long distances, no meals or water Impassable areas Sub Branch volunteers not established in every community 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Standardised assessment criteria for data collection should be used by government and all other stakeholders when registering and selecting beneficiaries Understanding and coordination is required at every level on stakeholder strength and focus and pre-agreed roles in disaster response – no plans for pregnant and under 5 in our Red Cross intervention – to be collected and shared Provision of disaster management kits, namely PPE and food, touches etc. for volunteers to undertake beneficiary selection Suitable transport to access communities Community participation to maintain impassable roads Grass roots volunteer need to be trained in local communities (so that volunteers do not need to travel long distances) Volunteers need to be link with CPC in each community to agree beneficiary selection While verifying beneficiaries, verify needs <p>- Response has helped to revitalize dormant branches</p>
Assessment	Strengths	Challenges	Solutions/Recommendations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government Disaster Officer is available Door to door verification Access to tools from the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most areas have impassable roads by small vehicles, as a result volunteers were walking long distances, due to 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Mobilise Ministry of Works and local leaders to maintain roads Provide sufficient vehicles Red Cross develop its own tools for assessment Volunteers trained on how to use all stakeholder



International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

	<p>government – District DM Officer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Worked with other stakeholders i.e. disaster and social welfare Access to tools from both Government and MRCS template 	<p>shortage of transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volunteers had problems using the all the tools from various stakeholders 	<p>tools in advance of a disaster</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Follow up with DoDMA on the finalisation of draft tools for assessment and standardise with MRCS own assessment tool
Volunteers	Strengths	Challenges	Solutions/Recommendations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Involved in implementation and monitoring (including registration & verification) Volunteers were involved in the distribution of relief items DREF has put volunteers on the map 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volunteers from sub divisions were not involved in planning (however the Branch was involved – subdivision was dormant) Volunteers view were not incorporated in the process Volunteers were not aware of the entire operation Volunteers did not have a copy of the DREF bulletin or budget Volunteers had to work long hours (no lunch) Volunteers did not have protective equipment or identification Difficult to involve all the volunteers in the whole process as there are so many volunteers 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Recruit more volunteers for the next DREF operation Volunteers should have a copy of the DREF bulletin and budget, and should be translated into local language Volunteers should have identification and protective equipment including t shirts, rubber boots etc. Set up a feedback or input mechanism which would allow input by volunteers, try and ensure communication is strengthened to ensure transparency Volunteers want to be involved and engaged, this is positive and should be encouraged.
Distribution	Strengths	Challenges	Solutions/Recommendations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate human resources Adequate financial resources for the target group There was proper coordination between stakeholders Availability of storage facilities Mobilisation of beneficiaries went well Reliable means of transport 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non registered/eligible people wanted to receive items Long distances covered by beneficiaries to receive items Poor road infrastructure Untimely distribution of relief items Lack of overall coordination between stakeholders providing relief 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Crowd control at distribution points (and improve beneficiary communication outreach) Make distribution points shorter and more convenient for vulnerable groups – this needs to be balance with road access and storage facilities Lobbying for prioritisation of disaster prone areas in contingency planning (including infrastructure) by the District Empower Civil Protection Committee and DEC, to ensure that they collection information from all stakeholders and coordinate all stakeholders MRCS should encourage better communication (stronger and more regular) and coordination at the camp and community level regarding stakeholder distributions



			- Relief is politicised
Logistics	Strengths	Challenges	Solutions/Recommendations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available of funds • Availability of storage facilities • Planned relief materials procured • There was excellent coordination and communication among all levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of availability of trucking transportation at reasonable cost (demand increase due to completion with tobacco growers/traders) • Security and storage of items brought to the distribution points • Delayed delivery because of poor road infrastructure • Shortage of staff in logistics department • The items not delivered on time due to transportation problems • Sole suppliers, when only one company has the items and may be unavailable – monopoly on the trading of such items • High inflation in Malawi resulted in currency fluctuations 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To have pre-agreed contracts with suppliers on transportation 2. Recruit Security guards for the safe guarding of items in storage facilities (with a gun) at distribution points with assistance from the community that is to benefit. 3. Find alternative solutions to security of depots 4. Involvement of the community to participate in rehabilitation of the roads 5. To recruit additional staff if funds permit 6. Timely procurement
Speed	Strengths	Challenges	Solutions/Recommendations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability of prepositioned stock • Availability of human resources on the ground 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of financial resources to transport stock • Inadequate number of volunteers • Lack of suppliers list delayed the procurement process • Quotation process affected by the Kwacha devaluation 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Availability of contingency funds (for immediate transportation of materials) 2. Recruitment of more volunteers in all sub divisions 3. Finalise the suppliers list 4. Hedging
Shelter	Strengths	Challenges	Solutions/Recommendations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability of pre-positioned stock (tarps) • Distributed appropriate shelter material • Availability of human resources • Responded to shelter needs for the first part in a timely manner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poorly constructed shelters • Lack of trained people in shelter construction • Transfer of knowledge in shelter construction was not passed on to beneficiaries • Maintenance of the quality 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Shelter construction training should be prioritised as initial an activity 2. Need to train staff and volunteers before disasters and the knowledge transferred to beneficiaries for quality construction of shelters 3. Emergency Action Team should receive training in sector response to disasters (NDRT training is required) – this is not just related to shelter but relates to capacity building for the National Society



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mangochi Emergency Action Team in place for the 2014 elections 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> of the tents Mangochi was not a traditional disaster prone district 	<p>as well as risk and vulnerability mapping</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> To have prepositioned tents in disaster prone areas (can be used as an income generation activity) Look into agreement with pre identified shelter material suppliers (tents, tarpaulins)
Health	Strengths	Challenges	Solutions/Recommendations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No outbreak of cholera or waterborne diseases during the operation Strong coordination between Health and WatSan Depts. and MRCS Skilled personnel Managed to reach beyond the targeted people 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport was a challenge Did not capture the actual number of beneficiaries which were reached by health services First aid kits distributed after the crucial moments (availability of funds, timely procurement and distribution) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholders should contribute adequate resources and vehicles Forums/meetings should be held to share information with relevant stakeholders Relevant kits should be provided on time Follow up with the Ministry of Health regarding distribution data (by all providers)
Water and Sanitation	Strengths	Challenges	Solutions/Recommendations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Skilled human resources Good coordination with the line ministry Adequate preventative kits (cholera kits) prepositioned Hygiene promotion campaign Provision of emergency latrines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient funding to meet needs of the community (3 out of 4 identified boreholes rehabilitated) Inadequate sanitation facilities Low participation of beneficiaries Training of water committees was delayed 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Need to mobilise more resources Need further to raise awareness on hygiene and sanitation Provision of appropriate technologies, with low cost alternative solutions Timely training of committees Closer monitoring of activities, funding, schedule etc.
Beneficiary feedback mechanism	Strengths	Challenges	Solutions/Recommendations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complaint desk was set at distribution points – government and MRCS Missed communities were discovered and assisted four days later through complaints Access of the beneficiaries to give feedback 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too many individual complaints and unmanageable Red Cross is difficult at handling complaints Complaints desk were unprepared for complaints that they received 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Need for a complaints desk – not only during distribution – but through all activities (including registration and verification) Better linking with Civil Protection Committees, who are responsible for community mobilisation in disasters to improve communications and targeting Action teams to assess complaints Look into communication mechanisms and tools to communicate the objectives of the operation (such as community radio which uses local language) in order to increase awareness and reduce the confusion (and thereby the number of complaints) and advertise the complaints mechanism Ensure groups are aggregated and focus groups set up to receive feedback from key groups such



International Federation
of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

			as women's groups and children 6. Ensure beneficiary committee to represent group views
--	--	--	--



Annex 7. Lessons Learned Workshop – Participant Evaluation Form

Participant Evaluation Form :

DREF for Malawi – 28-29 May 2013

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

1 – poor 2 – average 3- good 4 – useful (2) 5 – excellent (7)

Comments:

1. I have full knowledge on the DREF and come next time, I will be able to collect on the last mistakes.
2. This is because we have learnt a lot in this workshop.
3. It was nice except when people of Division wanted to leave and absence of some staff.
4. Have learnt on our weaknesses that we need to do better in case disaster occurs in future.
5. The workshop was useful in a sense that we were able to share experiences, ideas and even knowledge. Helped to plan and implement other DREFs more competently.
6. It has given us a way of analysing events as they transform.
7. I have learnt a lot from this workshop and it will help me in the future.
8. It has given us feedback of how the process has undergone.
9. I have learnt a lot that will indeed assist as a volunteer.

Was the workshop...(please circle one answer) Too long Too short (5) Enough time (2) no response (2)

How do you rate the facilitators? 1(1) 2 3 4(1) 5(7)

How well was the workshop prepared? 1(1) 2 3 4(3) 5(5)

What was the most useful session and why?

1. Monitoring and beneficiary selection because much was not done in the past DREF.
2. The most useful session was during monitoring because this is where everything is on transparency and accountability.
3. Time frame exercise.
4. Participatory group work and feedback on how most issues came out for discussion.
5. Session on strengths, challenges and recommendations was quite participatory, experiences were well articulated and shared.
6. The session where we were discussing issues in groups coming up with challenges, strengths and recommendations and also on events that happened along the way.
7. The most useful session was the Group Work because we were free to express our views.
8. The participation of all the stakeholders and volunteers which will improve the disaster management.
9. All sessions, though we missed another part because of the time schedule (the part missed was the DREF presentation, which was shared via email afterwards to be distributed)

How was the food? 1(1) 2 3(1) 4(3) 5(3) no response (1)

How could we improve the next DREF lessons learned workshop?

1. There should be time keeping considering the distances we travel.
2. Next time try to add more time so as to finish a lot in time.
3. Include two key Government staff and management to be stricter on attendance of concerned staff.
4. Need to have enough time.
5. Increase time allocation to at least three days to enable the discussion completion without rushing.
6. I think this was properly done.
7. Time consciousness is needed hence you need to look at this and at producing a timetable. We should start with a prayer and close with a prayer.
8. The time frame should be increased.
9. Try to give in more days so that everything is covered with all respect it deserves.