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A. SITUATION ANALYSIS

Description of the disaster
On 24 January 2021, Tropical Storm Eloise made landfall in South Africa after it was predicted by the South African Weather Service to cause disruptions in Limpopo, Mpumalanga, and KwaZulu Natal. The tropical storm also extended to other provinces without causing any damages but increased run-offs. The floods triggered by the heavy rain reportedly killed four people in South Africa. Across all the three main affected provinces, some of the homes were damaged or destroyed and families were separated during the floods. The floods damaged infrastructure including roads, bridges, equipment, and amenities which led to the disruption of the routine functioning of this facility in the affected areas.

The tropical storm resulted in the displacement of 3,200 people (640 households) in Mpumalanga, KZN, and Limpopo provinces. The affected communities were evacuated to the identified evacuation centres including schools and churches. Although timely evaucations were conducted, evacuation teams faced challenges of resistance from other community members. The dams in the three affected provinces were reported to be full and were overflowing heavily. Some water pumps were reported to have been washed away by floods in the affected provinces. According to the Hydrology unit, accumulated rain greater than 20mm was recorded in Limpopo and Mpumalanga from the 25th of January and more than 100mm recorded from the 26th of January. Cooperative Governance and Traditional
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Affairs (COGTA), local district and provincial municipalities and disaster management centres, and SARCS embarked on joint assessments to assess the impact and needs of people affected by the floods.

In addition, the joint assessments which were conducted in the three provinces were crucial to ensure well-coordinated response and relief to avoid duplication. The table below outlines the impacts caused by the storm in the three provinces.

This DREF Operation was launched on 02 February 2021 to respond to the immediate humanitarian needs of 1,500 people affected by tropical storm Eloise through the provision of emergency shelter and essential household items, health care, WASH and food security for three months. The operation ended on 31 May 2021.

Summary of response

Overview of Operating National Society
SARCS has a Contingency Plan (CP) for floods which was activated and guided the National Society in responding to flooding resulting from the storm in Mpumalanga, Limpopo, and KwaZulu-Natal. Following the issuance of the storm forecast by the government, the National Society mobilized in total 220 volunteers to be on standby and were also given orientation sessions on PGI, CEA and other disaster response mechanisms. However, only 20 volunteers were actively engaged in the operation (7 KwaZulu-Natal, 8 Mpumalanga, and 5 Limpopo) and 15 staff members in three provinces.

The National Disaster Management Centre (NDMC), South African Weather Service (SAWS), and Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (COGTA) requested the support of SARCS volunteers to disseminate Early Warning Messages to the communities, as the National Society is known for its great strength in community engagement and accountability (CEA). More so, SARCS volunteers come from affected communities, which made them agents of communication especially in early warning messages and leading mitigation initiatives in local communities. Benefitting from good relations with Government communications and local media platforms, SARCS provincial teams embarked on public awareness and sensitization sessions on Early Warning Messages in disaster/storm-prone communities through door-to-door campaigns, community radio stations, social media platforms, and loud hailers.

The national office technical staff were deployed to Mpumalanga and Limpopo to provide technical support in conducting rapid assessments, enhance National Society visibility through media engagements, and ensure timely assessments and response. More so, SARCS ensured the pre-positioning of food stocks and hygiene packs in affected provinces. The Psychosocial support (PSS) teams were also activated to offer support as the early warning caused stress and anxiety to at-risk communities. The National Society immediately assisted 139 households with food parcels, nutritional packs, blankets, mattresses, masks, and hygiene packs with assistance from the government, who provided transport for easy distribution particularly in the hard-to-reach areas.
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areas. The National Society undertook continuous assessments to ensure the services provided were appropriate to the needs of the affected people. SARCS as an auxiliary to the government participated in National Joint Operations Committee (NJOC), provincial and local meetings to ensure that it fulfilled its auxiliary role of being a first responder to emergencies that put people’s lives at risk.

Overview of Red Cross Red Crescent Movement in-country

The IFRC Cluster Delegation deployed the Operations Delegate, attached to SARCS, to Mpumalanga Province to provide technical guidance in conducting rapid assessments and emergency response and ensure a timely and integrated response. Coordination mechanisms were put in place to ensure well-coordinated response and timely updates with Movement partners. IFRC supported SARCS disaster management teams and volunteers with needs assessment, resource mobilization, and for the design and implementation of the emergency operation, in close coordination with other Red Cross Red Crescent Movement partners. IFRC continued to provide technical support and guidance to the NS from the onset of tropical storm Eloise prediction and other ongoing interventions.

More so, the NS collaborated with ICRC and ensured that Restoration of Family Links (RFL) was integrated into its response plan to ensure separated people were reunited with their loved ones. Telephone and internet services were provided to 83 people to reconnect with their family members.

Belgian Red Cross (BRC) is present in the country and is supporting the NS with First Aid training and First Aid structures. The training provided in the past through support from BRC enabled the NS to position itself as a first responder with a team of experts which possess first aid skills.

Overview of other actors’ actions in-country

The government’s Early Warning Protocol (EWP) was activated to provide timely updates to the Joint Operating Committees (JOC) at provincial level. The alerts assisted the JOC to provide early warning messages to the affected communities. South African Weather Services (SAWS) were consistent in providing updates through JOCs and SARCS ensured timely dissemination to volunteers and staff in at-risk communities. The National Disaster Management Centre (NDMC) coordinated all interventions by humanitarian agencies with support from other UN Agencies through the Command-and-Control Centre. Civil Society and NGOs worked jointly with the government to provide immediate assistance at provincial levels. To avoid duplication of efforts, the JOC for floods resorted that the response should be done in a coordinated manner. Through the JOC meetings, it was agreed that the NS and Department of Social Development (DSD), provincial and local disaster management forums (DMF) conduct joint assessments and distribute relief items jointly to avoid duplication of services. Other sectors such as the Department of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (DOWASH), Department of Agriculture Fisheries and Forestry (DAFF)), Department of Roads and Transport (DORT) focused on the restoration and rehabilitation of the damaged infrastructures in the affected provinces.

Needs analysis and scenario planning

SARCS and Provincial Disaster Management conducted joint assessments in three provinces that were seriously affected namely Limpopo, Mpumalanga, and KwaZulu-Natal. In some areas in Limpopo, infrastructure conditions were so bad for example, collapsed bridges and damaged roads prevented assessment teams from reaching some of the affected communities at the onset of the emergency. To gain access, the provincial disaster forum coordinated with the South African Defence Force (SADF) to supply relief aid to affected and isolated communities using a helicopter. The households which were assessed indicated priority needs of the affected population to be food, water, shelter, hygiene materials, and health & care. Due to overstretched capacity of the National Society, the Operations Update was not issued but SARCS continued working closely with its stakeholders to meet the needs of affected families as set out in this DREF Operation.

Shelter: Due to the heavy rains, shelter was among the sectors that were seriously affected. The displaced families were hosted in 7 evacuation centres which were set up in the 3 provinces. The multi-sector needs assessment which were conducted in the three affected provinces ascertained the scale and scope of the damages and informed operational strategy. The assessment findings revealed mass destruction of houses, public facilities, farms, and displacements of people from their homes due to the floods and strong winds. Households that were displaced needed temporary shelter solutions and the replacement of basic household items. Houses that were permanently and partially destroyed were 41 in total. Some of the affected communities’ documents such as medical cards, certificates, and passports were destroyed during the storm. The tropical storm caused damages to property and infrastructure where some services were interrupted. Affected family members were evacuated to evacuation centres while some community members were hesitant to leave their homesteads for fear of losing their belongings, they worked for life to the floods caused by the storm. The issue of evacuation centres also posed a threat to the ongoing COVID-19 response but during coordination meetings and site visits at evacuation, centres collaboration was done with the local department of health.
Conversely, there has been concern from local communities and government for the National Society to avoid shelter materials like tarpaulins in the future as they are not eco-friendly products and are no longer promoted for response interventions around shelter interventions in the country. The National Society will ensure that they will avoid the use of tarpaulins in future shelter interventions to abide by the government’s recommendation. Instead, the National Society will rather provide zinc rather than tarpaulins which are discouraged due to the standards set by the government.

**Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH):** Although communities had access to clean water, it was found that the scarcity of water gathering items and hygiene materials in the evacuated places made it difficult for the affected people to practice good hygiene. The displaced families lost their basic items including water containers. SARCS engaged municipal authorities to ensure a regular supply of water to all evacuation centers throughout the period. There was a need to supply affected people with hygiene materials to promote hygiene and avoid the outbreak of diseases. SARCS had to provide hygiene packs, jerry cans, buckets, and soap to the 300 affected households. No WASH-related disease outbreak was reported among the affected communities. As the country is currently affected by Covid19, good hygiene promotion and awareness were critical in affected areas. The Risk Communication and Community Engagement (RCCE) activities were strengthened and incorporated in WASH interventions.

**Livelihoods and Basic Needs:** In most of the affected areas, agricultural land was completely washed away by the flash floods and left people vulnerable to food insecurities and loss of livelihoods. The majority of affected communities in the three provinces are dependent on agriculture, livestock, and seasonal daily labour which were heavily affected by tropical storms. The districts (Ehlanzeni, Bush, Nkomazi, Zombo, Mkhuulu, Phendulani, Tiakheni, Vhembe, and Capricorn) affected by this storm in the three provinces contributed to about 45% to the food security sector and economy of the country. According to the municipalities, farmers were affected as their farms are submerged while others reported their produce was swept away by the floodwater. This includes serious effects to fruit and vegetable farms in Mpumalanga that were submerged in the water. The affected communities did not have the means to replenish what had been destroyed especially in the means to buy basic needs commodities like food. This situation had been worsened by the ongoing COVID-19 effects which have crippled community livelihoods and will take time for communities to recover from the impacts.

Households that were interviewed indicated that they did not have food stock available to meet their food needs and needed immediate food support. In total 300 families were supported with once-off food support through DREF, and support mobilized locally by the National Society.

**Health:** Tropical Storm Eloise exacerbated health challenges which were already existing due to COVID-19 pandemic prevalence. Although people were rescued to evacuation camps, there were high risks of increased COVID-19 cases in such centres. SARCS and other actors who were involved in the response like DOH and DSD, therefore, had an obligation to ensure that COVID-19 protocols and guidelines were enforced and adhered to. Screening services were done daily to everyone at evacuation centres. More so, regular check-ups were provided to people living with chronic illnesses and medication was provided.

**Protection, Gender, and Inclusion (PGI):** Women, girls, and people living with disabilities were the most vulnerable groups given their lack of or limited access to feminine hygiene products within markets, income generation activities, and government assistance. The National Society ensured that families with people with special needs were prioritized in terms of services provided. There were no cases of exclusion reported and this was attributed to an integrated response which the NS embarked on to ensure all social, cultural, and religious groups are engaged in all interventions on a need basis.

**Targeting**

SARCS’s response targeted 300 households (1500 individuals – 5 people per household) who had been severely affected by the tropical storm in three provinces. Among the 640 households which were affected, 350 of them were residing in evacuation centres and tents as their houses had been badly damaged by the floods. The National Society supported the affected (300 households (1500 people) with essential household items, hygiene packs, food parcels, mattresses, blankets, and hygiene items/kits (wash-buckets and soaps, shelter, kitchen sets, and shelter tool kits). The DREF support by the National Society was complemented by support provided by Government as well donations from the private sector.

Refer to the [DREF EPoA](#) for details on selection criteria.

**Scenario planning**

The planned response was implemented as per the initial design and required no change to the scope or timeframe of operation. The Emergency Plan of Action (EPoA) implementation focused on food provision, emergency shelter, health, WASH with PGI and CEA being integrated.
Risk Analysis
The current DREF operation was exposed to several risks as highlighted in the table below, for which NS and Cluster Delegation discussed mitigation measures to ensure targeted communities receive the needed support. Refer to DREF EPoA for details on risk analysis and mitigation measures.

This DREF operation and its operational strategy considered the risks related to the current COVID-19 pandemic and was aligned with the IFRC global emergency appeal that supports NS to deliver assistance and support to communities affected or at risk of being affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. According to the Department of Health (DOH), as of 30 May 2021, the cumulative number of COVID-19 cases identified in South Africa is 1,662,825, with 3,755 new cases reported and 78 deaths.

Through the operation, RC volunteers were provided with appropriate PPE (face masks, alcohol-based sanitizers) to ensure that they were not exposed while providing much-needed support to the affected communities. The design of the DREF operation took into consideration movement restrictions and Covid-19 protocols which were put in place by the Government. COVID-19 messages formed part of the hygiene promotion messaging which volunteers were disseminating in the evacuation centres throughout the operation.

B. OPERATIONAL STRATEGY

Overall Operational objective:
The overall objective of this operation was to respond to the immediate humanitarian needs of 1,500 people (300 households) affected by Tropical Storm Eloise, through the provision of emergency shelter and essential household items, health care, WASH, and provision of immediate food needs for three months.

During the operation, the NS collaborated with government departments like Department of Social Development and Provincial Disaster Management Centre (PDMC) to ensure that the basic food needs of affected people were met. Through financial support from DREF, a total of 250 households were provided with food parcels and the other 50 households which were among the target were covered through further advocacy and appeal which the National Society embarked on to local business owners.

Proposed strategy
The operational strategy of this operation was the outcome of continuous follow-up, assessments, and data analysis, as well as consultation between the SARCS and government officials on how to respond to this emergency in an integrated manner. The operational strategy is aimed at mitigating the combined impact of floods and ongoing COVID-19 response.

In addition, CEA and PGI were integrated into all the response interventions to ensure community participation and involvement during response interventions. The following were intervention areas which the National Society focused on after being informed by joint assessments which they conducted with local, provincial government officials and community stakeholders.

1. Shelter and household items
During the operation, SARCS focused on the provision of immediate shelter services and essential household items to 100 households affected by floods but due to price increase in tarpaulins and limited budget, the operation managed to support only 26 households. The shelter interventions included the following.

   • Procurement and distribution of 25 tarpaulins and shelter kits for 26 households through DREF support and supported 26 households in three provinces.
   • Procurement and distribution of 200 blankets (2 per household)
   • Procurement and distribution of 100 kitchen kits (1 per household)
   • Procurement and distribution of 200 mattresses (2 per household)
   • Training of 20 volunteers to support shelter activities, volunteers helped families to erect their emergency shelters with materials provided through DREF and those donated by other stakeholders.

2. Livelihoods and Basic needs
During the assessment, 300 households were identified to require basic food supplies. The total number of households that were supposed to benefit from food parcels supported by DREF was reduced from 300 households to 250 households due to price increase in foodstuff items, especially among suppliers in the Limpopo province. The NS complemented DREF on this operation with in-country support from local donors who supported its flood response intervention with food parcels. This enabled SARCS to cover the 50 households who were in great need but had been affected by the limited DREF budget for food parcels. In addition, the Department of Agriculture was also engaged in
discussions on assisting farmers who were adversely affected by floods to recover from the impact. Most of the affected farmers were registered to receive support from the agricultural sector next season.

The activities included:

- Procurement and distribution of food parcels which contained mealie-meal, beans, sugar, flour, milk, tinned meat, and fish to 250 households. The parcel was meant to serve for one month and covered 3 meals per day for 5 family members.
- Post distribution monitoring was conducted, and beneficiaries appreciated the effort SARCS made to address their basic needs when they needed it most.

3. **Health and care**

During the operation, Mental Health and Psychosocial Support (MHPSS) complemented the support which was provided to people affected by the storm and floods. In total, 20 trained Psychological First Aid (PFA) staff and volunteers were deployed in different communities, especially at evacuation camps, to offer basic PFA to individuals and families who were in distress, so they are calm and coping positively. In addition, the teams also identified 425 people with severe health needs; these were in 1,500 households that were adversely affected by the floods. The Risk Communication and Community Engagement (RCCE) activities were strengthened and incorporated in WASH interventions, reaching approximately 1,500 people (300 households). Due to the ongoing COVID-19 response, the National Society was able to complement WASH materials from local resource mobilization. **WASH activities included the following:**

- Hygiene promotion and health awareness to the entire targeted population, including Covid-19 prevention messages.
- Procured and distributed 600 jerry cans (2 per household)
- Procured and distributed 600 buckets and 600 soaps- (2 per household)
- Procured and distributed family hygiene kits 600 (2 per household)
- Distribution of 1,000 IEC materials on WASH and COVID-19 awareness.

**Protection Gender and Inclusion:** Protection Gender and Inclusion (PGI) was mainstreamed throughout the operation to ensure communities’ dignity, access, participation, and safety were met. Acknowledging that women, girls, men, and boys with diverse ages, disabilities, and backgrounds had different needs, risks, and coping strategies during the operation was key to achieve inclusiveness. Particular attention was given to the protection and inclusion of vulnerable groups, and genders. Gender roles were considered when setting up distribution time and dates as well as in hygiene promotion activities. In addition, hygiene packs contents for men and women, girls and boys were different due to different gender needs, for example, sanitary towels in girls and women packs. As part of the needs assessment and analysis, a gender and diversity analysis were integrated into all sector responses including Livelihoods, WASH, Shelter to understand how different groups were affected, and this informed specific gender needs which were addressed by the operational strategy. All sectors thrived to meet the IFRC Minimum Standards on Protection, Gender, and Inclusion in Emergencies.

**Community Engagement and Accountability:** During assessments, SARCS utilized CEA approaches, to determine the preferred communication channels by communities and preferred feedback mechanisms. As part of these approaches, SARCS conducted verification of the beneficiaries selected to ensure controls and adherence to selection criteria. National Society staff and volunteers also collected feedback and complaints of beneficiaries during the selection and throughout the operation. Feedback was shared and analysed at head office to refine the selection process and criteria if necessary. This was also used to adapt the interventions based on community needs.

**Operational support services**

**Human resources:** SARCS was well represented in all the three main affected provinces (Kwa Zulu Natal, Mpumalanga, and Limpopo) with functional Provincial offices and branch offices. Volunteers and staff members from these provinces had experience in emergency response, including floods. SARCS mobilized and activated 20 volunteers, 15 staff members, and 1 IFRC Delegate to support the operation.

**Logistics and supply chain:** Some of the proposed relief materials were procured locally but some of the materials were not available, e.g., tarpaulins and shelter kits which resulted in the purchase of other relief materials due to...
unavailability on local markets. Some of the relief materials were very expensive in other provinces such that the NS ended up procuring in KwaZulu Natal province which had goods at a reasonable price and transported to other 2 provinces. This delayed implementation due to efforts made by NS to save and stick within budget limits and reach all the targets. SARCS incorporated IFRC procurement and procedures into its internal procurement process.

Information technology and telecommunications: The affected provinces had functional and adequate Information, Communication and Technology (ICT) during the operation which enhanced communication between the response teams and affected communities from early warning messaging and communication, response, and relief.

Communications: The NS worked closely with different media houses, ensuring that SARCS interventions were well published, and communities and stakeholders were made aware of SARCS response interventions. Updates on the operation were shared on the NS social media networks (websites, Facebook, Twitter).

SARCS ensured that visibility was enhanced through the procurement of visibility material and protective clothing for its volunteers. Multi-media platforms were used to sensitize the communities on early warnings and evacuation procedures. A total of 20 volunteers and 15 staff members were engaged in the operation. SARCS also conducted refresher training in the 3 provinces on basic disaster management, CEA, PGI, Hygiene Promotions to 220 volunteers and 15 staff members who were involved in the operation. This was done to ensure that in future emergencies, NS can respond efficiently and effectively.

Planning, monitoring, evaluation, and reporting (PMER): PMER activities such as reporting, monitoring, and planning were conducted throughout the operation where reports were shared, and monitoring was conducted. Post distribution monitoring was also conducted at the end of each distribution to get feedback from beneficiaries. Operational updates were shared with the Cluster Delegation. At the end of the operation, PMER supported lessons learned workshops in the provinces with all stakeholders, including beneficiaries, to collect feedback on the efficiency and effectiveness of the response. This feedback will be used to inform future operations. Provincial offices provided weekly updates that formed part of operational updates by NS to cluster office.

Administration and Finance: The Finance Department monitored all the expenditure according to the National Society financial procedures, also taking into consideration the IFRC financial procedures to ensure proper reporting of expenses.

Security: During the operation, government law enforcement was always present in affected areas to provide a secure environment to the communities and humanitarian agencies who were working within these areas. Roads in some of the affected were badly damaged and response teams were used to confirm the status of routes before setting out. They also liaised with local stakeholders to ascertain the feasibility of specific journeys and safe routes.

C. DETAILED OPERATIONAL PLAN

### Shelter

**People reached: 500**
- Male: 203
- Female: 297

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of families that improve their living conditions according to the emergency housing rules</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of families provided with kitchen sets, blankets, mattresses</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of families that are supported in the build back safer approach</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Narrative description of achievements**

As highlighted during the assessment, one of the pressing needs of the displaced families was shelter and household items. The National Society team carried out joint assessments with local stakeholders to validate the needs of the vulnerable people. SARCS supported affected families with interventions highlighted below:

- 25 tarpaulins and shelter kits for 26 households through DREF support and supported 26 households in different three provinces. Awareness sessions were held with communities on “building back better” to ensure their new structures are stronger.
- 200 blankets (2 per household)
- 100 kitchen kits (1 per household)
- 200 mattresses (2 per household)
SARCS procured and distributed items which afforded dignity to families and sheltered them temporarily while they were reconstructing their permanent shelters.

Timely assessments were conducted jointly by NS, government authorities from local municipalities and community stakeholders. This enabled well-coordinated response and relief provision to the affected communities. Through well-coordinated response interventions, duplication of services provided to affected communities was avoided.

**Challenges**

During the operation, SARCS focused on the provision of immediate shelter services and essential household items to 100 households who have been affected by floods but due to price increase in tarpaulins and limited budget under DREF, only 26 households were reached with support for emergency shelters.

**Lessons Learned**

Joint assessments greatly assist in responding to the urgent needs of the affected communities in a well-coordinated manner. More so, it creates a platform to engage both government and private sector in contributing to the needs of affected communities.

Another lesson learnt is to rethink Red Cross emergency shelter response interventions, as the Government of South Africa is discouraging distribution of tarpaulins which are not eco-friendly. SARCS and IFRC will need to work on improved emergency shelter strategies to ensure to abide by this recommendation.

---

**Livelihoods and basic needs**

**People reached:** 1,500  
**Male:** 625  
**Female:** 875

**Indicators:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of households provided with food items for one month.</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of households provided with knowledge and skills on nutritional value</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Narrative description of achievements**

During the operation, the NS collaborated with Movement partners, other government departments like Department of Social Development (DSD) and Provincial Disaster Management Centre (PDMC) to ensure that the basic food needs of affected people were met. Through financial support from DREF, a total of 250 households were provided with food parcels and the other 50 households which were among the target were covered through further advocacy and appeal which the National Society embarked on to local business owners. During distributions sessions, information sessions were provided by staff and volunteers on nutrition and food preparation. The post-distribution monitoring revealed that the NS managed to provide basic needs (food, shelter, and health services) during the crisis and managed to address the needs of affected households in a timely manner.

**Challenges**

Price hikes in Limpopo province resulted in fewer food parcels procured due to limited budget, reducing the number of households targeted by 50 households, thus reaching on 250 households out of 300 planned.

**Lessons Learned**

Collaboration with both government and private sector in addressing community needs paves way for meaningful engagement and support to address urgent needs at hand by other key actors.

---

**Health**

**People reached:** 875  
**Male:** 312  
**Female:** 563

**Indicators:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># people reached with MHPSS and PFA services</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># staff and volunteers provided with PFA services</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># volunteers oriented on PFA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Narrative description of achievements**

Mental Health and Psychosocial Support (MHPSS) complemented the material support provided to people affected. The fact that some lost their means of livelihood and belonging due to floods posed immense stress to most affected people and MHPSS services were key in ensuring that they are mentally stable, and they regain hope for the future. More so, the response team referred 425 of the cases for further professional assistance.

**Challenges**

Due to the strain COVID-19 exerted on community members others were hesitant to welcome MHPSS support teams at their households to provide support services.

**Lessons Learned**

There is a need to raise community awareness on MHPSS even before emergencies so that people are aware of such services and how they assist people to gain hope for the future when their lives are threatened.

---

**Water, sanitation, and hygiene**

People reached: 1500  
Male: 621  
Female: 879

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators:</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of people reached with hygiene promotion activities</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of volunteers trained in hygiene promotion</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of households provided with jerry cans</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of households reached by hygiene materials</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Narrative description of achievements**

The operation actively engaged only 20 instead of planned 220 SARCS volunteers, as the storm impact was not huge as anticipated. Volunteers were given orientation session on hygiene promotion. Volunteers started incorporating hygiene promotions messages in their RCCE community interventions. All targeted communities were reached through volunteer dissemination sessions. A total of 300 households were reached with WASH materials which included, Jerry cans (2 per household), and hygiene materials which included soap and hygiene kits which contained toothbrushes, toothpaste, towel, Vaseline, and sanitary towels in girls and women’s packs.

During the operation, the National Society maximized collaboration with Department of WASH, Department of Health local municipalities, and community stakeholders to promote good hygiene behaviors and practices. Continued water supply was ensured at evacuation centers and hygiene materials for example hygiene packs and materials were provided to curb the spread of COVID-19. More so, numbers at evacuation centers were also managed according to government COVID-19 protocols to avoid overcrowding which would threaten people’s lives with the ongoing pandemic.

**Challenges**

The ongoing pandemic posed a great challenge to the National Society’s response to ensure that evacuation centres do not become super spreader spots for COVID-19.

**Lessons Learned**

The challenge posed by COVID-19 made the response teams work tirelessly and collaborate with relevant stakeholders and other humanitarian actors to ensure that measures are always in place and regulations followed to enhance very one’s safety in difficult times.

**Strategies for Implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators:</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of volunteers insured</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of national/provincial level training conducted for staff and volunteers of SARCS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of monitoring visits conducted</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of training conducted to staff and volunteers in different sectors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of staff and volunteers trained in CEA; PGi; DREF Process</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Lessons learned workshop conducted per province</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Narrative description of achievements**

The National Society mobilized and engaged 20 volunteers who are already insured through IFRC. Staff and volunteers were provided with necessary protective clothing to ensure their safety throughout the operation. The impact of the storm was not as big as anticipated, resulting in using smaller number of staff and volunteers than planned.

Psychological first aid (PFA) was provided to volunteers by the trained NS staff. On an ongoing basis, community meetings were organized for the dissemination of information and distribution of relief items. Community meetings formed the basis of community feedback to the National Society. The provincial and national office staff of the National Society visited the operation to monitor and support the volunteers as required. The visits were also used to engage communities, coordinate with stakeholders which resulted in the successful implementation of the project.

**Challenges**

Not all planned trainings could be carried out due to under budgeting, however the National Society will continue mobilizing resource to strengthen its preparedness for effective response mechanisms.

**Lessons learnt**

Due to increasing frequencies of emergencies and as part of strengthening its branch capacities, the National Society will be approaching IFRC request for support to roll out Preparedness for Effective Response (PER).

**D. Financial Report**

The overall amount allocated for this operation was CHF 38,893 of which CHF 38,861 was expensed. A balance of CHF 32 will be returned to the DREF.

**Explanation of variances:**

- **Shelter-Relief:** CHF-4,550 was budgeted for, though using the wrong account codes, leading to the expense on this budget line. This is a planning error.
- **Clothing and Textile:** This budget line was overspent by CHF 678. Blankets were more expensive than budgeted for.
- **Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene:** This Budget line was underspent by CHF 2,118 as it was complemented through other COVID-19 local resource mobilization.
- **Transport and Vehicle Cost:** This budget line was underspent by CHF 815 as the NS made provision of government transport for their distributions.
- **Volunteers:** This budget line was overspent by CHF 625 as more personnel were required on the ground with the NS making more use of volunteers.
- **Workshops & Training:** This budget line was under spent by CHF 1,669 as due to COVID-19 restrictions, training and workshops were minimized to curb transmission of the virus.
- **Information and Public Relations:** This budget line remained unspent because the NS did not incur any costs from local media due to existing good relations.
- **Office Costs:** This budget line was overspent by CHF 41 as there were more expenses on stationary than anticipated.
- **Communications:** This budget line was under spent by CHF 105 as the NS incurred minimal communication costs due to good relations with local radio stations and media forums that wanted to partner for early warning messaging and communication.
Contact information

For further information, specifically related to this operation please contact:

In the South African Red Cross Society
- **Secretary General:** Fernel Campher; Programmes Manager, Email: fcampher@redcross.org.za; Phone: +27720421494
- **Operational coordination:** Ireen Mutombwa; National Disaster Manager, Email: Imutombwa@redcross.org.za; Phone: +27 71 936 0221

In the IFRC
- **IFRC Southern Africa Cluster Delegation**
  - Dr Michael Charles, Head of Cluster Office; phone: +278 34132988; email: michael.charles@ifrc.org
  - Naemi Heita, Operations Manager; Mobile: +27829264448; email: naemi.heita@ifrc.org

IFRC Regional Office
Adesh Tripathee, Head of DCPRR Unit, Kenya; phone: Mobile +254 731 067489; email: adesh.tripathe@ifrc.org.

In IFRC Geneva
- **Programme and Operations focal point:** Nicolas Boyrie, Operations Coordination, Senior Officer, DCPRRR; email: nicolas.boyrie@ifrc.org
- **DREF Compliance and Accountability:** Eszter Matyeka, DREF Senior Officer, DCPRR Unit Geneva; Email: eszter.matyeka@ifrc.org

For IFRC Resource Mobilization and Pledges support:
- Louise Daintrey; Louise.DAINTREY@ifrc.org;

For In-Kind donations and Mobilization table support:
- **IFRC Africa Regional Office for Logistics Unit:** Rishi Ramrakha, Head of Africa Regional Logistics Unit, Email: rishi.ramrakha@ifrc.org; phone: +254 733 888 022

For Performance and Accountability support (planning, monitoring, evaluation and reporting enquiries)
IFRC Africa Regional Office: Philip Komo Kahuho, PMER Coordinator, Email: Philip.kahuho@ifrc.org; phone: +254 732 203 081

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:
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.
### I. Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funds &amp; Other Income</td>
<td>38,893</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DREF Allocations</td>
<td>38,893</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>-38,861</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing Balance</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II. Expenditure by area of focus / strategies for implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AOF1 - Disaster risk reduction</td>
<td>1,622</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOF2 - Shelter</td>
<td>10,793</td>
<td>10,533</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOF3 - Livelihoods and basic needs</td>
<td>6,551</td>
<td>6,787</td>
<td>-236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOF4 - Health</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOF5 - Water, sanitation and hygiene</td>
<td>9,359</td>
<td>13,210</td>
<td>-3,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOF6 - Protection, Gender &amp; Inclusion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOF7 - Migration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area of focus Total</strong></td>
<td>28,325</td>
<td>31,838</td>
<td>-3,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFI1 - Strengthen National Societies</td>
<td>9,997</td>
<td>6,582</td>
<td>3,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFI2 - Effective international disaster management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFI3 - Influence others as leading strategic partners</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFI4 - Ensure a strong IFRC</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy for implementation Total</strong></td>
<td>10,568</td>
<td>7,023</td>
<td>3,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>38,893</td>
<td>38,861</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### III. Expenditure by budget category & group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relief items, Construction, Supplies</td>
<td>23,315</td>
<td>26,650</td>
<td>-3,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter - Relief</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,550</td>
<td>-4,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing &amp; Textiles</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>2,318</td>
<td>-678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>6,151</td>
<td>6,373</td>
<td>-222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water, Sanitation &amp; Hygiene</td>
<td>7,030</td>
<td>4,912</td>
<td>2,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utensils &amp; Tools</td>
<td>8,494</td>
<td>8,498</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics, Transport &amp; Storage</td>
<td>1,582</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport &amp; Vehicles Costs</td>
<td>1,582</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>5,491</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Society Staff</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>4,671</td>
<td>5,296</td>
<td>-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops &amp; Training</td>
<td>4,394</td>
<td>2,724</td>
<td>1,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops &amp; Training</td>
<td>4,394</td>
<td>2,724</td>
<td>1,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Expenditure</td>
<td>1,738</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information &amp; Public Relations</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>703</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Costs</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Charges</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other General Expenses</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td>2,374</td>
<td>2,372</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme &amp; Services Support Recover</td>
<td>2,374</td>
<td>2,372</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>38,893</td>
<td>38,861</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>