


www.ifrc.org
Saving lives,
changing minds.

DREF final report

Saint Vincent and the Grenadines: Floods

 International Federation
of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

DREF operation n° MDRVC001
GLIDE n° [FL-2011-000043-VCT](#)
13 January 2011

The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent (IFRC) Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF) is a source of un-earmarked money created by the Federation in 1985 to ensure that immediate financial support is available for Red Cross Red Crescent response to emergencies. The DREF is a vital part of the International Federation's disaster response system and increases the ability of National Societies to respond to disasters.

Summary: 36,303 Swiss francs were allocated from the IFRC's DREF on 2 May 2011 to support the Saint Vincent and the Grenadines Red Cross (SVGRC) in delivering assistance to some 200 households.

The SVGRC DREF-supported operation distributed pre-positioned stocks to the most affected families by the Georgetown floods, including: hygiene kits, blankets, jerry cans and cleaning kits to 55 families in emergency and informal collective centres.

The flooding affected the water supply system, which made the water non-potable and created a demand for clean and safe water. The SVGRC trucked water and acquired chlorination tablets through the DREF operation to purify the water, as well as cleaning kits to support the recovery of the homes that had been affected by mud and debris from the floods. Families affected by the Georgetown floods lost many of their household belonging; therefore kitchen sets were identified as a need and were distributed to affected families to assist them to reassume their daily activities.



Volunteers of the Saint Vincent and the Grenadines Red Cross distributed relief items to 55 affected families. Source: SVGRC

The National Society was the first to assist the National Emergency Management Office (NEMO) immediately after the disaster with food items for families displaced by the flood. The SVGRC is a small National Society and as such has very limited resources to respond to emergencies. In spite of these limitations, the National Society was able to assist NEMO in responding to this disaster. The National Society's Emergency Operations Centre was activated and volunteers worked with a team from NEMO and other agencies to assist the affected families. Active volunteers, including some trained as Regional Intervention Team members and National Intervention Team members were able to respond to the immediate needs of the community, distributing items from pre-positioned stock and items supplied through the DREF. The DREF also supported the replenishment of the pre-positioned stock in order for the SVGRC to be prepared to respond to the next disaster.

This report is final in terms of narrative and financials. The operation is now closed, with a final balance of 23,171 Swiss francs unspent. This was due to the inability to conduct the water and sanitation training for SVGRC staff because of the additional workload from the activities related to the Hurricane Tomas

Emergency Appeal (MDR49006) that the SVGRC was also managing at the same time. Some of the water activities were also not conducted, as the government was able to repair the water supply system, which reassumed its operation much quicker than was anticipated. The remaining funds will be returned to the IFRC's Disaster Relief Emergency Fund according to standards defined in the DREF guidelines.

The major donors and partners of DREF include the Australian, American and Belgian governments, the Austrian Red Cross, the Canadian Red Cross and government, Danish Red Cross and government, the European Commission Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (ECHO), the Irish and the Italian governments, the Japanese Red Cross Society, the Luxembourg government, the Monaco Red Cross and government, the Netherlands Red Cross and government, the Norwegian Red Cross and government, the Spanish Government, the Swedish Red Cross and government, the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID), the Medtronic and Z Zurich Foundations, and other corporate and private donors. The IFRC, on behalf of the national society, would like to extend thanks to all for their generous contributions.

The Australian government replenished the DREF for the allocation made to this operation. Details of all contributions to the DREF for 2010 can be found on: http://www.ifrc.org/docs/appeals/Active/MAA00010_2010.pdf and for 2011 on: http://www.ifrc.org/docs/appeals/Active/MAA00010_2011.pdf

The situation

Heavy rainfall caused rivers to overflow and landslides in the north windward region of Saint Vincent on 11 and 12 April 2011. The floodwaters washed out three bridges making it difficult for relief workers to access the affected regions and some communities were isolated as the sole road leading north of Georgetown was blocked. The Georgetown community and the northeastern regions were the most heavily affected. Local infrastructure and houses in this area were severely damaged and 55 families were identified as being the most affected and in need of assistance.

The evening flooding was unexpected and caught people off-guard. Some families had to take refuge at neighbouring houses while others retreated to the corners of their homes until the water subsided and they could be accommodated at the collective centre. NEMO activated the branches of its national response system to restore the minimal facilities needed until initial damage and needs assessments were completed.

Assistance to these affected communities was even more pressing because they were still recovering from the effects of Hurricane Tomas. Less than six months earlier in October and November 2011, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines suffered damages from strong winds and excessive rains due to Hurricane Tomas. The hurricane caused severe flooding, landslides, damage to livelihoods and to infrastructure, including the water services.

Red Cross and Red Crescent action

The Saint Vincent and the Grenadines Red Cross activated its volunteers to participate in a multi-agency damage and needs assessment with the Central Water and Sewage Authority and NEMO. Members of the Community-based Disaster Response Team (CDRT) trained through the disaster preparedness programme of the European Commission's Humanitarian Aid Department (DIPECHO) were also deployed to the affected areas. The CDRT was able to improve information gathering from the field, which resulted in an effective assessment of needs.

Following the needs assessment, the National Society collaborated with NEMO and distributed food and non-food items to families at the collective centre using the pre-positioned stock. A second distribution of relief items supported families that had still not returned to their homes. An additional quantity of supplies of kitchen sets, blankets, hygiene kits, food packages and cleaning kits were later disbursed to the families whose houses had been the most affected and required additional support.

Two galvanized water tanks were procured to alleviate the water crisis that existed in the community following the floods. By the time the DREF went in to effect, this effort was deemed unnecessary because repair of the water supply systems by the government was already underway, and it was determined that repairs would be completed quicker than was initially anticipated. Therefore, buckets and jerry cans were distributed to the affected families as an alternative, which enable them to collect and store safe drinking water while the repairs were completed.

Achievements against outcomes

The community of Georgetown remained the area most affected by the water disruption and was the focal point for all relief efforts. The DREF-supported operation focused on two main areas of assistance: relief distribution and water, sanitation and hygiene promotion. Assisting the immediate needs of the most affected families was accomplished through four distribution phases – an initial distribution to provide for immediate needs of those in the collective centre, a secondary distribution to families that were still housed in a subsequent collective centre, a third distribution of supplies to support families returning to their homes, and a fourth distribution to these most affected families to assist in their recovery.

The other component area was the provision of safe water through supplemental trucking, distribution of chlorination tablets and the promotion and support of adequate hygiene and sanitation practices. This included the distribution of cleaning kits to support affected persons in preventing the spread of water-borne diseases. The operation also covered the replenishment of the pre-positioned non-food items that were distributed by the National Society immediately following the emergency.

Lessons learned from the operation involve the capacity of the National Society, communication with the IFRC, coordination with the government and procurement processes. As it is a small National Society and despite their active volunteer base and dedicated staff, managing two operations at the same time strained the SVGRC's resources. Although the National Society was managing an increased workload due to these operations, the visibility of the Red Cross in the communities was increased and the communities are now more familiar with the activities of the National Society. There is an increased awareness and respect for the Red Cross, and community participation in preparedness activities has increased since the operations. Therefore, although the National Society faced challenges due to the heavy workload of both operations, they were successful in increasing their capacity to manage operations and implement multiple activities.

The duality of the operations also increased the demand on financial, administrative and reporting tasks. In this respect, there is a need to improve communication between the IFRC and the National Society for timely and efficient management. This aspect will be taken into account during future operations to improve communications. Coordination with the government agencies has also increased. The two actors are now more familiar with the capacities and activities of each other, which will prove useful in coordinating activities in the future. This will be specifically advantageous in the planning stages, for example in knowing the timeframes and abilities of the government to repair infrastructure.

Capacity in local procurement processes has also increased, and the National Society is building closer relationships with local suppliers, which will enhance its ability to identify and purchase local materials in a more efficient manner in the future.

Relief distributions (food and basic non-food items)
Outcome: Affected households have received basic non-food items and food to meet their immediate needs and enable them to return to everyday life as quickly as possible
Output: 55 households are supported with basic non-food relief items and food items
Activities planned: Assessment and selection of the most vulnerable families <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local procurement of cleaning materials for cleaning kits • Distribution of basic household kits and control of distribution and monitoring phase • Replenishment of utilized stocks • Monitoring and evaluation of activities

Impact: The National Society was able to rapidly distribute relief items after the disaster due to the pre-positioning of supplies in Georgetown. The following items were distributed: 60 water buckets, 47 blankets, 100 jerry cans, 42 hygiene kits, 23 food packages and 21 kitchen sets. This initial distribution assisted 55 affected households, which were sheltered at the Langley Park School collective centre. The second distribution phase assisted 17 families which were staying at a subsequent collective centre at the Georgetown Community Centre. Families had been moved to this second location because they were still unable to return to their homes, and the first site was no longer deemed appropriate.

Many of the affected families began cleaning the mud and silt from all their homes as soon as the floods receded and it was safe to carry out cleaning activities. However, not all the families had the necessary tools to start the cleaning process and recover the use of their homes. A damage and needs assessment and beneficiary selection process was carried out in collaboration with NEMO and the Central Water and Sewage Authority to identify families in need of materials to clean their homes. Based on this assessment, the SVGRC assisted 24 families with cleaning kits of brooms, shovels, wheelbarrows, disinfectant (chlorine), rubber hoses and gloves. The supplies enabled the identified families to begin the process of cleaning their homes to make them habitable again. All these supplies were procured locally, as this was the most efficient and cost-effective process. The SVGRC volunteers distributed the cleaning kits and supported the affected families with the cleaning process as well.

The final relief distribution phase assisted these 24 families, who were identified as those most in need. The families were located in the areas of: Georgetown, Brownstown, Caratal, New Chapman, Basin Hole, Langley Park and O'Brien Valley. The following additional items were distributed: 22 hygiene kits, 27 blankets, 21 kitchen sets and 23 food packages. Food packages were donated by community members.

The overall outcome of supporting *the affected households with basic non-food and food items to meet their immediate needs* was met with 55 families being supported with an initial distribution and 17 of these families receiving additional support through a second distribution. The overall outcome of *enabling them to return to everyday life as quickly as possible* was met by the SVGRC volunteers assisting the affected families with cleaning their houses and removing debris, and the provision of cleaning kits to 24 families that lacked the appropriate supplies. These 24 families were further supported by a final distribution of relief items to assist them to return to their daily activities.

The SVGRC upheld the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement's ideals of incorporating gender considerations within the operation. Based on the final distribution phases, 70 per cent of the beneficiary families were female headed-households and 14 per cent of these households were headed by a woman over the age of 50 years old. Consideration was also given to the young and the elderly - 40 per cent of the persons reached were children and youth and 18 per cent of the persons reached were elderly. It is important to note that distributions were conducted based on the specific needs of affected families, therefore a standard package of relief items was not distributed, but beneficiaries received items according to the items they were in need of.

To ensure continued preparedness of the National Society, the pre-positioned stock used to respond to the emergency has been replenished. The items are pre-positioned in Georgetown. This will ensure easy access for the National Society and increase their ability to respond to future events effectively.

The DREF operation also covered the purchase of one laptop to support the National Society's activities.



The Director General of the Saint Vincent and the Grenadines Red Cross visited the affected houses after volunteers distributed cleaning kits and assisted with the cleaning process. Source: IFRC

Water, Sanitation and Hygiene promotion.

Outcome 1: The risk of waterborne and water related diseases has been reduced through the provision of safe water to 200 families in the affected areas for one month

Output: 200 families have received safe water while damaged water systems are restored

Activities planned:

- Provide safe water through supplementary water trucking to 100 families through portable water tanks
- Provide chlorination tablets to 100 families in the affected areas

Outcome 2: The water and sanitation response capacity of the SVGRC is increased

Output: Red Cross volunteers are trained in the use of water and sanitation equipment

Activities planned:

- Conduct training/information programmes for Red Cross volunteers on the safe use of water treatment kits and products

Impact: The Central Water and Sewage Authority was swift to restore the water systems in most areas. While this was being carried out, the SVGRC trucked water to areas in need for 15 days. This provided the affected families with access to safe water while the local authorities repaired systems in these remaining areas. Supplies were also provided to the identified beneficiaries to assist them in carrying and storing the water safely. As mentioned above, 60 buckets and 100 jerry cans were distributed to the affected families in order to support safe water, sanitation and hygiene practices.

To further support water and hygiene promotion needs, the SVGRC coordinated with the Central Water and Sewage Authority to provide chlorination tablets to 200 families in the affected areas. The chlorination tablets provided an economical, timely and easy method of purifying water. The distribution was effective in that it helped to reduce the risk of diseases like diarrhoea, cholera, typhoid, jaundice and gastrointestinal diseases, which are predominantly spread through water contamination.

Therefore, the overall outcome of *providing safe water to 200 families in the affected area for one month to reduce waterborne and water related disease risk* was met through the trucking of water in the first 15 days, and the distribution of chlorination tablets to 200 families to support access to safe water.

The outcome of *training SVGRC volunteers in the use of water and sanitation equipment* was furthered but no formal training was conducted. This was due to the fact that the SVGRC were already operating at maximum capacity due to the ongoing response to Hurricane Tomas that began in April 2011. Although the volunteer base increased due to this disaster, the volunteers were responding to the continued needs from the hurricane as well as the pressing needs from this new emergency. Instead, capacity development occurred through a learning-by-doing approach. Volunteers and staff of the SVGRC actively distributed cleaning supplies, assisted with the recovery of the affected families' homes by cleaning and removing debris, and in the implementation of public awareness activities on safe water practices.

In relation to raising awareness on safe water practices, the National Society liaised with NEMO and the Public Health department on the development and dissemination of information on safe drinking water. This information was distributed island-wide and informed the affected families and the greater community on water safety issues. The SVGRC also collaborated with the government on public awareness of water and health issues by driving through communities around the island with a sound truck providing information.

The capacity of the SVGRC was also improved through the experience of responding to health-related issues concerning shelter. Families complained that their children were experiencing severe headaches while staying at the collective centre. This was determined to be due to poor ventilation at the collective centre. The National Society facilitated the relocation of the families out of this collective centre and to their homes through the distribution of cleaning supplies and cleaning support, thus resolving the problem.

With regard to capacity development, the SVGRC also suggested the possibility of sharing knowledge between National Societies. Through the Hurricane Tomas operation, the SVGRC became very knowledgeable in shelter reconstruction activities through the support from the IFRC shelter coordinator and a shelter training. The Saint Lucia Red Cross, the National Society of its neighbouring island, became specialized in water and sanitation activities. It was suggested that the two National Societies could share expertise thus developing each other's capacity. This would increase both National Societies response

capacities, specifically the SVGRC in water, sanitation and health issues. It would also facilitate closer collaboration between the National Societies for future operations.

Contact information

For further information specifically related to this operation please contact:

- **In Saint Vincent and the Grenadines:** Bernard Marksman, director general, phone: +1 784 494 8008; email: bernard_marksman@yahoo.com
- **IFRC Regional Representation:** Howard Arfin, regional representative for the Caribbean; phone: +1 868 628 2439; email: howard.irfin@ifrc.org
- **IFRC Zone:** Jorge Zequeira, PADRU coordinator, phone: +507 316 1001; email: jorge.zequeira@ifrc.org
- **In Geneva:** Pablo Medina, operations quality assurance senior officer; phone: +41 22 730 4300; email: pablo.medina@ifrc.org
- **Regional Logistics Unit (RLU):** Douglas Baquero; regional logistic coordinator; phone: +507 316 1001; email: douglas.baquero@ifrc.org

For Resource Mobilization and Pledges:

- **In IFRC Zone:** Zuleyka Maynard; resource mobilization officer; phone: + 507 317 1304; email: zuleyka.maynard@ifrc.org

**For Performance and Accountability
(planning, monitoring, evaluation and reporting enquiries)**

- **In IFRC Zone:** Jane Grimshaw: PMER coordinator; phone: +507.317.3050; email: jane.grimshaw@ifrc.org
-

DREF history:

- This DREF was initially allocated on 2 May 2011 for 36,303 Swiss francs for three months to assist 55 families.
 - DREF operation was completed in August 2011.
-



Click here

1. Click [here](#) to return to the title page
 2. Click [here](#) to view the final financial report
-

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 Disaster 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.

www.ifrc.org
Saving lives, changing minds.



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

1. Save lives, protect livelihoods, and strengthen recovery from disaster and crises.
 2. Enable healthy and safe living.
 3. Promote social inclusion and a culture of non-violence and peace.
-



Selected Parameters	
Reporting Timeframe	2011/5-2011/11
Budget Timeframe	2011/5-2011/11
Appeal	MDRVC001
Budget	APPEAL

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

I. Consolidated Funding

	Disaster Management	Health and Social Services	National Society Development	Principles and Values	Coordination	TOTAL
A. Budget	36,303					36,303
B. Opening Balance	0					0
Income						
Other Income						
<i>DREF Allocations</i>	36,303					36,303
C4. Other Income	36,303					36,303
C. Total Income = SUM(C1..C4)	36,303					36,303
D. Total Funding = B + C	36,303					36,303
Appeal Coverage	100%					100%

II. Movement of Funds

	Disaster Management	Health and Social Services	National Society Development	Principles and Values	Coordination	TOTAL
B. Opening Balance	0					0
C. Income	36,303					36,303
E. Expenditure	-13,132					-13,132
F. Closing Balance = (B + C + E)	23,171					23,171

International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
MDRVC001 - Saint Vincent and the Grenadines - Floods

Appeal Launch Date: 02 may 11

Appeal Timeframe: 02 may 11 to 31 aug 11

Final Report

Selected Parameters	
Reporting Timeframe	2011/5-2011/11
Budget Timeframe	2011/5-2011/11
Appeal	MDRVC001
Budget	APPEAL

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

III. Consolidated Expenditure vs. Budget

Account Groups	Budget	Expenditure					TOTAL	Variance
		Disaster Management	Health and Social Services	National Society Development	Principles and Values	Coordination		
A		B					A - B	
BUDGET (C)	36,303						36,303	
Relief items, Construction, Supplies								
Shelter - Relief	1,637	1,234					1,234	403
Clothing & Textiles	289	263					263	25
Food	875							875
Water, Sanitation & Hygiene	13,634	2,348					2,348	11,286
Teaching Materials	1,925							1,925
Utensils & Tools	2,261	1,881					1,881	380
Other Supplies & Services		2,163					2,163	-2,163
Total Relief items, Construction, Supplies	20,621	7,890					7,890	12,731
Logistics, Transport & Storage								
Storage		5					5	-5
Distribution & Monitoring	3,500	276					276	3,225
Transport & Vehicles Costs	438							438
Logistics Services	778	300					300	478
Total Logistics, Transport & Storage	4,715	581					581	4,135
Personnel								
Volunteers	1,313	1,214					1,214	99
Total Personnel	1,313	1,214					1,214	99
Workshops & Training								
Workshops & Training	2,625							2,625
Total Workshops & Training	2,625							2,625
General Expenditure								
Travel	3,500							3,500
Office Costs	438	755					755	-317
Communications		287					287	-287
Financial Charges	875	1,605					1,605	-730
Total General Expenditure	4,813	2,647					2,647	2,166
Indirect Costs								
Programme & Services Support Recov	2,216	801					801	1,414
Total Indirect Costs	2,216	801					801	1,414
TOTAL EXPENDITURE (D)	36,303	13,132					13,132	23,171
VARIANCE (C - D)		23,171					23,171	