

www.ifrc.org
Saving lives,
changing minds.

Emergency Appeal Preliminary Final Report

Lesotho: Food Insecurity

 International Federation
of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

Emergency Appeal: MDRLS004	Glide No: OT-2016-000005-LSO
Date of Issue: 31 March 2017	Timeframe: 22 January – 31 December 2016
Appeal Budget: CHF 735, 735	Appeal Coverage: CHF 669,956 (91% coverage)
DREF Advancement: CHF 84,369	No. of People Assisted: 9,000 (1,800 households)
Host National Society: The Lesotho Red Cross Society (LRCS) allocated nine (9) staff members and 30 volunteers to the implementation of this emergency response in three districts—Qacha's Nek, Thaba Tseka, and Mafeteng	
Red Cross Red Crescent Movement partners actively involved in the operation: IFRC (Southern Africa Country Cluster Office), Monaco Red Cross, the Netherlands Red Cross, Norwegian Red Cross, Swedish Red Cross, Japanese Red Cross and British Red Cross	
Other partner organizations actively involved in the operation: The Government of Lesotho (GoL), through the Disaster Management Authority, coordinated the emergency response at country level. WFP, FAO, and other UN and humanitarian partners were also active in the implementation of the response.	

This preliminary final report provides an overview of progress made during the Appeal's 10-month implementation timeframe. The final report will be published 31 May 2017 to incorporate the final financial report, which is currently being consolidated. The original EA was launched in response to the food insecurity situation in Lesotho brought on by the El-Nino induced drought.

Appeal history:

- This [Emergency Appeal](#) was launched on 22 January 2016 for CHF 669,160 to enable the IFRC to support the Lesotho Red Cross Society (LRCS) to respond to the food security needs of 4,500 drought affected beneficiaries for a period of six months. The initial strategy sought to address immediate food security needs through cash transfer programming and strengthen livelihoods in three districts—Mafeteng, Thaba Tseka, and Qacha's Nek.
- Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF): CHF 84,369 was initially allocated from the Federation's DREF to support the National Society (NS) to start up operations on 24 February 2016.
- [Operations Update 1](#) was issued on 8 February 2016
- [Operations Update 2](#) was issued on 26 February 2016
- [Operations Update 3](#) was issued on 06 April 2016
- [Operations Update 4](#) was issued on 20 July 2016



Beneficiary training and registration on the Vodacom mobile network. Photo: LRCS

IFRC, on behalf of Lesotho Red Cross, expresses sincere thanks to various donors, British Red Cross, Monaco Red Cross, the Netherlands Red Cross, Norwegian Red Cross, Japanese Red Cross and Swedish Red Cross for their support to this Emergency Appeal. Appreciation is also extended to the volunteers of the LRCS for their commitment to the implementation of this response.

Summary of response

Following the launch of the Emergency Appeal in January 2016, LRCS has been involved in responding to the immediate needs of a total targeted population of **9,000 people (1,800 households)** in three (3) rural districts--Mafeteng, Thaba Tseka, and Qacha's Nek—providing cash-based support to meet immediate food needs and agricultural inputs subsidization to strengthen livelihoods. To kick-start the emergency option, **CHF 84,639** was allocated from the IFRC's Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF) for assessments and to support the start of the assistance to food insecure people. In January 2016, the Emergency Appeal was launched for **CHF 664,073** to support 4,500 people with immediate humanitarian assistance and medium-term livelihoods support.

Food assistance support through cash transfers was recommended by the Lesotho Vulnerability Assessment Committee report (LVAC) to support affected households in addressing their immediate food requirements and avoiding the adoption of negative coping mechanisms. To complement this initiative and build household resiliency, LRCS also suggested the implementation of medium-term livelihoods support through the provision of seeds and agricultural training. As such, the intervention sought to implement the following priority activities:

Immediate intervention: the LRCS will assist 9,000 people (1,800 households) that are food insecure in Mafeteng, Thaba Tseka and Qacha's Nek Districts through:

- Two-month food distribution of CHF 35 per household per month over two months of February and March
- A monthly cash transfer of CHF 35 per household per month over four months. The transfer will be sufficient to meet the immediate food needs of a household of five members. The cash transfer value was calculated based on the current prices of a standard food basket (50kg bag of maize, 7,5kg beans, 4.5 litres cooking oil).
- The operation will use mobile money transfers, working in partnership with the Vodacom Lesotho. Free Sim cards will be provided and Vodacom will train staff and volunteers in the registration and transfer systems.

Medium-term intervention: within the planned beneficiary figure of 9,000 people (1,800 households), the National Society will support 1,800 households with the following medium-term interventions

- Support to agricultural production through the provision of agricultural inputs (hybrid seeds of maize, beans and fertilizer and production tools for winter cropping).
- Provision of agricultural training to 30 lead farmers with each lead farmer being responsible for cascading knowledge and skills to 10 follower farmers. Training of affected communities on farming techniques includes but is not limited to farming practices, which will minimise the impact of drought, such as seed selection, inter cropping, intensifying mulching, rotational cropping, soil and moisture conserving practices like keyhole and trench gardening.
- Climate change and adaptation through trainings on establishing and promoting the share of community indigenous knowledge, practices and also looking at the fuelling factors for the climate change related possible response mechanisms, mapping their resource, capacities and hazardous issues leading to climate change.

A community-based selection approach was applied to the beneficiary selection process, which allowed the communities to democratically elect the most vulnerable within their context. It also allowed them to select people based on their own definition of vulnerability. The selection criteria applied within the communities was consistent with the IFRC and LRCS' commitment to strive for diversity, gender equality, and to ensure non-discrimination in the provision of services to the most vulnerable. The intervention primarily targeted the chronically ill, those with disabilities, the elderly, households with malnourished children <5, pregnant and lactating mothers, female- and child-headed households, orphans or vulnerable children (OVCs), labour constrained households, and the very poor income quartiles. The most food insecure districts in Lesotho—Thaba Tseka, Mafeteng and Qacha's Nek—were targeted for support consistent with the Movement's principle of impartiality.

Health and hygiene activities were also implemented focusing on promotion of safe and clean water as well as case referral of malnourished people to health centres for therapeutic feeding, engaging the government to ensure assistance to the malnourished. Initiatives where beneficiaries engaged through community engagement and participation (one member per household taking part in activities for a maximum of 20 days) were: Community dams, land reclamation, silt trap construction, tree planting, reseeding of rangelands and soil and water conservation activities. These activities were also aimed to enhancing resilience capacity within communities.

However, as the drought emergency progressed and the number of affected individuals increased, LRCS conducted a market assessment in March 2016 to assess the operation's response approach and efficiency of its chosen cash transfer programming (CTP) modality. The market assessment concluded that the cash transfer value per household could be reduced from CHF 68 to CHF 35, which would allow LRCS to target 1,800 households (9,000 individuals) rather than the original 4,500. As such, LRCS issued an operations update in April 2016 to increase the targeted beneficiaries and revise the EPoA budget. Per the fourth Operations Update issued in July 2016, the Appeal sought a total of **CHF 735,735** and targeted **9,000 individuals** in three of the most affected districts for food insecurity across the country.

The Situation

At the launch of the Emergency Appeal (EA), Lesotho was in the midst of a food insecurity crisis that had impacted an estimated 534,502 individuals across the country. At the peak of the lean season, food insecurity in rural areas reached around 48 per cent of the population, affected some 679,437 people (RIASCO, 2016). Households faced limited food access, small consumption gaps, and, without humanitarian support, did not have the capacities to cope with the severity of the drought (FEWS NET, 2016). Contributing to the food insecurity situation were the high prices of staple foods in many areas of the country, exceeding the five-year average—which reduced the purchasing power of households, relative to their food requirements and access to markets.

Lesotho had lost normal rainfall between April and May 2015, when the next harvest is expected. This made it difficult for Basotho (the Lesotho people) to be engaged in winter ploughing due to scarce moisture. The first rains were expected between August, September, October and November but vegetation conditions by November 2015 were reported to be at their lowest in 15 years. In December 2015, Prime Minister declared a state emergency due to the prevailing drought and asked development partners to help combat the situation. The 22 January 2016 the IFRC launches an Emergency Appeal for 664,073 Swiss francs for 4,500 people and with allocated 84,369 on form of DREF as start-up funding.

Food insecurity in rural areas is high: around 48 per cent with 679,437 people affected (RIASCO, 2016). Limited food accessibility is a major issue in households that are affected by small consumption gaps, lack of coping mechanisms and staple food high prices that are above the five-year average which reduces purchasing power in homes to meet their food requirements and access to markets. These food availability and food accessibility though purchase increases food insecurity countrywide.

There is then a favourable market, able to deliver affordable food to be purchased locally, a pre-condition for successful cash based interventions. There was some inflation due to the drought situation but the Government subsidized the cost of maize by 30% which helped the situation.

Following the drought conditions due to El Niño, heavy snowfall adversely impacted agricultural production throughout July and August 2016 (RIASCO, 2016). This resulted in the decline of maize production by 61 per cent, sorghum by 88 per cent and wheat by 38 per cent compared with the last season, which was already marked by poor performance (OCHA, 2016). Despite this, adequate rainfall was received across the country in early 2017 to indicate a prosperous cropping year in 2016/17. FEWS NET (2016) reports that adequate water is available for crops and conditions are at a near average point. As such, households may begin to access green crop foods in March 2017.

The Government of Lesotho led the overall coordination of disaster response through national coordination meetings hosted by the Disaster Management Authority (DMA) under the Office of the Prime Minister that is the chair and where the LRCS takes part. The District Disaster Management Team (DDMT) is the coordination platform for partner institutions (UN agencies, WFP, INGO's, NGOs) along with the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security. It is established for humanitarian response strategic planning (with WFP as leading agency) and policy set-ups in funding and food distribution.

Water rationing caused by low water levels is common in communities despite the seasonal rains and can lead into water borne disease outbreaks. Water shortages are still common in 56 per cent of schools according to UNICEF. Consequently, WASH related needs in terms of supply in dams for urban areas are still high and an underfunded sector.

Overview of Red Cross Red Crescent Movement in country

The Government of Lesotho leads the overall coordination of disaster response through national coordination meetings hosted by the Disaster Management Authority (DMA) under the Office of the Prime Minister that is the chair and where the LRCS takes part. The District Disaster Management Team (DDMT) is the coordination platform for partner institutions (UN agencies, WFP, INGO's, NGOs) along with the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security. It is established for humanitarian response strategic planning (with WFP as leading agency) and policy set-ups in funding and food distribution.

LRCS has responded to the immediate needs of **9,000 people (1,800 household)** in the three rural districts- of Mafeteng, Thaba Tseka, and Qacha's Nek. Especially relevant for LRCS has been the fact of having been able to respond with 2-month food distribution of CHF 35 per household per month (February and March 2016) and a monthly cash transfer of CHF 35 per household per month over 4 months (3 CT done and 1 pending)

The Southern Africa Country Cluster Support Team has been providing technical support to the NS in its implementation of the response. To date, the emergency Appeal has received **91% coverage** and faces a **funding gap of CHF 66,139**.

DETAILED OPERATIONAL PLAN

Food security, Nutrition, and Livelihoods			
Outcome 1 Immediate food needs of 9,000 beneficiaries (1,800 households) are met over a period of six months	Outputs		% of achievement
	Output 1.1 1,800 households (9,000 beneficiaries) receive food and cash in order to purchase food		100%
Activities	Is implementation on time?		% progress (estimate)
	Yes (x)	No (x)	
Information for local authorities' awareness session	X		%
Beneficiary, targeting identification and registration.	X		100%
Food procurement (maize, bean, sorghum, cooking oil)	X		100%
Food distribution for 1,800 households	X		100%
Establishment of CTP and payment mechanisms processes	X		100%
Validation of beneficiary list and establishment of an accountability mechanism (beneficiary communication, feedback systems, etc.)	X		100%
Training and Capacity Building in Transfer Cash Programming among the staff and volunteers	X		100%
Training on beneficiary identification, registration, rapid assessment and field data collection and analysis	X		100%
Selection and signing contract with Service Providers	X		100%
Cash distribution for four months April, May, June and July 2016	X		75%
Procurement of mobile hand sets		X	0%
Mobile providers input into training of volunteers in mobile phone registration, provision of free Sim cards	X		100%
Monitoring and evaluation of the activity	X		100%
Outcome 2 Livelihoods of 1,800 households are reinforced to build community resilience in targeted regions	Outputs		% of achievement
	Output 1.1 Appropriate agricultural inputs (seeds, fertilizers and production tools) are distributed to 1,800 farmers (9,000 people) in rural areas		100%
Activities	Is implementation on time?		% progress (estimate)
	Yes (x)	No (x)	
Assessment to identify most vulnerable households that have capacity to work and have available land for planting	X		100%
Conduct specific needs assessment via Ministry of Agriculture to identify most appropriate items to be distributed depending on the market availability and period	X		100%
Assessment to establish capacity of local traders to provide proposed seeds and fertilizers	X		100%
Organize procurement of seeds, fertilizers and production tools for 1,800 farmers	X		100%
Training of lead farmers in agricultural production (they will be trained on farming techniques, water harvesting techniques like dam maintenance, catchment design and maintenance, water hygiene this will be cascaded down to entire community	X		100%

Conduct distribution of seeds, fertilizer and production tools	X		100%
Monitoring and evaluation of the activity	X		100%

Progress towards outcomes

Targeting and beneficiary selection

Stakeholders engaged in an authentic dialogue, helped in identifying vulnerable beneficiaries in the selected areas. 600 beneficiaries from each District were targeted to a total number of 1800. It was only through inclusion that organizations determine the best ways to unify, strengthen, and leverage community assets, capacities, and interests. Communities were given the selection criteria and then entrusted with the selection of suitable beneficiaries. This was done with the help and presence of the local leaders and members of the CBOs in each area. After that targeting was done, which was a joint venture by the stakeholders at district level, hence it can be said that this process was inclusive and participatory.

Cash Transfer Programming (CTP) Training

The CTP training was conducted for the staff and volunteers from three districts. Since CTP is new in the country a few ground rules were essential for the staff and volunteers to understand and acknowledge as follows:

- It saves time, beneficiaries do not require to queue to receive assistance;
- During the disaster, the beneficiaries or vulnerable families prioritize critical needs, families choose directly, even with conditional cash (e.g. food vouchers) and recipients can select what is essential to them.
- Improves the inclusion of certain household members in decision making.
- Direct cash delivery reduces operational costs.
- Recipients meet self-identified needs at a lower rate.
- Benefits local markets as it provides more than in-kind assistance and strengthen local economies as well as benefits host communities. It makes easy monitoring and the evaluation of expenditure on core activities, its impact on households, markets, and communities.
- Provides more comprehensive feedback on people's needs, vulnerabilities, and coping strategies in addition to the humanitarian impact on local contexts and communities.

Challenges:

- In some cases, CTP modalities can negatively affect markets by causing inflation or supply shortages.
- Accelerate existing household tensions or negatively impact dynamics between household members (head of household diverting money on other things than food for the children).
- Increases women exposure to domestic violence, worsen relations between recipient and non-recipient

Beneficiary training by Vodacom on mobile registration on M-pesa

Vodacom Lesotho as mobile service provider for cash transfer conducted a brief training for beneficiaries on how to register for and use M-pesa upon receiving cash. It was a participatory training with Vodacom providing supervision and beneficiaries taking the lead. Vodacom has sufficient skills and also facilitate local traders to set up M-pesa based shop, which contributes to the efficiency of the intervention.

Food Distribution

Distributed staple food such as maize, beans, and oil, aiming to reach 1800 households constituting 9,000 people. For the first two months of February and March 2016

Seeds and tools enhanced the household livelihood capacity on medium term and it is also a potential support for households to sustain themselves with vegetables for consumption and sale.

Lead gardeners' livelihood training

Five days training was conducted in all areas to equip the Lead Gardens on sustainable livelihood programme which incorporated the farming techniques, WASH issues as well as topics pertaining to climate change and adaptability. From each area 10 lead gardeners were trained and various stakeholders participated in the trainings to make them a success. From the trainings, referral systems were well established for beneficiaries with different specific needs.

- The main objective of the training was to increase lead gardens' skills and enhance their knowledge regarding disaster, climate change impact and adaptability. Amongst the topics discussed:
- Construction of keyhole gardens, trench and normal plots
- Food processing, handling and preservation

- Livestock nurturing and water harvesting
- Hand washing facilities -Tip-Tap,
- Health: Communicable diseases such as HIV/TB, diarrhoea, Under 5s malnutrition

Water, sanitation, and hygiene promotion			
Outcome 3 Immediate reduction in risk of waterborne and water related diseases in targeted districts	Outputs		% of achievement
	Output 3.1 Health and hygiene promotion activities carried out to targeted population		100%
Activities	Is implementation on time?		% progress (estimate)
	Yes (x)	No (x)	
Training of volunteers, water committees and teachers on hygiene promotion (proper hand washing, water treatment and health education)	X		100%
Training of volunteers to monitor malnutrition indicators and conduct referrals and social mobilization exercises in targeted communities	X		100%
Hazard mapping and analysis in villages and schools and identify potential water sources	X		70%
Distribution of water treatment tablets		X	0%
House to house visits for hand-washing; water treatment and health education	X		50%
Monitoring and evaluation of the activity	X		90%

Progress towards outcomes

Health and Sanitation

Training is the initiative that entitles this component. The primary objective incorporating Health and Sanitation in this initiative was to enlighten participants to access to safe water, sanitation facilities and promote good hygiene practices.

Access to clean water and sanitation were the basis for this training. People lack access to improved means of clean water supply due to the drought prevailing situation as well as the lack of access to adequate sanitation facilities. Without access to sanitation people frequently practice defecation in the open spaces and / or rivers. This, as well as a lack of access to a safe supply of water and poor hygiene practices, has severe consequences for human health and directly impacts on their well-being and dignity. Diarrhoea caused by poor sanitation remains a leading cause of death particularly for children under five years old.



The participants also became aware of WASH importance for people living with HIV. WASH is essential to ensure that people with HIV (PLHIV) live healthy and productive lives. The following points were discussed at length with practical examples:

- Susceptibility of HIV to WASH related illnesses such as typhoid and skin diseases.
- An adequate supply of water is essential for home-based care of PLHIV. Sensitization on this aspect attains prevention of opportunistic infections and diarrhoea, addressing the need for close and easily accessible toilet facilities and water for hand washing.
- **Prevention of mother-to-child transmission (PMTCT):** If a mother living with HIV decides to use formula or replacement feeding rather than breast milk, access to clean water is essential to ensure that it is safe for consumption.

WASH further exploration

The Lesotho Red Cross Society in collaboration with other stakeholders engaged in the training of lead gardeners on issues of WASH to create more awareness on issues which may have been of major health concern.

One of the findings was that most of the wells were not covered in the villages, remaining exposed to open air defecation, still a major practice among the villages. This led to increased water borne diseases such as diarrhoea which increased heavily in Thaba Tseka especially amongst children under the age of ten.



A woman collecting water from an open well exposed to dirty winds

Due to the drying up of open water sources, which use is an opting for most people, the Ministry of Water Affairs had to recourse to importing water in most of the areas, the water treatment equipment being the challenge; hence the likelihood of water bore diseases increase. Boiling water prior to usage was therefore encouraged in order to kill the germs.



Red Cross volunteer demonstrating the construction and use of tippy tap using locally available materials. Tippy Tap is used to wash hands

The recommendation was therefore that the locally available material can be used in construction of latrines and also that the water sources should at least be protected from animals and dirty winds which usually brings particles of faeces from open defecation. Participants were also presented ways to wash hands using the tippy taps after using the toilets and before having meals.

Programming/Areas common to all sectors			
Outcome 4 Continuous and detailed assessment and analysis is used to inform the design and implementation of the operation.	Outputs		% of achievement
	Output 4.1 Initial needs assessment are updated following consultation with beneficiaries		%
Activities	Is implementation on time?		% progress (estimate)
	Yes (x)	No (x)	
Inception meeting with implementation team– IFRC SACO and LRCS	X		100%
Coordination and engagement with key stakeholders (DMA, MoAFS, Community leaders, NGOs, Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, UN Agencies).	X		100%
Joint monitoring of operations by LRCS & IFRC	X		80%
Evaluation of assistance impact in supported households (related to all food security activities)	X		70%
Lessons-learned and review meeting	X		100%

Progress towards outcomes

Coordination with stakeholders

As part of mobilization process prior to execution of the project, stakeholder meetings were conducted at the national, district and community levels to share activities, intervention modality, beneficiary selection criteria, modality of support (food basket, sustainable livelihood activities as well as Cash transfer programme) and organisational operation response. Another purpose was to identify what resources each stakeholder has. That also led to the effectiveness and sustainability of the programs having all the role players planning and acting together.

Press Conference:

Following the information sharing with all the stakeholders in country, the communication office laid a ground for the press conference where media house were invited for the larger publicity. The press conference attracted newspapers, local and national radios as well Lesotho Television. The conference acknowledges the presence of IFRC represented by Dr Michael Charles who was acting Head of Zone Office.



Common issues around the secured funding as well as different assistance modalities were shared by Dr Charles. Lesotho Red Cross Society staff represented fully, Secretary General Prof Kitleli, Programmes Director Mrs Matsepo Moletsane and the Disaster Management Coordinator Maine Makula. The management briefly indicated that an appeal amounting to 10 million was secured for the emergency plan of action to address the food insecurity challenges facing thousands of Basotho. It further indicated that as much as 10 districts are affected the national society to extend its support in all ten due to resource constraints. However, based on the LVAC and rapid assessments that were carried out, LRCS found it worthwhile

to assist three districts hardest hit by the drought which are Qacha's Nek, Thaba-Tseka and Mafeteng. The areas and families chosen within the districts were found to be the most vulnerable within their respective villages.

The issues of households to be assisted was shared, 9 000 food insecure people in 1,800 households to receive assistance in two ways namely:

1. Food commodity distribution per household over a period of two months from February and March 2016
2. Cash transfer of M525.00 per household per month for a period of four months (April to July 2016). The cash sufficient to meet the immediate food needs of a household of five
3. The cash transfer value has been calculated based on the current prices of a standard food basket that is 12.5kg bag of maize, 1.9kg of beans and 0 .9 Litres of cooking oil per Household with one member.

4. It was further shared that the beneficiaries will receive their cash through mobile money transfers in partnership with telecommunications services providers in country. The Free sim cards were provided and the selected supplier trained staff and volunteers in the registration and transfer systems.
5. The supporting National societies of British Red Cross, The Netherlands, Swedish Red and Norwegian Red Cross Societies surfaced through IFRC presentation

Operation Relevance and appropriateness

The food items were considered as per the beneficiary's preferences. The combination of maize based meal as staple meal with beans for protein availability in the diet and vegetable and oil as base for cooking has constituted a good food basket in Lesotho's context. Since February the market was promising food accessibility through purchase for a diversification in beneficiaries' diet. However, in mountain areas like Sehlabathebe, food commodities were starting to be difficult to attain since most of their stock comes from South Africa. Thus, some of the most preferred maize meal became expensive. Some other essentials like non-food items were also becoming dear for the available household earnings, therefore cash transfer was found to be the most appropriate modality in responding to the current food insecurity situation.

Operation efficiency and Effectiveness

Focusing on cash transfer, it is essential to mention that **CTP** was new to Lesotho Red Cross society. Consequently, the initial training conducted for the staff and volunteers was an eye opener for the best implementation of the operation. The main issue is the availability of two mobile phone network service providers fully engaged in the cash transfers, one of them, Vodacom, assisting the national society. This facilitated the cash transfer management from the beginning, spilling cashing out skills over the relief officers and beneficiaries easily. The cash transfer programme is packaged in such a way that the organisation takes care of administration charges; this implies that the beneficiaries receive the stipulated amount. The Lesotho Red Cross Society negotiated the low price for the beneficiaries, especially for maize meal in Qacha'snek district.

Nonetheless, due to low level of education there is a need to revisit the communities with the purpose of ensuring that each and every household benefited from the cash distribution. The cash disbursement list as shared with Vodacom is used for verification purposes and follow-up processes, assuring that all the beneficiaries have been cash picking entitled and challenges are best addressed. Adoption of mobile cash pick services have been perceived as an in-community friendly formal payment modality and very compatible with the objective of the programme to bring about a change in the community.

Monitoring

Monitoring the operation for its impact on food insecurity and nutrition at a household level is important to measure the success and also the weaknesses for identification of possible adverse effects with the aim to address them rapidly. Monitoring of programme results during implementation is also important in order to enhance sustainability, ensuring that all participants are playing a role and that all activities are being carried out as planned. Relevant stakeholders are involved in monitoring so that they become part of the program, in activities such as vegetable production; cash transfer as well as lead gardeners, for suitability purposes assisting households' beneficiaries. This joint monitoring at a district level is an important to set an active platform towards beneficiaries' ownership beyond the operation strict timeframe, as on a larger range it constitutes a well-defined exit strategy for the local stakeholders to be able to keep on follow these and other initiatives and extend their efforts to assist further.

Sustainability Process

Collaboration among different actors is not only paramount, but it is also the sole route to successfully addressing the challenges we face. Developing a worldwide mainstream sustainability standard requires a joint approach among relevant organizations and governments. Improving the elements for sustainability is a question of dialogue and cooperation between public and private actors in many fields. Implementing sustainable long term livelihoods recovery actions requires collective action on the ground by civil society organizations and communities, and exchange of best practices for multiplier effects.

To ensure the sustainability of the program, relevant stakeholders at community, district and national levels were involved right from the initial stage of the operation. Information on planning and design (community mobilisation, beneficiary selection, verification and registration and direct observation of distribution of both the cash and food items) was shared at all levels.

Knowledge was promoted among the staff, volunteers and beneficiaries through cash transfer training and training on the construction of hands washing device called Tippy Tap. Practices resulting from the operation have also enhanced that knowledge such as beneficiary selection, market assessment, farming practices, health and sanitation education and construction of keyhole and trench gardens. About food production, as mentioned above, training along with stakeholders at district level ensured instauration of skills on this matter.

Community, together with the local leaders, stakeholders at district level and Red Cross volunteers will be responsible for ensuring sustainability beyond project phase out. Fully engagement of the Red Cross Volunteers (committees) with the oversee of every activity by the RC divisional secretary has revealed to be a good strategy towards the stewardship and adequate management thanks especially to the availability of the volunteers in the district.

Challenges

Cash Transfer is not pegged on any Sphere standard, it was left to implementers and community representatives to decide on what amount to deliver and in general on how to support the operation.

Most of the targeted villages are located in rural and mountainous parts of Lesotho. These are areas characterised by poor and damaged roads, sharp topography and bad weather conditions. This therefore posed a challenge in terms of delivery of food items hence delay in other areas

In the last growing season, no plants seeded even with the fields remaining fallowed. Thus, the households are experiencing a severe shortage of food as the time goes by. This is alarmingly increasing the number of people without food in all ten districts of the country.

Communication between finance teams internationally and nationally needs to improve for a timely implementation of the activities.

Retaining skilled volunteers remains a major challenge and continuous engagement of the volunteers should be enhanced.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Cash transfer may be the most effective modality in assisting rural communities. It would be important to solicit more resource in terms of funds to assist the same beneficiaries and more beyond May 2017. Bear in mind to customize the generic IFRC cash transfer guidelines to country specificities -line Ministry to develop cash transfer guidelines- and include sustainability component (e.g. re-investing cash) in future CTP.

Strengthen the beneficiary feedback mechanism (toll free numbers, suggestion box, volunteers etc.) and link M&E activities with the program implementation. Ensure efficient and continuous communication with the beneficiaries (e.g. status, progress and challenges).

Integrate capacity building of the NS on national and district level and better connect emergency with medium/long-term recovery.

Strengthen local resource mobilization strategy and ensure timely transfer of funds for emergency operation avoiding or anticipating possible bottle neck in the administration along with other operations

IFRC to ensure that tools are in place for capturing disaggregated data on beneficiaries (gender, age. etc.), to continue maintaining and building regional response capacity, to continue engaging in discussion with LRCS on the next step (Exit strategy) and support LRCS to engage with partners as well as external actors.

Lessons learned:

1. Cash transfer when compared to in-kind food aid is more efficient and effective.
2. The use of CT as a modality, offers flexibility to the beneficiaries to the extent that they can address their needs handily.
3. Selection process was appreciated by the communities and the beneficiaries. A transparent and participatory targeting and selection is the way to ensure that the right beneficiaries are incorporated in the program
4. Timely RDRT deployment contributed to design the cash transfer program component in the operation and to build capacity of volunteers and staff.
5. The use of an external mobile phone operator proved to be efficient and it offers the opportunity to be more transparent and accountable to beneficiaries and donors.
6. Including sustainability analysis in the programme design ensures continued benefits even after running out of the programme.
7. There is a need for a better and more standardised coordination of cash transfer that appropriately addressed the needs of the beneficiaries. They received the correct amount (M 525), second (M 525) and third (M 525) but in larger households they stated that M 800-1,000 will be the suitable rate to cater for their needs. People used the cash for basic needs, mainly food, clothing, hygiene item and school fees.

8. During the implementation of an Emergency Appeal, National Societies should be pro-active in resource mobilisation in order to ensure timely and sufficient reception of funding.
9. Mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction and climate change as adaptation related frameworks helps the HOUSEHOLD adjust to problems related to climate change.
10. It has been challenging the distance to the food distribution and M-pesa points, in particular for the elderly and chronically ill people.
11. The Post distribution monitoring and complaints mechanism was insufficient for effective follow up on problems / issues with Cash.
12. The registration and follow up did not captured individual needs for each household and does not allow for disaggregated data management of the beneficiaries (Gender and Age).
13. M&E structure can be strengthened from the field –Division-HQs in terms of definition of roles and responsibilities.

The lessons learnt above are summarized after realization of an external evaluation of this Emergency Appeal, facilitated by the Southern Africa Regional Office, and are related to the main outcome areas (Cash transfer, WASH, and food insecurity)

Operational way forward

In ensuring that the program goals are attained and livelihoods improved, the LRCS will still engage in the following activities outlined below: the delivery of the production tools and seeds to the districts warehouse, then their distribution on set dates to the beneficiaries, cash disbursement to the beneficiaries on the schedule agreed between LRCS and IFRC, this will be done by sharing the schedule with Vodacom being the key service Provider.

One of the key activities for the success of the operation is monitoring which will be done jointly by LRCS headquarters and IFRC. The field based monitoring and coordination meetings are targeting all the districts between the LRCS staff and relevant stakeholders to set up the ultimate schedule that implementation involves.

At the national level the coordination meetings are also held between LRCS and the key stakeholders like Disaster Management Authority, FAO, World Vision and World Food Programme. The meetings are extended to the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security, Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation who are also key in co-facilitating long term livelihoods activities like construction of earth dam, and further promotion of farming practices and nutrition issues. Ministry of Health through the department of Environmental Health Department and the Department of Rural Water Supply are identified as impending partners to conduct health and sanitation education related initiatives.

Contact Information

For further information specifically related to this operation please contact:

- **Lesotho Red Cross Society:** Prof. Teboho Kitleli, Secretary General; phone: +266 22 313 911; email: tkitleli@redcross.org.ls
- **IFRC Cluster Representation:** Lorraine Mangwiro, Head of Southern Africa Cluster; phone: +27 113 039 715; email: lorraine.mangwiro@ifrc.org
- **IFRC Africa Region:** Farid Aiywar, Head of Disaster Crisis Prevention, Response and Recovery Department, Nairobi, Kenya; phone +254 731 067 489; email: farid.aiywar@ifrc.org
- **IFRC Geneva:** Cristina Estrada, Response/Recovery Lead, DCPRR; phone: +41 227 304 260; email: cristina.estrada@ifrc.org
- **IFRC Regional Logistics Unit (RLU):** Rishi Ramrakha, Head of Africa Region Logistics unit; phone: +254 733 888 022; fax: +254 202 712 777; Email: rishi.ramrakha@ifrc.org

For Resource Mobilization and Pledges:

- **In IFRC Africa Zone:** Fidelis Kangethe, Partnerships and Resource Mobilization Coordinator; Addis Ababa; phone: +251 930 03 4013; email: fidelis.kangethe@ifrc.org

Please send all pledges for funding to zonerm.africa@ifrc.org

Performance and accountability support (planning, monitoring, evaluation and reporting)

- Beatrice Okeyo, Acting PMER Coordinator, mobile phone: +254 732 412 200; email: beatrice.okeyo@ifrc.org

How we work

All IFRC assistance seeks to adhere to the **Code of Conduct** for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in Disaster Relief and the **Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Response (Sphere)** in delivering assistance to the most vulnerable. The IFRC's vision is to inspire, **encourage, facilitate and promote at all times all forms of humanitarian activities** by National Societies, with a view to **preventing and alleviating human suffering**, and thereby contributing to the maintenance and promotion of human dignity and peace in the world.

The IFRC's work is guided by Strategy 2020 which puts forward three strategic aims:



Save lives.
protect livelihoods,
and strengthen recovery
from disaster and crises.



Enable **healthy**
and **safe** living.



Promote **social inclusion**
and a culture of
non-violence and **peace**.

Disaster Response Financial Report

MDRLS004 - Lesotho - Food Insecurity

Timeframe: 21 Jan 16 to 31 Dec 16

Appeal Launch Date: 22 Jan 16

FINAL

Selected Parameters			
Reporting Timeframe	2016/1-2017/2	Programme	MDRLS004
Budget Timeframe	2016/1-2016/12	Budget	APPROVED
Split by funding source	Y	Project	*
Subsector:	*		

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

I. Funding

	Raise humanitarian standards	Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people	Strengthen RC/RC contribution to development	Heighten influence and support for RC/RC work	Joint working and accountability	TOTAL	Deferred Income
A. Budget		735,736				735,736	
B. Opening Balance							
Income							
Cash contributions							
<i>British Red Cross</i>		344,621				344,621	
<i>Japanese Red Cross Society</i>		21,900				21,900	
<i>Norwegian Red Cross</i>		162,942				162,942	
<i>Red Cross of Monaco</i>		10,988				10,988	
<i>Swedish Red Cross</i>		63,848				63,848	
<i>The Netherlands Red Cross (from Netherlands Government*)</i>		65,297				65,297	
C1. Cash contributions		669,596				669,596	
C. Total Income = SUM(C1..C4)		669,596				669,596	
D. Total Funding = B + C		669,596				669,596	

* Funding source data based on information provided by the donor

II. Movement of Funds

	Raise humanitarian standards	Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people	Strengthen RC/RC contribution to development	Heighten influence and support for RC/RC work	Joint working and accountability	TOTAL	Deferred Income
B. Opening Balance							
C. Income		669,596				669,596	
E. Expenditure		-598,901				-598,901	
F. Closing Balance = (B + C + E)		70,695				70,695	

Disaster Response Financial Report

MDRLS004 - Lesotho - Food Insecurity

Timeframe: 21 Jan 16 to 31 Dec 16

Appeal Launch Date: 22 Jan 16

FINAL

Selected Parameters

Reporting Timeframe	2016/1-2017/2	Programme	MDRLS004
Budget Timeframe	2016/1-2016/12	Budget	APPROVED
Split by funding source	Y	Project	*
Subsector:	*		

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

III. Expenditure

Account Groups	Expenditure						TOTAL	Variance
	Budget	Raise humanitarian standards	Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people	Strengthen RC/RC contribution to development	Heighten influence and support for RC/RC work	Joint working and accountability		
	A					B	A - B	
BUDGET (C)			735,736			735,736		
Relief items, Construction, Supplies								
Food	100,800		67,152			67,152	33,648	
Seeds & Plants	41,400		33,352			33,352	8,048	
Utensils & Tools	41,400		46,347			46,347	-4,947	
Cash Disbursement	319,590		202,444			202,444	117,146	
Total Relief items, Construction, Sup	503,190		349,295			349,295	153,895	
Logistics, Transport & Storage								
Transport & Vehicles Costs	11,500		6,874			6,874	4,626	
Total Logistics, Transport & Storage	11,500		6,874			6,874	4,626	
Personnel								
International Staff	51,000		38,272			38,272	12,729	
National Staff	4,800						4,800	
National Society Staff	44,095		36,791			36,791	7,304	
Volunteers	7,185		6,050			6,050	1,135	
Total Personnel	107,080		81,112			81,112	25,969	
Workshops & Training								
Workshops & Training	29,600		16,733			16,733	12,867	
Total Workshops & Training	29,600		16,733			16,733	12,867	
General Expenditure								
Travel	10,500		9,584			9,584	916	
Information & Public Relations	3,500		106			106	3,394	
Office Costs	2,000		171			171	1,829	
Communications	2,000		1,830			1,830	170	
Financial Charges	3,000		-11,854			-11,854	14,854	
Other General Expenses			361			361	-361	
Shared Office and Services Costs	15,018		15,500			15,500	-482	
Total General Expenditure	36,018		15,699			15,699	20,319	
Operational Provisions								
Operational Provisions			87,190			87,190	-87,190	
Total Operational Provisions			87,190			87,190	-87,190	
Indirect Costs								
Programme & Services Support Recovr	44,680		35,936			35,936	8,745	
Total Indirect Costs	44,680		35,936			35,936	8,745	
Pledge Specific Costs								
Pledge Earmarking Fee			4,663			4,663	-4,663	
Pledge Reporting Fees	3,667		1,400			1,400	2,267	
Total Pledge Specific Costs	3,667		6,063			6,063	-2,396	
TOTAL EXPENDITURE (D)	735,736		598,901			598,901	136,835	
VARIANCE (C - D)			136,835			136,835		

Disaster Response Financial Report

MDRLS004 - Lesotho - Food Insecurity

Timeframe: 21 Jan 16 to 31 Dec 16

Appeal Launch Date: 22 Jan 16

FINAL

Selected Parameters

Reporting Timeframe	2016/1-2017/2	Programme	MDRLS004
Budget Timeframe	2016/1-2016/12	Budget	APPROVED
Split by funding source	Y	Project	*
Subsector:	*		

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

IV. Breakdown by subsector

Business Line / Sub-sector	Budget	Opening Balance	Income	Funding	Expenditure	Closing Balance	Deferred Income
BL2 - Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people							
Food security	735,736		669,596	669,596	598,901	70,695	
Subtotal BL2	735,736		669,596	669,596	598,901	70,695	
GRAND TOTAL	735,736		669,596	669,596	598,901	70,695	