



Some people are still living in tents provided by the RCST after the floods in May 2014.
Kulyab district, Balkhobi administrative center, Garabdara village. *Photo: IFRC*

EVALUATION MISSION REPORT

on DREF operations in Tajikistan

Alma ALSAYED, Disaster Management Officer, IFRC Europe Zone Office

Dorottya PATKO, PMER Officer, IFRC Europe Zone Office

14 November 2014

Contents

1. Background / Situation	3
2. Aim and scope of the mission	3
3. Team composition and mission methodology.....	3
4. Summary of operations	4
5. Field visits / direct beneficiary meetings:	5
6. Key findings, observations	5
7. Recommendations	7
Annex 1 – Places visited and people met during Federation DREF evaluation mission in Tajikistan	9
Annex 2 – Lessons Learned workshops – NS findings and recommendations.....	11
Annex 3 – Beneficiary Satisfaction Survey – Summary of the report	12
Annex 4 – Red Crescent Society of Tajikistan – Warehouse report	13

Acknowledgements:

The Evaluation team would like to acknowledge and thank the IFRC Country Representative, his Staff and Tajikistan Red Crescent for their valuable assistance in logistical and administrative support during the visit and also for interest, commitment and active participation in the DREF evaluation mission.

1. Background / Situation

Heavy rainfall and hailstorms caused several floods and flash floods in spring 2014, affecting many villages and provinces in different districts of Tajikistan. As a result, several people lost their homes and had to be temporarily sheltered. The mudflow also damaged the local infrastructure and affected the livelihoods of the population.

A total of **CHF 252,357** was allocated from the IFRC's Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF) **through three consecutive DREF operations** in the period from **18 April through 16 May 2014** to support the Red Crescent Society of Tajikistan in delivering immediate assistance to **8,617 beneficiaries** in total. The overall objective of these operations was the addressing of the immediate needs of the population affected by the floods all over the country, through provision of relief items and providing Water and Sanitation services. The date of completion of the last DREF operation was **15 August 2014**.

In order to provide assurance that the funds claimed for the implementation of these operations have been used in accordance with the initial plan of action and in compliance with DREF procedures, as well as to assess the results of response to the disasters that the National Society has carried out, the IFRC Secretariat Europe Zone Office Disaster Management and Planning Monitoring Evaluation and Reporting team agreed with the Red Crescent Society of Tajikistan and the IFRC Country Representation in Tajikistan on an evaluation mission to take place.

The practice of conducting an evaluation mission, especially in the case of a country receiving numerous DREF allocations over a relatively short period promotes greater transparency on the use of the funds and enhances our accountability to the beneficiaries and donors.

2. Aim and scope of the mission

Conduct a field review in order to assess the recent National Society response (with IFRC support) to Tajikistan emergencies according to the objectives and activities as outlined in the three respective DREF operations. Particular emphasis was placed on the overall management and performance of the response and related preparedness actions to see how effective they were in delivering services throughout the response to the latest three emergencies. The mission was in line with the approved guidelines of the Global PMER meeting, i.e. emphasizing the importance of monitoring and evaluation also with regard to the reporting process. During the visit, the experiences and lessons learned during the three DREF operations were discussed too.

3. Team composition and mission methodology

The team of evaluators was composed of Alma Alsayed, Disaster Management Officer and Dorottya Patko, Planning and Reporting Officer of the IFRC Europe Zone Office.

In addition to that, a representative of the ECHO Regional Office in Almaty, Kazakhstan joined the mission to review the progress on the operation, as ECHO replenished 50% of two DREF allocations (MDRTJ017 and MDRTJ019). The IFRC Country Representation in Tajikistan took the leading role in the overall mission organization, together with the RCST DP/R Coordinator.

However, a number of key persons in the National Society, including the DM Coordinator, were not available to meet the evaluation team during the mission due to National holidays and other commitments.

The mission timeframe was from the **2nd October – 8th October 2014**.

The methodology included:

- Desk review of the operation's related documentation and the archiving system;
- Interviews with the stakeholders (*please refer to the list of people met in the Annex 1*) including the representative of ECHO Regional Office, UNDP DRMP Program Manager and the representative of the Committee of Emergency Situations and Civil Defence (CoES),
- Field visits to three sites, where the operations took place (*please refer to Section 5 and Annex 1 for details*),

- On-site interviews with beneficiaries;
- Interviews with local NS representatives, government officials in Dushanbe and three other regions (*please refer to the list of people met in the Annex 1*),
- De-briefing session with the Acting Head of the IFRC Country Representation in Tajikistan and the management of the National Society to share and discuss the preliminary findings of the evaluation mission with all parties involved in the process.

4. Summary of operations¹

On 11-12 April 2014, floods and landslides occurred in Vose, Shurobod, and Hamadony districts and in Kulob city in the south of Tajikistan as a result of heavy rains. In total, 15 people were killed, some 38 people have been injured. Six houses were totally destroyed and many others were severely damaged. In total 1,000 families were affected, with 246 families displaced.

Later, on 16 April 2014, due to heavy rains and hailstorm, mudflow hit Kizil-kala village in Khuroson district, Khatlon province.

According to the initial rapid assessment, 172 households comprising of 256 families and 1,890 people were severely affected. Two children were killed by the mudflow. The mudflow also damaged local infrastructure and affected the livelihoods.

One month later, heavy rainfall caused flooding and flash floods on 10 and 11 May 2014 in two provinces and two Direct Ruled District districts in Tajikistan. More than 1,072 families (5,360 people) have been severely affected by the floods, and around 425 people, who lost their homes were temporarily sheltered in kindergartens, mosques, at their relatives and in neighbouring villages.



Prepositioned stocks in NS warehouse in Kurgan-tube region.
Photo: IFRC

Storage buildings, stocks for cooking/heating (e.g. firewood), cooking utensils and bedding/clothes of the most affected households were damaged or lost in all the above mentioned disasters.. The affected villages were provided with food and other means of living by the population of the neighbouring villages and relatives. The kitchen gardens of most affected households and crop field were damaged.

At the end of operations, a review was carried out by RCST on 9 July 2014 (MDRTJ019) in Khujand city, Sughd oblast and on 29-30 July 2014 to examine if the DREF operations MDRTJ017 and MDRTJ018 achieved their planned goals and outcomes, to assess outputs against the plan of action, and a lessons learned workshop was conducted to improve future planning and response.²

¹ The three DREF operations can be directly accessed via these links: MDRTJ017: <http://adore.ifrc.org/Download.aspx?FileId=58032>; MDRTJ018: <http://adore.ifrc.org/Download.aspx?FileId=58057>; MDRTJ019: <http://adore.ifrc.org/Download.aspx?FileId=58895>.

² Please refer to Annex 2 for the lessons learned workshop's findings and recommendations.

5. Field visits / direct beneficiary meetings:

- I. **Rudaki district, Zainabobod administration centre;** altogether three villages were affected and received support from NS in Rudaki district. The evaluation team visited all three villages, and chose randomly the households to be visited.
- II. **Kulyab region, Kulyab district, Balkhobi administrative centre;** after meeting with RCST branch and listening to a presentation about response activities implemented under the EPoA, it was agreed that the team will visit villages considering the remoteness, the destination and accessibility to the location due to geographical coverage and the vulnerability of the population.
- III. **Kurgan-tube region, Khuroson district, Mehnatobod administrative centre.** only one village was affected and visited (Kizil-kala village), while visited families were selected randomly.

During the field visits, the evaluation team's aim was to meet as many stakeholders as possible, thus beneficiaries, branch representatives and where possible, representatives of the local governments (administrative centres) and RC volunteers were met and interviewed (*please refer to Annex 1 for detailed information*).

Three beneficiary families were visited and interviewed at each sites. Some general observations about the implementation of the operation:

- Due to the destroyed and/or damaged houses, the beneficiaries needed temporary shelter facilities for 1-2 weeks after the disaster in most cases. Those who lost their homes were temporarily sheltered in kindergartens, mosques, or at their relatives and in neighboring villages. These temporary shelters were managed by the local authorities, with some support from the National Society in First Aid and PSP services.
- The distribution points were easily reachable by the beneficiaries, and they were also well informed about the details of the distribution. One distribution point per village was set. However, NS's volunteers were delivering the items to the beneficiaries houses when it was difficult for them to reach the distribution point due to long distance. The Government supported the distributions by providing trucks for the NS staff/ volunteers.
- According to the beneficiaries in some areas targeted by the DREF operation, it might be considered to improve the quality of some distributed tools, namely shovels and hoes. However, it was noticed that more resistant building materials are used during the reconstruction and rehabilitation, thus mitigating eventual destruction of houses in the future due to similar natural disasters.

The humanitarian assistance provided by the RCST was timely and visible. Additionally, other National Societies (Finnish RC and German RC) assisted in the operations on a bilateral basis, contributing with the distribution of food parcels and additional construction tools to the affected families. The local authorities and the CoES also provided help throughout the operations, jointly with the RCST. Overall, the operations were successful in reaching the targeted families with assistance.

6. Key findings, observations

Back in September 2012, another evaluation mission took place in Tajikistan in relation to DREF operations on floods, avalanches and an earthquake. As a result of that mission, a comprehensive and detailed report was produced afterwards that contained many important and valuable points, therefore the current evaluation team took into consideration the findings and recommendation of the last mission, trying to build up on some of them and follow up on others.

- According to all interviewed stakeholders, including local government authorities, during operations to address consequences of floods, these disasters would not have received adequate response without DREF support.
- In order to coordinate the disaster response in the country, in 2002 the Rapid Emergency Assessment and Coordination Team (REACT) was created and led by the Office for Coordination of the Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). Chaired by the CoES, this mechanism focuses not only on response, but on prevention and preparedness as well as overall cooperation within the Disaster Management sector. The overall

strategic goal of the REACT is to establish ownership of DM coordination process among the local organizations.

During the meeting with UNDP DRMP Program Manager, the REACT coordination mechanism was discussed. UNDP is currently co-chairing this body in the country, it was stated by the UNDP representative that the coordination with IFRC and Red Crescent of Tajikistan is on high level.

In August 2013, a workshop was held in order to review REACT mechanism and the main findings of the review survey showed the following:

- A commitment and strong interest in REACT.
 - The core objectives of REACT are still valid.
 - Relative acceptance of REACT in concept and in its current structure.
 - Changes to be made to the current structure, processes of REACT.
 - Additional themes proposed to be considered by REACT.
- While reviewing the documentation and archiving system the National Society HQ DM is using, it is clear that this system is very well organized, and unified templates and forms are used, shared by all branches in terms of rapid needs assessment, detailed assessment. The following documents were reviewed:
 - Memoranda of Understanding between IFRC Country Representation and RCST on DREF implementation;
 - Memorandum of Understanding between RCST and Committee of Emergency Situations and Civil Defence (CoES);
 - REACT mechanism review documentations.
 - RCST and IFRC CR situation updates (on DMIS and other channels);
 - RCST operation updates;
 - Beneficiaries distribution list for DREF operations used by RCST;
 - Emergency Preliminary needs assessment forms;
 - Disaster Needs Assessment Report;
 - RCST field reports;
 - Beneficiary Satisfaction Survey questionnaires;
 - Visibility/Photos;
 - Information /awareness materials.
 - During the field visits and as the team had more in-depth information regarding the social structure of the affected communities, it was noted that the number of members per family was significantly higher than the average for Europe (an average of 6-7 per family). This issue has created a challenge for the NS as the hygiene kits and household kits were designed for smaller households. This has left some members uncovered by certain items.

As a mitigation solution for this issue, one kit was provided for the families by the NS, while it was negotiated with the government to cover the rest of the needs (four family members covered by the National Society and 2-3 members covered by government).

- It was noted by the evaluation team that there was a limited interest in Tajikistan from different stakeholders to support the rehabilitation process and the reconstruction of damaged houses and properties. On the other hand, it seemed that the National Society might be capable to expand its mandate (within the current MOU this area is not included as responsibility of NS) to cover some recovery phase activities after a disaster, in order to fill this gap. It shall be noted, however, that this activity can be conducted not financed by the DREF framework, but relying on support from other sources.
- The condition of the roads and difficulties in accessibility shall be taken into account in case of future operations, as it is creating a challenge for the National Society in accessing the beneficiaries and can also be an obstacle when it comes to transportation. In addition to that the vehicles of the NS are limited,

and the fleet is not sufficient to fulfill the distributions needs. In order to overcome this issue, the National Society is occasionally borrowing trucks from the local authorities during the disaster response phase of an eventual operation.

- The NS has effectively coordinated and complemented the work done by the other stakeholders; the relief was timely and very much needed.
- Beneficiary selection process was done in close cooperation with the local authorities, yet the NS focused on targeting the most vulnerable families in the affected areas.
- In certain cases, the NS became the sole organization, which has provided immediate relief to the affected population and was the first one to assess the situation on the disaster sites.
- According to the beneficiaries' feedback, the relief provided by the NS (non-food items, psycho-social support) was adequate and according to the needs of the affected communities and has significantly contributed to the reduction of their vulnerability straight after the disaster.
- The National Society does not have an officer specifically dedicated to report writing. They themselves consider this as an obstacle, as during disaster times, people at the operational level might not be in the position to provide reports which are fully in compliance with IFRC reporting standards.
- The NS experiences a normal volume of volunteer turnover. The volunteers met during the mission seemed to be enthusiastic and dedicated towards their work, and there is a potential in them to attract several other volunteers from their networks (like universities etc.).
- There is no local company with which the NS would have a special prior agreement in terms of procurement supplies, which may cause longer processes. However, all the procurements conducted under the DREF operations framework are done locally, following the IFRC procurement standards.
- There are still gaps in funding, especially with regard to local fundraising, which makes the NS more dependent on external funding. However, a fundraising strategy has already been drafted.

7. Recommendations

- Strengthening the organizational capacities of the NS is still an issue. More support for branches shall be provided from the Headquarters, in terms of technical equipment, trainings, refresher courses, simulation exercises both for the staff and volunteers. Exchange visits, experience sharing workshops shall be organized internally between the branches.
- It is important to continue the tradition of conducting beneficiary satisfaction surveys and organizing lessons learned workshops/meetings upon completion of DREF operations. This is essential to assess the viewpoint of the beneficiaries on the support provided by the NS, provision of factual data for the reports to donors, and ensuring visibility of the NS efforts in disaster response.
- A local staff specifically dedicated to report writing shall be employed/nominated by the National Society, as during disaster times, people at operational level might not be in the position to provide reports fully in compliance with IFRC reporting standards due to lack of time and capacities.
- It is important to strive at the aim of making pre-stocking an integral part of the local disaster preparedness activities. During the third DREF operation the pre-positioned stocks in the NS warehouses had been already used due to the previous two operations, thus the response promptness was affected and it came a bit slower.
- Organization of local fundraising campaigns focusing at stocks replenishment is crucial in the situation of international donors phasing out or reducing the level of their funding.
- During the operation, PSS service was provided on a basic level by volunteers during the response activities. It seemed to be welcomed and effective, although the volunteers would need more in depth training. Our recommendation would be that the National Society invest further in this sector by providing additional professional training, as it can add a lot of value to the operation achieved at relatively low cost.
- The representative of ECHO provided a very positive feedback on the implementation of the operation and on the performance of the National Society and showed their willingness to provide support in future

operations as well. They suggested to be contacted shortly after a future disaster, so as to establish even smoother coordination between our organizations.

- While Beneficiary selection process is done in close cooperation with the local authorities, the NS should be careful not to depend solely on the local authorities and to double check if the defined criteria are applied equally to all selected beneficiaries to ensure reaching the most vulnerable groups.

Endorsed by (Line Managers): Alberto MONGUZZI, Imre NAGY

8. Annex 1 – Places visited and people met during Federation DREF evaluation mission in Tajikistan

Date	Place	People met	Accompanied by
2 October 2014, Thursday	NS HQ offices	NS departments coordinator	
3 October 2014, Friday	Rudaki district, Zainabobod administration center, villages Adolat and Komsomol	<i>Jamolova Mavjuda</i> – Chairlady of Zainabobod administrative center <i>Khudoiberdieva Risqiniso</i> – RCST Rudaki branch Executive Secretary Beneficiaries (3 families)	<i>Umed Saiduniev</i> - RCST DP/R Coordinator <i>Saifullo Davlatov</i> – RCST DM Department Deputy of Head <i>Ulmas Davlatov</i> – RCST DM Department staff
6 October 2014, Monday	Kulyab region Kulyab district, Balkhobi administrative center, Garabdara village	Beneficiaries – 3 families	<i>Shamsudin Muhudinov</i> – IFRC DM Manager <i>Umed Saiduniev</i> - RCST DP/R Coordinator <i>Zainiddin Olimov</i> – RCST Executive Secretary in Kulyab region <i>Mirzoev Habibullo</i> – RCST Kulyab ERC Coordinator
7 October 2014, Tuesday	Kulyab region Shurobod district, building of Shurabad Khukumat	<i>Shoiev Islom</i> – Deputy of Chairman of Shurabad Khukumat <i>Zaripov Safarkhon</i> – RCST Shurabad Executive Secretary	<i>Shamsudin Muhudinov</i> – IFRC DM Manager <i>Umed Saiduniev</i> - RCST DP/R Coordinator <i>Zainiddin Olimov</i> – RCST Executive Secretary in Kulyab region <i>Mirzoev Habibullo</i> – RCST Kulyab ERC Coordinator
7 October 2014	Kulyab region, RCST Regional office	<i>Zainiddin Olimov</i> – RCST Executive Secretary in Kulyab region <i>Mirzoev Habibullo</i> – RCST Kulyab ERC Coordinator Kulyab ERC NDRT members: <i>Nazarov Shamsullo</i> <i>Mirzoev Safarkhon</i> <i>Mahmadaliev Mehribon</i> <i>Karimov Faridun</i> <i>Izatov Umed</i>	<i>Shamsudin Muhudinov</i> – IFRC DM Manager <i>Umed Saiduniev</i> - RCST DP/R Coordinator
8 October 2014, Wednesday	Kurgan-tube region, RCST Regional office, branch warehouse	<i>Zubaidullo Tolibov</i> – RCST Executive Secretary in Kurgan-tube region <i>Muhtojov Islom</i> – RCST Kurgan-tube ERC Coordinator Kurgan-tube ERC NDRT members:	<i>Shamsudin Muhudinov</i> – IFRC DM Manager

		<p>Yusupov Ilhom Murodov Shovali Jumaev Alisher Sattorov Muhsiddin Mirzorahimov Abdullo Tolibov Firdavs Sulaimonova Zainura Davlatova Gulandom Aliev Nusratullo Salimova Saodat</p>	
8 October 2014, Wednesday	<p>Kurgan-tube region, Khuroson district, Mehnatobod administrative center, Qizil kala village</p>	<p>Beneficiaries: Abdulhaev Saidahmad Mirzonazarov Habib Fattoeva Idigul</p>	<p>Shamsudin Muhudinov – IFRC DM Manager Zubaidullo Tolibov – RCST Executive Secretary in Kurgan-tube region Muhtojov Islom – RCST Kurgan-tube ERC Coordinator</p>
8 October 2014, Wednesday	<p>Dushanbe city, UNDP Disaster Risk Management Program office</p>	<p>Firdavs Faizulloev, UNDP DRMP Program Manager Khursheda Aknazarova, UNDP DRMP staff</p>	<p>Shamsudin Muhudinov – IFRC DM Manager Umed Saiduniev- RCST DP/R Coordinator</p>

9. Annex 2 – Lessons Learned workshops – NS findings and recommendations

The lessons learned workshops were attended by RCST Leadership including Secretary General and his Deputy, DMD HQ and branch Staff, LDC members from affected areas, Federation CR DM and GRC DM Project officer, ICRC Mission Communication Officer and RCST ERC team leaders Coordinators, CoES and local authorities representatives and REACT partners in region. The lessons learnt exercise was valuable for the Red Crescent Society (RCST) and its partners to identify priorities and key areas to focus on in the future, as well as for IFRC to identify gaps for additional or revised support in the coming year.

Findings

The coordination mechanism of REACT forum is in place , however, it needs to be reinforced through taking coordination role by regional CoES and RCST branch to strengthen cooperation with local authorities and other stakeholders and responding agencies.

The National Society is in good relationship with the government and is recognized as a key response agency. The opportunity for emergency relief and preparedness funding should be lobbied for, especially in non-disaster times.

RCST active volunteers have full-time jobs or are full-time students, which potentially limit volunteer mobilization to a small window of available timeframes on working days and the weekend. This needs to be kept in consideration when designing relief and response activities, as well as any follow up, including carrying out surveys and beneficiary communication activities.

Recommendations

- ✓ RCST should continue to play a key role as part of the Government Emergency Commission structure, within its mandate and close communication in times of disaster as well as for preparedness.
- ✓ For future flood or emergency situations, DREF can and should be used as 'start-up' support for assessment and so that response activities can begin quickly. A subsequent assessment or review part-way through the operation of activities and beneficiary needs can guide a revision of the DREF intervention, thereby increasing the speed of the initial application and response.
- ✓ Revise RCST contingency planning, Disaster Management (DM) and warehousing policies, and explore opportunities to work with key partners to implement and scale-up contingency and risk reduction activities.
- ✓ Continue to strengthen capacity within the RCST DM structure, particularly around procedures for DREF/Emergency Appeals and documentation of distributions of relief supplies and activities.
- ✓ Support and technical advice from experienced Regional Disaster Response Team members needs to be appropriate and tailored to the country context.
- ✓ IFRC supported operation reviews may have more impact when carried out either mid-operation or, at the very latest, prior to the end of the operation timeframe, to enable support to the operating National Society to revise the plan of action and budget based on the evolving situation and needs on the ground.

Conclusion

The Red Crescent Society of Tajikistan undertakes to include all identified recommendation in 2015 DM action plan, involving internal and external support. The Recommendations will be discussed at 2015 RCST DM Coordinators meeting and the implementation plan will be elaborated accordingly in close coordination with movement partners and external stakeholders.

10. Annex 3 – Beneficiary Satisfaction Survey – Summary of the report

Summary

This beneficiary satisfaction survey was conducted during 04 to 10 July 2014, among the people who were assisted through the DREF operations MDRTJ017 and MDRTJ018 responding to floods consequences during April – May, 2014. In total 30% of beneficiaries (59 families) were randomly visited and interviewed and at the same time the BSS was conducted from 04 to 10 July, 2014 in Kurgantube region, among the people who were assisted through the DREF operation (MDRTJ 018), responding to floods consequences during April – May, 2014.

During the survey, a total of 60 families (35% of total beneficiaries) were visited and interviewed in all of the affected area. During the survey, a total of 117 families were interviewed in both regions of the affected areas. There were involved 16 volunteers and 6 RCST staff in conducting the beneficiary satisfaction survey.

Purpose of the survey

- The beneficiaries' opinion about provided services by the Red Crescent Society of Tajikistan during the emergency operation;
- To identify weakness and strength points of the response operations and provide concrete recommendations.

Main activities:

1. Meetings with RCST branch staff and volunteers involved in response operations;
2. Conducting BSS workshops to introduce BSS questionnaire for RCST branch staff and volunteers involved in survey;
3. Meeting and discussion with local authorities involved in operations;
4. Field visits and interviews with beneficiaries and data collection according to BSS questionnaire;
5. Analyze and report.

Main Outcome of the survey

The survey confirmed that the distributed items met the basic needs of the affected population and the assistance provided in time, 6 – 7 hours and one to two weeks after emergency occurs, therefore the distributed items were useful for the beneficiaries. The support of the RCST volunteers was highlighted by population.

The beneficiaries were asked about their needs and informed about the distributions by RCST volunteers. Most of the interviewed people stated that only the RCST made assessment about their needs. The majority of the respondents received the relief within one week. The operation aimed to assist the most affected vulnerable families during the emergency phase of the disaster to meet their basic needs. Many of the affected families supported would not have been able to cope with the situation without external support. Most of the people participating in the survey confirmed that they had recognized that they received the humanitarian aid from the RCST.

Please refer to the evaluation team for the full survey report.

11. Annex 4 – Red Crescent Society of Tajikistan – Warehouse report

DP stock report. October 2014

No	Item	Unit	Dushanbe	Sughd	Kurgan-tube	Kulyab	GBAO	Rasht	Penjikent	Ayni	Ishkoshim	Vanj	Total
1.	Plastic bags	pcs.	156	113	40	52	0	45	0	64	6	38	514
2.	Woollen blankets	pcs.	54	64	183	58	409	268	93	262	250	156	1,797
3.	Hygiene kits	pcs.	1	100	45	34	0	45	15	26	6	43	315
4.	Mattresses	pcs.	492	22	142	129	386	243	49	283	0	50	1,796
5.	Pillows	pcs.	536	64	146	179	386	98	48	270	0	53	1,780
6.	Plastic sheets	pcs.	0	90	21	12	116	47	7	89	31	35	448
7.	Bed linen	set	287	448	114	198	386	98	72	290	0	60	1,953
8.	Spades	pcs.	156	68	39	56	53	4	13	1	75	22	487
9.	Hoes	pcs.	194	21	40	66	45	6	18	2	65	44	501
10.	Tents	pcs.	71	64	53	37	60	2	16	40	26	35	404
11.	Quilts	pcs.	54	92	151	38	382	83	259	302	104	220	1,685
12.	Kitchen sets	pcs.	314	260	53	48	96	46	15	81	74	52	1,039
13.	Water cans	pcs.	156	185	111	118	157	56	46	155	90	86	1,160
14.	Kerosene stoves	pcs.	69	86	0	7	12	1	0	0	3	12	190
15.	Megaphones	pcs.	0	1	3	2	9	2	0	0	0	1	18
16.	Stretchers	pcs.	0	10	10	18	49	4	1	2	6	5	105
17.	FA kits	pcs.	0	8	20	0	105	12	18	10	13	63	249
18.	Torch	pcs.	0	2	12	24	0	12	0	15	11	36	112
19.	Construction tools	pcs.	0	29	0	6	0	13	0	0	3	61	112