

Emergency Plan of Action Final Report

Myanmar: Cyclone Mora

DREF n° MDRMM009	Date of issue: 28 December, 2017
Operation start date: 9 June 2017	Operation end date: 21 September 2017
N° of people assisted: 5,000	Amount allocated from DREF: CHF 83,397
Host National Society presence: The Myanmar Red Cross Society (MRCS) has 40,000 active volunteers and 630 staff members across its national headquarters and 334 branches, including 17 branches in Rakhine State.	
Red Cross Red Crescent Movement partners actively involved in the operation (if available and relevant): The MRCS is working closely with the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and the International Federation Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) in readiness measures for mounting an effective response. Danish Red Cross and Qatar Red Crescent Society are also engaging in the readiness measures.	
Other partner organizations actively involved in the operation: In addition to Myanmar public authorities at national and state levels, several UN agencies and international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) are present in the Rakhine State. The UN agencies include UNHCR, UN OCHA, UNICEF, UNFPA and WFP while the INGOs include ACF, CARE, Malteser International and MSF.	

On behalf of the Myanmar Red Cross Society, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies would like to thank the Canadian Government for generous contribution to the replenishment of this disaster relief emergency fund (DREF). The unspent balance of CHF 16,212 will be returned to DREF.

A. Situation analysis

Description of the crisis

Tropical cyclone Mora made landfall on the coast of Bangladesh between Cox's Bazaar and the city of Chittagong on 30 May 2017. Myanmar's Rakhine state was severely hit, particularly in the northern areas of the state, and the states/regions of Chin, Ayeyarwady, Magway and Sagaing. MRCS conducted a rapid assessment in the affected townships to assess the needs of the affected population.

According to government figures, 67 school buildings were completely destroyed, 297 houses partially damage, 4 health facilities destroyed while 45 public facilities were damaged in Maungdaw and Buthidaung townships. In central Rakhine, 86 educational facilities were damaged (11 educational facilities collapsed, 33 severely damaged and 42 had minor damages).

Affected population whose shelters were destroyed by the tropical winds had increased risks to ailments as they were exposed to the elements. Schools which was reopened on 1 June required materials for repairs as well as furniture. The respective township education officers worked together with humanitarian partners in identifying the schools that needed repairs and rehabilitation.

Damages caused by TC Mora compounded the already difficult humanitarian situation in Rakhine state. The context was characterized by protracted tension and communal violence, with displacement of 145,000 people in 2012. Violence flared up again in October 2016 in Maungdaw and Rathedaung townships, causing up to 94,000 people to flee their homes to other parts of northern Rakhine or across the border into Bangladesh. The situation prompted MRCS with the support of IFRC to request for a DREF for complex emergencies worth CHF 69,653. The operation aims to provide assistance to 1,000 households in northern areas of Rakhine state between February – July 2017 by supporting MRCS emergency response readiness and conducting needs assessments. The TC Mora operation therefore occurred in the middle of ongoing complex emergency operation which have affected the capacity of the response as the capacity of MRCS was further stretched.

Implementation of the cyclone mora operation (June – September 2017) coincided with two emergency operations in Rakhine state. In the beginning, the operation coincided with the complex emergency operation which ended on 19 July 2017. A joint Movement response for population movement started on August 2017 which coincided with this operation at the end of its implementation period.

Security situation remained tense during the implementation period, with reports pointing to armed clashes with unknown armed groups, the discovery of weapons and other military equipment, and deaths of civilians. In July 2017 reports suggested that areas of Maungdaw and Buthidaung townships remained under active military activity with additional reports of civilian deaths, including a local INGO aid worker in Maungdaw township.

It remained difficult to verify the security incidents reports coming in, which further escalated uncertainty in what already was an unstable humanitarian situation and security environment. With an increased security risk and the enforcement of a curfew (9PM – 5AM), the above situation placed severe operational constraints on the implementation of this DREF.

Overview of Host National Society

MRCS had a network of branches and volunteers in all 17 townships in Rakhine State. These branches were trained and prepared to respond to the needs of vulnerable people across the state, in the event of natural disasters or other emergencies. In addition, and as a means of providing human resources within a sensitive communal conflict, MRCS deployed teams of Red Cross volunteers on a monthly basis from other states/regions in the country to support the operations, and slowly built up a programme team of recruited MRCS staff based in Sittwe, Mrauk-U, Minbya and Maungdaw townships.

MRCS had been responding to the displacement crisis in Rakhine since its onset in June 2012. In central Rakhine, interventions included distribution of relief items; provision of water and sanitation infrastructure in IDP camps (including water trucking); mobile clinics providing primary health care in IDP camps; emergency medical transportation; construction of temporary shelters for IDPs in camps; and support for livelihoods in indirectly affected villages. Since the beginning of 2017, MRCS further expanded their engagement in central Rakhine through integrated long-term programming aimed at increasing the resilience of communities indirectly affected by communal violence. Prior to responding to cyclone Mora in June 2017 through cash and relief item distributions in northern and central areas of Rakhine state, IFRC had supported MRCS preparedness to respond through prepositioning of relief items, and recruitment and training of volunteers in northern areas of Rakhine state.



Myanmar Red Cross Society volunteers and staff distributing unconditional cash grants to registered family representatives at distribution point in Minbya Township, Rakhine state in June 2017. (Photo: MRCS)

Overview of Red Cross Red Crescent Movement in country

Prior to Cyclone Mora in Rakhine state, there was already a strong and well-established Movement coordination mechanism in place at the Yangon level which was led by MRCS with the support of IFRC and ICRC. The coordination mechanism had been and remained a permanent feature which brought together MRCS and all its Movement partners within the country. In 2017, the Movement coordination mechanisms expanded to the field and reinforced guarantees for the Movement partners to communicate and work effectively together to achieve the operational priorities.

The Movement coordination mechanisms function at two levels: Yangon-based tripartite strategic level comprised of the MRCS president, ICRC head of delegation and IFRC head of country office; and at operational level (in Yangon, Sittwe and Maungdaw, involving operational/programming leads of MRCS, ICRC, IFRC and PNS). Among others, the two levels facilitated joint planning and preparedness which led to a coordinated response implementation based on common standards and approaches, harmonized resource mobilization, common external

communication, and well-coordinated efforts that enhanced presence and building the capacity of MRCS base units in Rakhine State.

Overview of non-RCRC actors in country

In the aftermath of Cyclone Mora, the Government's National Disaster Management Committee (NDMC) met for the first time in the capital city of Nay Pyi Taw on 30 May 2017 and discussed response and recovery actions. The Government's National Emergency Operations Centre (EOC) was activated and it collected data and information from states/regions in the country that supported planning for the response. The Government's EOC closely worked with MRCS's EOC and the Department of Meteorology Hydrology (DMH) EOC on information collection/sharing.

At national level, MRCS and IFRC regularly shared information and updates with Department of Relief and Resettlement (RRD), UNOCHA and UNHCR. IFRC also regularly attended meetings of the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) at Yangon, Sittwe and Maungdaw levels.

At the township and state level in Rakhine, MRCS regularly worked in coordination with the local authorities especially General Administration Department (GAD) and RRD. Wash, Health and Shelter/NFI/CCCM clusters were active in Myanmar and operated at national and field levels. At national level and Sittwe levels, IFRC often attended UNHCR shelter cluster coordination meetings and shared information on behalf of MRCS.

Needs analysis and scenario planning

Rakhine state has been and remains one of the least developed areas of Myanmar, with a diverse ethnic and religious population. The 2009-2010 Integrated Household Living Condition Survey, conducted before the current crisis, ranked Rakhine as the country's second poorest region, after Chin State. The state also performs poorly on a range of development indicators concerning hygiene, public health, education and other sectors, and is isolated from the rest of the country by difficult and inaccessible geography and weak transport links. Malnutrition is a concern in Rakhine, particularly in the north of the State, where some of the highest rates of global acute malnutrition and severe acute malnutrition have been recorded. Access to basic services like health care and education, and to markets and livelihoods opportunities, were limited for most Muslims already before the most recent violence, and the situation has since worsened either due to restricted movement, or to fear and insecurity. The prolonged conflict has affected all communities, but the situation is critical for Muslims, whose citizenship status remains unresolved.

Rakhine has been hit with varying degrees of severity by at least 6 tropical cyclones since the year 2000, most notably Cyclone Giri in 2010 and Cyclone Komen in 2015. Meanwhile, flooding occurs across parts of the state on an almost annual basis. Its low-lying coastline is exposed to a lower-level but still present threat from tsunami. The occurrence of Cyclone Mora in May 2017 was therefore expected.

From rapid assessments conducted by MRCS with IFRC support, Rakhine state was the most affected by the Cyclone Mora in Myanmar. Reports from the MRCS assessment indicated 14,482 houses partially or fully damaged in Maungdaw and Buthidaung townships (7,320 houses partially and 3,351 houses fully damaged in Maungdaw township; 2,948 houses partially and 863 fully damaged in Buthidaung township), and 1,630 houses damaged mainly in Sittwe, Minbya and Rathedaung townships. However, it was noted that MRCS had less capacity and access to conduct detailed needs assessment in all affected villages in Maungdaw and Buthidaung townships. Hence, confirmation of the figures was done through verification of information obtained through and in coordination with respective township disaster management committees.

The needs identified at the beginning of this project did not change. Overall, the figures related to food, water and sanitation, shelter and assistance to rebuild or repair public buildings, bridges, latrines, water systems, houses roofing, windows, walls and doors that had been totally or partially destroyed because of the cyclone. In addition, hygiene promotion which had also been identified due to increased risk of transmission of water borne diseases was provided during pre-distribution of hygiene parcels and dignity kits.

Access to improved water and sanitation in rural Rakhine was amongst the lowest in Myanmar. While access to drinking water was estimated at 33%, access to improved sanitation was at 23.6%. In areas exposed to strong wind, latrine superstructures had been damaged and access to water (ponds and open wells) had been affected. This was particularly problematic for women from a dignity perspective in terms of latrines and a hardship perspective as they were responsible for obtaining water for the households. Other key areas of need identified were dissemination

of key messages relating to hygiene promotion among the affected communities together with distribution of hygiene and dignity kits as priorities.

Based on the above, MRCS response through DREF was focused on distributing non-food items (NFI) in townships of Maungdaw, Buthidaung and Minbya, while distribution of unconditional multipurpose cash grants was limited to Minbya township where conditions including requisite community engagement were more favourable at the time. Furthermore, promotion of safe hygiene and sanitation practices were disseminated in all the three target townships.

Risk Analysis:

Following easing of access by international aid workers to many areas in northern areas of Rakhine state since April 2017, there was relative improvement for conducting field visits with limited restrictions. It is important to note however, that approvals by the local authorities on which villages could be visited and the dates remained in force due to security concerns. MRCS maintained regular dialogue with both local authorities and central government officials and advocated for principled humanitarian access with some reasonable success.

On 24 June, two Rakhine men from San Kar Pin Yin village in Maungdaw north were reportedly killed by a group of unidentified men. This prompted a retaliation by a group of armed Rakhine men accompanied by security personnel who mounted a search operation towards the Muslim village tract of Kyun Pauk Pyu Su, where the perpetrators allegedly lived. According to UN, over 1,400 Muslim villagers fled to the neighboring villages fearing retaliation. Calm was later restored with some returning to their villages in Baw Da Li and Baw Da Li 2 in the Kyun Pauk Pyu Su Village Tract by 27 June 2017.

Five days later on 29 June 2017, a 34-year-old Muslim employee working with an international aid organization on child protection and education, was attacked and killed by another group of unknown men in Maungdaw south. The local authorities attributed the death to personal dispute.

On 25 August 2017, there were coordinated attacks by armed groups on Myanmar security forces in northern areas of Rakhine State. Thirty police posts were attacked by Arakan Rohingya Salvation army (ARSA). According to government reports, 59 of ARSA and 12 members of the Myanmar security forces were killed in Maungdaw, Buthidaung and Rathedaung townships. This prompted Myanmar government declaring ARSA as a terrorist organization, which gave the state authorities powers to arrest and detain those suspected of belonging to ARSA. The attacks happened following the publication of Kofi Annan Commission's final report on 24 August 2017 amid objections from different political parties in the country claiming that "outsiders" were interfering in Myanmar's internal affairs.

The above key security incidents not only increased tensions among the target communities, but also limited the access and increased fear among MRCS staff and volunteers, and ultimately led to termination of implementation of this DREF operation on 21 September.

The implementation of this DREF operation (along with all other pre-existing MRCS activities and programs) was halted due to the escalation of violence starting with the 25 August 2017 incidents in northern Rakhine, and followed by several other security incidents in central Rakhine state mentioned above.

The above security incidents occurred at a critical time when the ongoing DREF operational context in Rakhine state had drastically changed from cyclone related to population movement in the same area that warranted scaling up joint RC Movement response to IDPs desperately in need of emergency assistance. The scaling up was done through the Population Movement Emergency Appeal funded by ICRC.

B. Operational strategy and plan

Overall Objective

The overall objective to ensure the basic immediate needs of 1,000 cyclone-affected families in Rakhine state are met through provision of emergency relief items and a multipurpose cash grant for a four-month period, was to a large extent achieved.

This is evidenced by the total implementation rate of 64% on average from the twenty-one DREF activity outputs with only three outputs (all in outcome 4, related to quality programming) with implementation rate lower than 50% on average. Four outputs covering cash grants, distribution of non-food items (NFIs), tarpaulins and needs assessment reached implementation rate of at least 50%; while three outputs on quality programming had implementation rate lower than 50%.

First, the impact of this DREF operation among the target population and MRCS consolidated the gains from the previous DREF operation in terms of: strengthening level of emergency preparedness at community and township branch levels; raising the profile of MRCS in the area; use of monitoring tools through routine monthly Movement; project and inter-agency meetings. The above gains helped to detect risks and proactively manage resources including time, and volunteers and relief items to meet workplan requirements.

Secondly, the MRCS staff and volunteers who underwent orientation in cash transfer programming gained new practical skills and experience in delivering the unconditional cash grants (UCG) especially in interacting with the target communities during pre-distribution assessment and actual delivery. At community level, the UCG empowered the target population with freedom to choose priorities for which to utilise the UCG, thus affording them increased dignity. No post-distribution monitoring was conducted due to constraints of easy access to villages in the target population in Minbya. While distribution exercise for the cash grants was only possible during morning hours for four days when tides were low on rivers leading to the distribution centres, the weather worsened thereafter, thus making it very risky to travel by boats on the same rivers due to all day-long high tides on the access rivers. According to MRCS, the target population in Minbya used the UCG to replace their livestock, buy seeds, household items that were not part of the standard NFI distributed by MRCS in those areas. The farmers in the target population were able to utilise the season (June-October) to plant seeds procured using the UCG, which ultimately may have boosted their health benefits and livelihoods.

The positive impact of the DREF was reportedly observed from increased demand for first aid training in the area leading to MRCS conducting two community based first aid courses for 35 participants who were awarded certificates. According to interviews with a few members of the target population in the three townships, the advocacy on MRCS' auxiliary role to local authorities among the local population and leadership and hygiene promotion campaign conducted prior to distributing hygiene kits went a long way to increase MRCS acceptance and boosted healthy lifestyle among the population respectively.

The above mentioned 64% achievement accounts mainly for outputs related to procurement and distribution of non-food items, procurement and distribution of hygiene related goods and awareness; volunteer mobilisation and supplies and provision of unconditional cash grants all of which scored above average percentage achievement.

However, performance on the quality programming continued to suffer delays which ultimately led to either lower or no implementation all notably conducting continuous needs assessments; maintaining two-way communication between MRCS and target population and conducting formal lessons learned workshop respectively. In addition, the planned post-monitoring exercise for UCG delivered was not conducted.

The inability to fully implement some of the planned activities was largely due to:

- The occurrence of massive population movement from Maungdaw as a result of clashes between armed groups and government security forces, which prompted a huge and joint Movement response which required huge mobilisation of resources by all Movement partners and therefore diverted attention from the ongoing DREF operation implementation.
- The deterioration of the security situation caused by the 25 August 2017, clashes between armed groups and the government security forces in Maungdaw township in northern area of Rakhine state, which heightened fears leading to relocation of key project staff and volunteers
- Increased political tensions prompted by public anger directed at UN agencies and other INGO staff operating in Rakhine state.

To address some of the challenges above, the MRCS announced a termination of activities in this operation on 21 September, both for security reasons and to focus capacities on intervention by the RC Movement to the Population Movement appeal, and as requested by the government. Moreover, Emergency Task Forces (ETF were activated at both Yangon and Sittwe levels, with deployment of senior and technical teams locally and globally as surge capacity to cope with the evolving emergencies within and outside Rakhine state in Myanmar.

Fig 1: Table shows timeframes for major emergency operations in Rakhine state in 2017 as at 7.12.2017

Category of Response	Area of Operation	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec

Complex Emergencies	Maungdaw Township												
Cyclone Mora	N & Central Rakhine												
Pop Movement	Rakhine State (5Tsps)												

Proposed strategy

In line with MRCS strategic plan 2016-2020, and IFRC strategy 2020, the DREF request was based on following principles:

- *Meet humanitarian needs of the affected population through provision of non-food items*
- *Support early recovery through provision of unconditional cash grants*
- *Emphasize community engagement and accountability through use of CEA minimum standards and tools*
- *Supplement the capacity of MRCS branches in affected areas from headquarters and state*

Based on needs and presence of MRCS, IFRC and ICRC in the affected area, operation was implemented in Rakhine State. The geographical focus of the operation was in Maungdaw, Buthidaung, Rathedaung and/or Sittwe townships. These townships were prioritized by MRCS based on the following criteria: guidance from authorities; severity of impact and needs; and townships where MRCS had existing operations/capacity. Needs in other affected states/regions (Chin, Magway, Ayeyarwady) was covered through MRCS own resources and bilateral contribution with PNS support.

Within the targeted townships, the operation sought to assist 1,000 vulnerable families (5,000 people) who were severely affected (such as shelter that was fully damaged) by the cyclone, and whose coping capacities were already compromised before the cyclone. The rationale of this beneficiary selection criterion was to reach and benefit the most affected households within a possibly high total number of affected populations. Households whose houses were partially damaged were also selected in case they meet MRCS vulnerability criteria (persons with disabilities, child-headed and women-headed households, and elderly). All relief items of this operation were part of the existing, standard MRCS disaster preparedness (DP) stock.

There was an established presence of several humanitarian actors (United Nations organizations, International Non-Governmental Organizations) in Rakhine State who supported the operation by providing services in IDP camps before Cyclone Mora occurred. Based on information received from Rakhine cluster updates, which outlined the mobilization of humanitarian assistance, it was envisaged that the humanitarian actors would assist the communities affected in the Internally Displaced Persons (IDP) camps; therefore, beneficiaries residing in IDP camps were outside the scope of this plan. This operation therefore targeted cyclone-affected beneficiaries in rural villages, where MRCS added value is through its volunteer network and community-based approaches. However, MRCS stood ready to fill gaps in NFI distributions in the IDP camps, if requested.

The operation comprised of following components:

- Provision of multi-purpose unconditional cash grant (of CHF 85) to 1,000 HHs;
- Distribution and replenishment of 1,000 tarpaulins
- Distribution of 1,000 hygiene parcels and 1,000 dignity kits; and promotion of safe hygiene and sanitation practices;
- Support MRCS branches in the affected areas

Operational support services

In addition to achievements referred above and as continuation of previous Complex Emergency DREF operation, this DREF was further supported with joint communication guidelines which were regularly updated and helped control potential misinformation in communicating internally and externally in a rather sensitive working environment. Guidelines on civilian military relations was developed together with ICRC and were shared and disseminated among all delegates, national staff and volunteers in Rakhine state.

Human resources (HR)

Ten staff from the MRCS disaster management (DM) department led the response operation. The coordination with logistics, health, organizational development (OD), and finance departments was done at all levels of the National Society.

For this operation, MRCS deployed a response team from MRCS HQ to support the local branch volunteers in the assessments and implementation of the plan. The team consisted of 2 technical staff with experience in cash transfer programming (CTP) in emergency settings; 6 Emergency Response Team (ERT) volunteers with 29 additional volunteers with experience in team leadership, community based first aid and CTP deployed from other states and regions. Moreover, MRCS had over 100 active volunteers in Rakhine state; of these, 38 were involved in relief distribution and cash distribution in Minbya, Maungdaw and Buthidaung townships.

IFRC had a team of three delegates (Health, Livelihoods/Cash and Program Support) currently based in Sittwe supporting the implementation of existing health and resilience programs in Mrauk-U, Minbya and Sittwe townships. The Program delegate was specifically responsible for supporting MRCS operations and branch capacity building in northern areas of Rakhine. The IFRC DM Delegate and DM/DRR Delegate, both based in Yangon, provided overall management and technical support to the operation.

Logistics and supply chain

Logistics activities aimed at effectively managing the supply chain, including, procurement, fleet, storage and transportation of relief items to distribution sites in accordance with the operation's requirements and aligned to IFRC's logistics standards, processes and procedures. Logistics support for this operation was provided through the strong capacity of the MRCS logistics built over the previous years operation. The IFRC AP OLPSM department in Kuala Lumpur extended its technical support to MRCS and the IFRC Myanmar Country Office as needed.

MRCS existing warehouse capacity was enough to meet operational needs and there was no need to hire additional warehouse capacity. MRCS also had an existing long-term framework agreement with transportation companies. These arrangements were used to transport the NFIs to Rakhine.

To meet the operational needs, MRCS locally procured 1,000 hygiene parcels and 1,000 hygiene kits while IFRC procured 1,000 pieces of tarpaulins for the DREF. All the NFIs had been delivered by MRCS to their field warehouses in Sittwe and Maungdaw and later transported to their respective distribution points in Minbya, Maungdaw and Buthidaung townships. All planned logistics activities to support this operation were achieved within the agreed timeframe.

Communications

On 30 May, a press release for cyclone Mora was published in the local media to promote the operation including information on donation procedures and funds utilisation. MRCS also utilised its Facebook page to promote the profile of the National Society and its response to Cyclone Mora.

Security

MRCS together with IFRC has set up a security and safety committee that assisted in setting up security systems and ensured that safety messages are developed and shared with all staff and volunteers working on this operation.

Updates on all the above-mentioned security incidents were shared, analysed and reviewed during monthly Movement coordination meetings both at strategic and operational levels and appropriate precautions were adopted and communicated to relevant stakeholders. Towards the end of this operation (early September 2017), the task force that had been established and meeting on daily basis at the Emergency Operations Centre (EOC) in Sittwe provided more comprehensive updates and mechanisms to address potential security threats during the just started joint Movement emergency response for the population movement in Rakhine state.

Planning, monitoring, evaluation, & reporting (PMER)

MRCS was responsible for day-to-day monitoring of the emergency operation in accordance with MRCS standard PMER guidelines. MRCS field staff and volunteers in affected townships report to MRCS Field Manager, based in

Sittwe, compiled reports together with MRCS M&E officer; with the support of MRCS Deputy Director of DM department at HQ.

Monthly review of the DREFs workplan and budget were conducted in order to maximize resource utilization, capture vital information necessary for updates, create a sense of urgency in meeting set targets within the timeframe and coordinate mobilisation of available resources to complete remaining activities as conditions permitted. Monthly DREF monitoring meetings with MRCS staff both at Yangon and Maungdaw were also held to gather and record key facts and figures related to activities implemented and plan for delayed activities in subsequent months.

C. Detailed Operational Plan

Food security, nutrition and livelihoods

Outcome 1: Communities, especially in disaster and crisis affected areas meet their immediate needs	Outputs		% of achievement
	Output 1.1: Households are provided with multipurpose cash grants to address their basic needs		68%
Activities	Was implementation on time?		% progress (estimate)
	Yes (x)	No (x)	
1.1.1 Conduct rapid emergency needs and capacity assessments	x		90%
1.1.2 Develop beneficiary targeting strategy and registration system to deliver intended assistance	x		70%
1.1.3 Conduct information sessions with appropriate CEA messages among targeted population; establish feedback mechanisms	x		75%
1.1.4 Disbursement of cash to 300 most vulnerable households (cash in envelopes)	x		95%
1.1.5 Post-distribution monitoring		x	10%

Progress towards outcomes

In Minbya township, MRCS conducted needs and capacity assessments for 342 households for the multipurpose unconditional cash grants (UCGs) in 16 villages which were part of the 30 villages where NFIs had been distributed. Findings from the assessments indicated availability and accessibility of markets e.g preferred basic household goods like, cooking utensils, beddings and clothing, livestock, farming seeds that met local demand in entire township population. Capacities of the target population in relation to UCG included; existing set up and organisation of village administration that verified registered beneficiary household representatives, facilitated in managing safety and security of the grants provided at the distribution centres.

The sixteen villages covered in the assessment were; Kalamataung, Panmyaung, Oaktayar, Laharkyal, Panzinmaw, Pyitawhla, Shwepyisoe, Thinbawseik Ywarthit, Maw ywar, Kywal tat, Zeekaihoung, Athaykarla, Yantai, Khamaungdaw, Sonye and Kyaungshaychaung. The assessment was conducted by ten MRCS Red Cross volunteers (all volunteers had completed CBFA TOT training and three out of the ten volunteers were Emergency Response Team (ERT) trained) under supervision of two Rakhine Special Programme (RSP) staff based in Sittwe between 2 to 7 July 2017. The needs assessment was conducted using designed tool (questionnaire) that provided criteria for selection of suitable beneficiaries.

After the needs assessment and selection of 286 households for the UCG, MRCS engaged the targeted population between 18 to 30 July 2017 by establishing and communicating to the community telephone contacts of two MRCS staff and volunteer ready to receive complaints and provide feedback on the UCG exercise. During the period, one complaint related to omission of one family considered most vulnerable and inquiry about criteria for selection of target households were attended to respectively prior to start of distribution of the UCG.

The one-off UCG of MMK 110,000 (CHF 80) per household for the 286 target households in Minbya township was a preferred mechanism for delivery of emergency assistance compared to NFI distribution because it provided them with a choice to purchase what they pleased, it was also cheaper to administer as it required less logistical planning and implementation and it gave the population, especially the mothers and their families the deserved dignity to prioritize their own needs.

In addition, according to MRCS programming for the UCG, the operation took into consideration the seasonality of the year (June-October) as a rainy season where often the cost of living tended to be high. The amount of MMK 110,000 distributed to each household was based on the high market prices that prevailed at the time during the rainy season. Delivery of the UCG was done directly to each registered and confirmed household representative in Minbya township having considered that the conditions did not pose high risk (safety) for managing the transfer process for the cash grants.

In order to enhance legitimacy and community ownership of the project, promote social inclusion and minimise ethnic disparities among the target population, MRCS engaged community, opinion and local leaders among the target population by presenting key messages on role of MRCS/ RC Movement, purpose, criteria for delivering UCG and the role of target population in ensuring accountability of the relief assistance to be provided. Also, the population was given time to air their views and concerns with MRCS taking on role of listener while acknowledging diversity.

Challenges

Poor weather conditions continued to hamper implementation of the DREF operation. Only small streams in the affected geographical area in Minbya were available as waterways to and from Sittwe and reaching some of the remote villages was difficult due to frequent high tides especially in afternoons. This often prevents movement, thus leading to delays in the implementation schedule.

MRCS response to TC Mora in Maungdaw and Buthidaung townships was delayed largely due to deteriorating security situation that hindered access to the target population as well as limited human resource (volunteers most of who had escaped with their parents following the August 2017 attacks) capacity at local branch level.

Lessons Learned

Due to short term gap between previous DREF operation and the Cyclone Mora DREF operation, MRCS was proactively kept in emergency operational mode, thus drawing from recent experience and momentum that helped quick planning and implementation of this DREF operation.

The month of September 2017 (Fig 1 above) which was not only the deadline for implementation of the DREF but also the busiest in terms of mobilising RC Movement operational surge capacity to match intervention in the evolving population movement crisis in Rakhine state. As a result, MRCS had to redirect its resources to meet multiple operational demands at all levels for Rakhine State.

Water, sanitation and hygiene promotion

Outcome 2: Immediate reduction in risk of airborne and water related diseases in target communities.	Outputs		% of achievement
	Output 2.1: Hygiene-related goods (NFIs) are provided to the target population		100%
Activities	Was implementation on time?		% progress (estimate)
	Yes (x)	No (x)	
2.1.1	Conduct rapid needs and capacity assessments	x	85%
2.1.2	Distribute 1,000 hygiene parcels and 1,000 dignity kits from existing MRCS stocks	x	100%

2.1.3	Conduct awareness raising sessions on safe hygiene and sanitation practices	x		60%
2.1.4	Procure and restock hygiene parcels and dignity kits	x		100%

Progress towards outcomes

In Minbya township, MRCS in the initial phase of the operation distributed 331 hygiene parcels and 155 dignity kits to 465 vulnerable households whose houses had been damaged or destroyed by TC Mora in 30 villages. The distributions were conducted by MRCS volunteers and overseen by its headquarter technical staff. Distributions were conducted on-site in affected villages, and during distributions, information on the content and proper use of the NFIs and precautions to be taken was shared to the target populations, along with beneficiary selection criteria and process of distribution.

In Maungdaw township, 369 hygiene parcels and 545 dignity kits were distributed to 500 households between 26 - 29 July 2017. In Buthidaung township, 300 hygiene parcels and 300 dignity kits were distributed to 200 households between 31 July and 2 August 2017. Out of a total of 25 volunteers earlier recruited and oriented, only 7 (28%) volunteers in total were available from the two townships to participate in the distribution of the NFIs. This was due to prevailing fear among the volunteers being seen working among different ethnic groups which restricted movements of community volunteers from their home villages to those outside theirs in the operational area. Summary of the distribution as seen in the table below:

Township	No. of hygiene parcels distributed	No. of dignity kits distributed	No. of HHs benefitted
Minbya	331	155	465
Maungdaw	369	545	500
Buthidaung	300	300	200
	1,000	1,000	1,165

Prior to distribution of hygiene parcels and the rest of the NFIs, selected hygiene messages were delivered by MRCS volunteers to the target population. The hygiene messages focused on importance of washing hands after visiting toilet, handling babies, how domestic water can be contaminated, and dangers associated with the contamination, best practices of disposal of feces in preventing transmitted diseases. Challenges were faced with distribution to all targeted groups due to access restrictions and security challenges.

In Minbya, MRCS used its existing stocks to distribute the hygiene parcels and dignity kits mentioned above which were later replenished from the local procurement made by MRCS. Distributions of the two NFI in Maungdaw and Buthidaung had been delivered to Maungdaw warehouse from where they were transported to distribution points using hired vehicles.

According to MRCS staff, dissemination of hygiene messages helped health promotion. This is because, water borne diseases was initially identified as a need due to the increased risk of transmission of water borne and vector borne diseases in the area.

Challenges

In Maungdaw and Buthidaung townships, target villages were not easily accessible due to insecurity and bad weather conditions which hampered reaching all targeted villages on time.

As a result, the seven volunteers were instead supported by village administrators who represented target communities in the two townships to conduct indirect distribution on the NFIs.

The occurrence of crisis for population movement overstretched MRCS' capacity to cope with simultaneous implementation of the two responses due to their limited capacity.

Lessons Learned

The cyclone mora DREF operation was compounded by another population movement crisis in the same area, this time caused by clashes involving armed groups especially in Maungdaw where access to target communities became extremely difficult.

It will take a long and integrated approach by all stakeholders to build trust among volunteers and their communities affected by violence.

Shelter and household items

Outcome 3: Communities in disaster and crisis affected areas restore and strengthen their safety, well-being and longer-term recovery through NFI distributions.	Outputs		% of achievement
	Output 3.1: Short-term settlement assistance is provided to affected households		100%
Activities	Was implementation on time?		% progress (estimate)
	Yes (x)	No (x)	
3.1.1 Conduct rapid needs and capacity assessments	x		85%
3.1.2 Distribute 1,000 tarpaulins	x		100%
3.1.3 Procure and restock tarpaulins	x		100%
Progress towards outcomes			
<p>In Minbya township, MRCS distributed 552 tarpaulins to a total of 465 households and 36 schools under this DREF. 55 of these households had fully damaged houses and 410 households had partially damaged houses. Each school received 3 tarpaulins which were distributed by MRCS volunteers under supervision of MRCS staff. Distributions were conducted on-site in affected villages. Prior to distribution sessions, information messages were communicated to beneficiaries and the content included; proper use of the NFIs, criteria used for the beneficiary selection and the process of distribution. The tarpaulins distributed in Minbya in June 2017 were obtained from existing MRCS stock which were later replenished.</p> <p>Procurement of the 1,000 tarpaulins was conducted by IFRC in Kuala Lumpur and delivered to MRCS at their Yangon warehouse by mid-August 2017.</p> <p>In Maungdaw and Buthidaung townships, 248 pieces and 200 pieces amounting to (448pieces) of tarpaulins were distributed to only 448 households out the targeted total of 700 households in the two townships. This was due to uncertainty related to access due to security situation in the area that had deteriorated. The target population (300 households) in Minbya for all NFIs had been overshoot by 252 pieces of tarpaulins in the earlier distribution of June 2017 due to the same reasons.</p> <p>In all the three townships, the tarpaulins distributed mitigated the existing high risk of ailments to the population caused by the bad weather by using them as temporary shelter on their houses, schools and health buildings and thus contributed to relative normalcy in the affected population's lifestyle.</p>			
Challenges			
<p>Volunteers and staff found it difficult to access all villages during assessment due to bad weather conditions. As a result, secondary data was also used to determine targeting of/ or verifying beneficiary selection.</p> <p>Due to constant access constraints for aid workers caused by insecurity especially in northern areas of Rakhine state, conducting needs assessments and providing timely humanitarian assistance remained a challenge due to persistent fear of MRCS volunteers and staff who were key actors. Relief activities remained severely limited in northern areas of Rakhine state and significantly disrupted across central Rakhine as of late September.</p>			
Lessons Learned			

Although the 700 households in northern areas of Rakhine state would have been top priority for the unconditional cash grants, operational conditions in terms of requisite direct and consistent engagement with the community in the response process were not favourable enough.

Quality 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: Needs assessments are conducted and response plans updated according to findings		78%
Activities	Was implementation on time?		% progress (estimate)
	Yes (x)	No (x)	
4.1.1 Mobilize staff and volunteers for assessments (including Movement Partners' resources)	x		85%
4.1.2 Procure safety and visibility items for volunteers, and FA kits; distribute items to branches	x		100%
4.1.3 Undertake assessments to determine specific needs of beneficiaries	x		65%
4.1.4 Together with Movement partners, develop detailed response plans with activities that will meet identified beneficiary needs	x		60%
Outcome 4: Continuous and detailed assessment and analysis is used to inform the design and implementation of the operation	Outputs		% of achievement
	Output 4.2: Additional assistance is considered where appropriate and incorporated into the plan		50%
4.2.1 Ensure that any adjustments to initial plans are informed by continuous assessment of needs		x	50%
Outcome 4: Continuous and detailed assessment and analysis is used to inform the design and implementation of the operation	Outputs		% of achievement
	Output 4.3: Mechanisms are in place to facilitate two-way communication with and ensure transparency and accountability to disaster-affected people		50%
4.3.1 Provide appropriate information, including on the scope and content of projects, to disaster-affected people		x	50%
4.3.2 Ensure that affected people can deliver feedback on the programmes and report any complaints, in confidence, and that such are actioned by MRCS and its partners		x	50%
Outcome 4: Continuous and detailed assessment and analysis is used to inform the design and implementation of the operation	Outputs		% of achievement
	Output 4.4: Management and delivery of the operation is informed by an appropriate monitoring and evaluation system		30%
4.4.1 Develop and utilize an appropriate M&E system to support monitoring of the operation progress, including final evaluations and lessons learnt activities		x	60%
4.4.2 Lessons Learned workshop		x	Not implemented
Progress towards outcomes			

MRCS procured; vests, T-shirts, bag packs, badges, helmets, waist coats, caps, rain coats and first aid kits as visibility items all labelled with MRCS logo. Maungdaw, Buthidaung and Minbya township branches each received 50 pieces of each of the items procured as part of promoting visibility. The impact of the visibility materials was that when they were distributed and used by MRCS staff and volunteers during the DREF operation, MRCS presence was enhanced. Furthermore, the visibility materials provided the staff and volunteers with a strong sense of identity, pride and obligation to abide by the fundamental principles while at work.

A detailed implementation plan for the DREF operation was developed in close cooperation with Movement partners based in Sittwe. The implementation plans provided information on beneficiary selection criteria, human resources required and risk assessment. Furthermore, IFRC and MRCS agreed on joint monthly review and monitoring of progress made in the implementation of workplan using an excel sheet template for monitoring progress through providing brief notes on activities implemented, delayed and why for guiding reporting and follow up.

Through continuous needs assessment and monitoring, MRCS was able to ascertain the actual figure of target population for the UCG based on verification of beneficiary lists.

Challenges

Failure to conduct the lessons learned exercise for the DREF was due to its early termination arising from both security concerns that limited gathering or accessing key stakeholders in the operation and diverted attention by key stakeholders on the ongoing RC Movement emergency response for the population movement.

Lessons Learned:

With limited technical human resource capacity in the field, both MRCS and IFRC teams in the field were overstretched having to cope with not only simultaneous closing and reporting on just ended DREFs (June-September,2017) but also making preparations for the new emergency responses in Rakhine state.

The OCHA representative in Sittwe had requested to participate in the planned “Lessons Learned” exercise for the DREF after sharing the initial EPoA with him in early stages of its inception. This was a clear indication of the importance UN attached to the MRCS auxiliary role played and the experience it had demonstrated in delivering emergency assistance to the affected population in Rakhine state and as part of the wider RC Movement.

The technical capacity of MRCS to maintain same pace of implantation of the three emergency responses in succession was overstretched.

D. Final Financial

Click [here](#) for the final financial report.

Variances in the budget:

Workshops and Trainings (CHF -301):

The cost of hotel accommodation and air travel for both IFRC and MRCS personnel increased due to frequent visits to and from Sittwe to monitor and support implementation of the project.

Total relief items (CHF 4,828)

The positive variance was mainly due to unspent working advance due to delayed of scheduled activities in northern areas of Rakhine state due to worsening security situation and changes in the context arising from new emergency of population movement, for which RC Movement was tasked to undertake as a matter of priority. The highest under expenditures were on cash disbursement and shelter relief.

Logistics, Transport & Storage (CHF 1,767)

The bulk of the under expenditure was on distribution and monitoring which was due to limited access to distant areas of distribution, and low frequency of monitoring field visits due to constant security concerns in the operational area.

Personnel (CHF 7,456)

The highest under expenditure was on volunteers. Some of the MRCS local volunteers either fled with their families due to sporadic communal violence, or did not participate in the field visits for fear of reprisals all of which reduced expenses on their operational costs. The limited period of the operation (3.75 months) and overlap with the population movement operation also contributed to less expenditure on volunteers as volunteer capacities were prioritised for that operation.

General Expenditure (CHF 1,473)

The highest under-expenditure was on communications, partly due to early termination of the DREF implementation and overlaps in emergency operations (population movement) that had competing budgets.

Indirect Costs (CHF 989)

The highest under-expenditure was on programme and services recovery. This is linked to the overall under-expenditure of the operation.

Reference documents



Click here for:

[Emergency Plan of Action \(EPoA\)](#)

[Operations Update 1](#)

Contact information

In Myanmar Red Cross Society, Yangon:

- ✓ U Khin Maung Hla, secretary general; email: ed-mrcs@myanmarredcross.org.mm
- ✓ Daw San San Maw, director of disaster management department; email: dm1@myanmarredcross.org.mm

In IFRC Country Office, Yangon:

- ✓ Joy Singhal, head of office; email: Joy.Singhal@ifrc.org
- ✓ Charles G. Byamugisha, programme delegate, Rakhine state, email: charles.byamugisha@ifrc.org

In IFRC Asia Pacific Regional Office, Kuala Lumpur:

- ✓ Martin Faller, deputy regional director; email: martin.faller@ifrc.org
- ✓ Nelson Castano, head of disaster and crisis unit (DCPRR); email: nelson.castano@ifrc.org
- ✓ Maya Helwani, surge operations coordinator; email: maya.helwani@ifrc.org

For resource mobilization and pledge enquiries:

- ✓ Sophia Keri, resource mobilisation in emergencies coordinator; email sophia.keri@ifrc.org

For communications enquiries:

- ✓ Rosemarie North, communications manager; mobile: +60-122-308-451; email: rosemarie.north@ifrc.org

For planning, monitoring, evaluation and reporting (PMER) enquiries

- ✓ Clarence Sim, PMER manager; email: clarence.sim@ifrc.org

In IFRC Geneva:

- ✓ Susil Perera, senior officer, response and recovery; phone: +41-2-2730-4947; email: susil.perera@ifrc.org
- ✓ Christina Estrada, Operations Quality Assurance Senior Officer; email: christina.estrada@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 (NGO's) 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

MDRMM009 - Myanmar - Cyclone Mora

Timeframe: 09 Jun 17 to 30 Sep 17

Appeal Launch Date: 09 Jun 17

Final Report

Selected Parameters

Reporting Timeframe	2017/6-2017/12	Programme	MDRMM009
Budget Timeframe	2017/6-2017/9	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		83,397				83,397	
B. Opening Balance							
Income							
<u>Other Income</u>							
<i>DREF Allocations</i>		83,397				83,397	
C4. Other Income		83,397				83,397	
C. Total Income = SUM(C1..C4)		83,397				83,397	
D. Total Funding = B + C		83,397				83,397	

* 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		83,397				83,397	
E. Expenditure		-67,185				-67,185	
F. Closing Balance = (B + C + E)		16,212				16,212	

Disaster Response Financial Report

MDRMM009 - Myanmar - Cyclone Mora

Timeframe: 09 Jun 17 to 30 Sep 17

Appeal Launch Date: 09 Jun 17

Final Report

Selected Parameters

Reporting Timeframe	2017/6-2017/12	Programme	MDRMM009
Budget Timeframe	2017/6-2017/9	Budget	APPROVED
Split by funding source	Y	Project	*
Subsector:	*		

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

III. Expenditure

Account Groups	Budget	Expenditure					TOTAL	Variance
		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)			83,397			83,397		
Relief items, Construction, Supplies								
Shelter - Relief	13,000		18,847			18,847	-5,847	
Water, Sanitation & Hygiene	5,840		5,159			5,159	681	
Medical & First Aid	750		623			623	127	
Other Supplies & Services	8,760		1,858			1,858	6,902	
Cash Disbursement	25,500		22,534			22,534	2,966	
Total Relief items, Construction, Sup	53,850		49,022			49,022	4,828	
Logistics, Transport & Storage								
Storage			574			574	-574	
Distribution & Monitoring	4,117		1,741			1,741	2,376	
Transport & Vehicles Costs	3,000		3,380			3,380	-380	
Logistics Services	1,500		1,155			1,155	345	
Total Logistics, Transport & Storage	8,617		6,850			6,850	1,767	
Personnel								
International Staff			1,409			1,409	-1,409	
National Society Staff	2,400		2,250			2,250	150	
Volunteers	8,990		276			276	8,714	
Total Personnel	11,390		3,934			3,934	7,456	
Workshops & Training								
Workshops & Training	700		1,001			1,001	-301	
Total Workshops & Training	700		1,001			1,001	-301	
General Expenditure								
Travel	1,400		1,644			1,644	-244	
Office Costs	150		105			105	45	
Communications	1,500		92			92	1,408	
Financial Charges	700		436			436	264	
Total General Expenditure	3,750		2,277			2,277	1,473	
Indirect Costs								
Programme & Services Support Recove	5,090		4,100			4,100	989	
Total Indirect Costs	5,090		4,100			4,100	989	
TOTAL EXPENDITURE (D)	83,397		67,185			67,185	16,212	
VARIANCE (C - D)			16,212			16,212		

Disaster Response Financial Report**MDRMM009 - Myanmar - Cyclone Mora**

Timeframe: 09 Jun 17 to 30 Sep 17

Appeal Launch Date: 09 Jun 17

Final Report

Selected Parameters

Reporting Timeframe	2017/6-2017/12	Programme	MDRMM009
Budget Timeframe	2017/6-2017/9	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	83,397		83,397	83,397	67,185	16,212	
Subtotal BL2	83,397		83,397	83,397	67,185	16,212	
GRAND TOTAL	83,397		83,397	83,397	67,185	16,212	