



<b>DREF Operation n°</b>	<b>MDRLS005</b>
<b>Date of issue: 15 June 2022</b>	<b>Glide number: <a href="#">VW-2021-000139-LSO</a></b>
<b>Operation start date: 10 September 2021</b>	<b>Operation end date: 31 January 2022</b>
<b>Host National Society(ies): Lesotho Red Cross Society</b>	<b>Operation budget: CHF 174,013</b>
<b>Number of people affected: 2,550 people (510 HH)</b>	<b>Number of people assisted: 2,550 people (510 HH)</b>
<b>Host National Society(ies) presence (n° of volunteers, staff, branches):</b> 70 volunteers and 15 staff members in implementing districts.	
<b>Red Cross Red Crescent Movement partners actively involved in the operation:</b> International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Society (IFRC)	
<b>Other partner organizations actively involved in the operation:</b> Disaster Management Authority, Ministry of Local Government, Ministry of Social Development, and World Food Programme (WFP)	

*The major donors and partners of the Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF) include the Red Cross Societies and governments of Belgium, Britain, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Norway, Republic of Korea, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland, as well as DG ECHO and Blizzard Entertainment, Mondelez International Foundation, Fortive Corporation and other corporate and private donors. On behalf of Lesotho Red Cross Society (LRCS), the IFRC would like to extend gratitude to all for their generous contributions.*

## A. SITUATION ANALYSIS

### Description of the disaster

At the end August 2021, Lesotho experienced windstorms leading to destruction of shelter, food stuff, and household items in the districts of Qacha'snek and Thaba Tseka. An initial assessment was conducted by the Disaster Management Authority (DMA) through the District Disaster Management Team (DDMT) and the Lesotho Red Cross Society (LRCS). Findings from this assessment indicated that approximately 2,550 people (510 households) were affected by this disaster. Out of the affected households, 162 households had their homes destroyed and had to be hosted by neighbours or relatives. The remaining 348 families whose houses were damaged used the undamaged parts of their houses, although having lost their basic household items.



*Figure 1: LRCS preparing for distributions ©LRCS*

In response to the above, a [DREF Operation](#) was launched on 03 September for CHF 174,013 to meet the needs of 2,550 people (510 households) in the two districts of Thaba tseka and Qacha'snek by supporting them with immediate food support, temporary shelter materials, WASH, and psychosocial support.

### Summary of response

#### Overview of Operating National Society

Following the alert forecast from the metrological agency, the Lesotho Red Cross Society (LRCS) and the Disaster Management Authority (DMA) disseminated alerts and preventative information through media channels and branches across the country. Division disaster response teams in Thaba Tseka and Qacha'snek districts gathered and worked in the affected sites to collect timely information. The Red Cross Divisional Secretaries in both Thaba Tseka and Qacha'snek attended districts emergency coordination meetings.

In response to the windstorms in September in Qacha'snek and Thaba Tseka districts, initial needs assessments were also conducted by the Disaster Management Authority through District Disaster Management Teams (DDMT) and LRCS from 29 to 31 August 2021. To facilitate the initial response, LRCS mobilized, and deployed 70 volunteers, 15 staff (3 National Disaster Response Team (NDRT) members, 6 Community Based Disaster Response Team (CBDRT) members, and 6 staff from the society's headquarters). The National Society supported with food and non-food items (pulses, mats, and blankets) which were provided to 100 households in Qacha'snek and Thaba Tseka districts. These items were replenished through this DREF operation.

A detailed breakdown of achievements realized through this DREF operation by sector is outlined in the Operational Strategy section below.

### Overview of Red Cross Red Crescent Movement in-country

The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) supports LRCS through the Pretoria Country Cluster Delegation. IFRC provided technical support to LRCS in rapid assessment, communication, and implementation of the response.

### Overview of other actors' actions in the country

District Disaster Management Authority (DMA) coordinated Emergency Response closely with LRCS. Other UN agencies such as WFP also supported affected families by providing cash transfers for food to 400 households in Qacha'snek; the support was meant for six months (6) from October 2021 to March 2022. WFP adopted the same national transfer value of Lesotho Loti (LSL) 772 per household which forms a full food basket for the family.

The WFP assistance, as is with LRCS, prioritized households who were jointly assessed by the District Disaster Management Authority (DMA), LRCS, and WFP. The assessment covered households affected by the loss of food and shelter, internally displaced families and, family members with malnourished children, pregnant and nursing women, persons with disability, and those headed by women or the elderly.

### Needs analysis and scenario planning

A needs assessment was conducted by the relevant District Disaster Management Teams (DDMT (and Red Cross Divisional disaster response teams via on-site visits from 29 to 31 August 2021, and phone calls were made during the storm to confirm the dates of assessments with local authorities who also confirmed the emerging damages on the households. Findings from the assessments indicated that the priority needs were shelter and household items (HHI).

Families who had their houses severely and partially destroyed were in great need to repair their houses and replace the essential household items lost in the storm. Findings from the needs assessments indicated that the roofs of the houses were ripped off by the storm and that the use of cash assistance would enable affected communities to repair their roofs, whilst simultaneously replenishing essential household assets as the local market system was functioning.

As stated by the needs assessment findings, unconditional multipurpose cash would be the optimal intervention modality to address the various needs of the households who had their houses partially damaged. During community engagements, the use of unconditional multipurpose cash assistance was encouraged by the representatives of the affected population and relevant local authorities, including the local community-based disaster response teams (CBDRT).



Figure 2: Destroyed house in Qacha's Nek  
©LRCS



Figure 3: Destroyed household items following the windstorms in Thaba Tseka. ©LRCS

Following the disaster, a series of meetings with government authorities and LRCS continued to look into the operational plan and conduct an analysis of the needs, gaps, and possible solutions. In September, LRCS conducted a market assessment in the two districts of Thaba Tseka and Qacha'snek to determine the availability and prices of commodities in the markets to back up the cash distribution. The final amount received (transfer value) per household was therefore informed by the assessment to meet the household food basket.

More details on the needs analysis done at the time of launching the operation can be found in the [EPoA](#).

### Risk Analysis

Due to extensive collaboration with the Meteorology office, LRCS carefully monitored news on other storms that could potentially affect the operation. Despite surging COVID-19 cases in Lesotho that reached over 20 locally transmitted cases per day, there was no regulation regarding the COVID-19 outbreak that interfered with operation activities, including procurement, transportation, and allocation of the items.

The mitigation measures put in place through this operation included:

- Provision of personal protective equipment (PPE) for staff and volunteers to guard against COVID-19 infection
- Training of staff and volunteers on COVID-19 prevention measures
- Staff and volunteers observed all COVID-19 prevention measures during implementation
- Collaboration with the local authorities to ensure access to communities
- Insurance of volunteers involved in the operation.

## B. OPERATIONAL STRATEGY

The objective of this operation was to address the immediate humanitarian needs of approximately 2,550 people (510 HH) affected by the windstorms through the provision of temporary shelter, health and care services, WASH, and immediate food needs.

This objective was achieved as a total of 510 households (2,550 people) were reached with the various cash interventions, with 155 HH (775 people) reached in Thaba Tseka and 355 HH (1,775 people) reached in Quacha's nek as detailed in below sections. Thus, 162 households with completely destroyed houses were assisted while 348 households with partially damaged houses received support, all through cash and voucher assistance within a four-months operational timeframe.



Figure 4: Rehabilitated house in Sehlaba-Thebe Qacha's Nek ©LRCS

### Proposed strategy

The operational strategy focused on the relief phase, to meet the immediate needs of the disaster-affected people. As identified in the joint needs assessment conducted by local/DDMT and the Red Cross branch, the affected population was divided into two groups based on their needs. The first group (162 households) lost their homes completely, while the second group (348 households) had severe damages to their homes and assets. According to the observation and analysis from the needs assessment and feedback from the affected population, the groups who had their homes destroyed were left with nothing and stayed at relatives or neighbors places. There was no known or planned accommodation by Government for the affected population both in Thaba Tseka and Qacha'snek.

LRCS identified the needs of the households who had their homes destroyed. The most essential and timely necessity was accommodation, thus LRCS concluded to provide cash to those who lost their homes completely. Pulses, mattresses, and blankets were greatly needed as the households who lost their homes were left with nothing but the clothes on their backs. LRCS provided the mentioned essential household items to meet their immediate needs through the in-kind modality. As mentioned above, this in-kind support was from the National Society emergency stocks and was replenished through this DREF operation. In addition, unconditional multipurpose cash assistance was provided to these households to recover their damages.

On the other hand, the households whose homes were partially and severely damaged lost essential household items and food. Based on the feedback by the affected communities and analysis of the needs assessment team, unconditional multipurpose cash assistance could meet the various needs. These needs included repairing the house and purchasing food items since the markets functioned normally and common items could be bought locally. The cash transfer was made electronically through Vodacom, which has sufficient cash agents across the country. Vodacom was the contracted financial service provider and has branches in rural areas, which made the cash transfer feasible. However, due to WFP providing support to 400 households in Qacha'snek for six months (October 2021 to March 2022), LRCS only provided cash for food in Thaba Tseka, to avoid duplication of efforts.

The first cash transfer distribution was also the launch of the response, and it attracted a range of stakeholders from LRCS executive governance senior management, Disaster Management authority executives, District Administrators, and local authorities. Stakeholders observed beneficiaries receiving their cash through their mobile phones whilst the LRCS volunteers and community structures therein referred to as Help Desk actively assisted the beneficiaries in processing their cash out at the nearby Vodacom cash agents.

Overall, 70 volunteers were mobilized from Thaba Tseka and Qacha'snek branches and engaged in the operation. Volunteers beefed up DDMT and LRCS staff to carry out needs and damage assessment, beneficiary registration, validation, distribution, collecting feedback and complaints, and



Figure 5: Community members attending a consultation meeting with LRCS in Thaba Tseka @ LRCS

monitoring. The volunteers were all trained in refresher training and insured as per NS standards. LRCS effectively ensured visibility during the operation.

### 1. Livelihoods and Basic Needs

In planning for assistance, it was instrumental to identify who were the affected population and map the magnitude of the destruction per each type of livelihood and asset. Where and who could provide which support. This allowed for a faster response, in reaching the intended target population, preventing depletion of scarce local resources or services, and preventing further displacement of those affected by the disaster. In addition, and as highlighted by the assessment results, unconditional cash was the best response modality, which would give the families the possibility to spend the money in a flexible manner, depending on the individual priority needs per household with the understanding that they would use it for their priority needs which per assessment, included shelter, household items and food.

Two cash interventions were implemented for:

- 1- **Quacha's nek district:** In this district, a total of 355 households (1,775 people) were reached with two cash interventions; one for 110 households (550 people) who were found to have lost their houses and all items, and the other 245 households (1,225 people) whose homes were partially destroyed, thus needed household items. The 110 households received LSL 4,200 which helped them purchase temporary shelter materials, Kitchen kits (1 per family), Buckets (2 per family), Blankets (2 per family), Mattresses (2 per HH) and Hygiene kits including dignity items for women and girls. The remaining 245 households received LSL 1,450 to purchase same items in same quantities, except for the temporary shelter materials and dignity kits, as planned in the EPoA. The cash was distributed to the targeted households via mobile money transfer (Vodacom M-Pesa). No food was distributed in this district because WFP provided cash for food to 400 households for 6 months. As such, these funds were expensed to increase cash for food in Thaba Tseka.

**Table 1: People reached in Quacha's nek**

Quacha'snek district	HH reached with cash for shelter material and cash for household items	HH reached with cash for household items only	Total Households reached
Number of households	110 HH (550 people)	245 HH or 1,225 people	355 HH or 1,775 people
Cash amount received	4200 LSL	1,450 LSL	
Number of disbursements	One-off	One-off	

- 2- **Thaba Tseka district:** In Thaba Tseka, a total of 155 households (775 people) were reached with three cash interventions. Instead of the planned 14 households with completely destroyed houses, 52 households (260 people) were found, thus receiving LSL 4,200 to support with shelter material, LSL 1,450 for household items and LSL 3,088 for food for 4 months. Indeed, since WFP was providing cash for food in Quacha'snek, Lesotho Red Cross decided to increase the cash disbursements for food to cover entire period of the response, in a bid to ensure alignment with the other district and because the food needs were present. As such, these 52 households received a total amount of LSL 7,288. On the other hand, 103 households in Thaba Tseka whose homes were partially damaged received LSL 1,450 to support replacement of the lost household items and LSL 3,088 to support food needs for 4 months. In total, the 103 households received LSL 4,588. The value of the amount distributed for food was based on the minimum food basket as detailed in the [EPoA](#).

**Table 2: People reached in Thaba Tseka**

Thaba Tseka district	HH reached with cash for shelter material, cash for household items and cash for food for 4 months)	HH reached with cash for household items and cash for 4 months of food	Total Households reached
Number of households	52 HH (260 people)	103 HH (515 people)	155 households (775 people)
Cash amount received	7,288 LSL	LSL 4,538	
Number of disbursements	Split in 4 disbursements	Split in 4 disbursements	

In total, 510 households (2,550 people) were reached with the various cash interventions, with 155 HH (775 people) reached in Thaba Tseka and 355 HH (1,775 people) reached in Quacha's nek as detailed in tables 1 and 2 above. Overall, 162 households with completely destroyed houses were assisted while 348 households with partially damaged houses received support.

Local authorities with community Help Desks coordinated distribution with DDMT and LRCS. As with shelter cash distributions, the distribution process was witnessed by national, district local authorities LRCS governance, and Senior Management Team who attended the first distribution for cash launch.

LRCS paid great attention to community engagement and accountability in its intervention to ensure the assistance provided met the needs and priorities of the communities assisted. Communities were given priority to identify and select vulnerable food-insecure households using a community-based targeting approach. Further, LRCS introduced a Complaints, Feedback, and Response Mechanism (CFRM), consisting of suggestion boxes, a toll-free line, and Help desks. Twelve (12) suggestion boxes and 12 help desks (65 members) were strategically placed near 12 distribution points. The toll-free line was based in Maseru Headquarters and monitored by the CEA focal point. These mechanisms allowed communities to freely voice out their grievances and provide feedback, which was responded to, for two-way communication.

Close monitoring was carried out to ensure that complaints were addressed in time depending on the type of complaint. In the post distribution monitoring (PDM) conducted by LRCS, 90% of respondents were aware of their right to complain and participate in all levels of the project cycle. One PDM was conducted in Qacha'snek and the second one in Thaba Tseka to establish, firstly, the receipt of cash for relevant households and then the repair of the houses started. The third and fourth PDMs were conducted in the same districts separately, following distribution of cash for food and household items including dignity kits.

Two market assessments were conducted in September for the cash support implementation and cash for food was provided to 155 households in Thaba Tseka to cover a period of four months. The cash value per household for one month was LSL 772 as outlined in the EPoA. During the reporting period, 100% of the households received their cash in Thaba Tseka used it primarily for purchasing food items.

Local authorities with community Help Desks coordinated distribution with DDMT and LRCS. Shelter cash distributions were observed by national, district local authorities LRCS governance, and Senior Management Team who attended the first distribution for cash launch.

## 2. Health

Based on the plan, all 70 volunteers and 15 staff members received refresher training on First Aid and Psycho-Social Support (PSS) and of the 510 affected households at least 400 were provided with PSS services.

Over and above shelter and food needs, promotion of health and sanitation was also established and prioritized and implemented in communities where the need was observed. The volunteers were provided with basic WASH training which was cascaded at the community level. The volunteers were engaged throughout the implementation period and applied different approaches for the behavior change communication and engagement with the community including house to house visits, public address systems, and practical demonstration sessions of best practices like hand washing. Moreover, the volunteers mobilized the community for voluntary clean-up environmental hygiene campaigns.

At least 10 hygiene & sanitation promotion awareness sessions, including key messages on COVID-19, were conducted.

### Community Engagement and Accountability (CEA)

LRCS ensured that the CEA activities were mainstreamed in this emergency operation. These attempts were valuable to guarantee trust from the community, as well as, to advocate central ideas of CEA internally or externally. Community engagement was extensively used in the selection and validation of lists process for the cash intervention. The community was involved in selecting the most vulnerable to receive support from all the affected families.

Collaboration with the communities has always proved to be very effective, as some people from the operations viewed participatory techniques as tedious especially during emergency operations wherein the rapid response is required. It has been proven in various operations that community acceptance paves the way to a smooth-running implementation of activities.

As mentioned earlier, some people demonstrated stress reactions brought by their loss of property and goods because of the windstorm. To help communities cope better with stress caused by the windstorms. LRCS deployed their PSS team to conduct and set up psychological support sessions for the adults and children. Through coordination with the local authorities, the team was able to identify people needing intervention. PSS Team sessions and house-to-house visits were provided.



*Figure 6: Volunteers demonstrating how to use tippy taps for hand washing hygiene in Thaba Tseka @ LRCS*

**To receive community feedback and complaints, different strategies were utilized:**

- Formation of Community Help Desks
- Volunteers' door to door visits
- Suggestion box
- Telephone numbers to call for complaints or feedback.

**Protection, Gender and Inclusion (PGI)**

A detailed PGI awareness/sensitization training was held for community-based volunteers (help Desks) and local authorities. The same training was rolled out to communities at large contributing to the cash-based intervention in Thaba Tseka and Qacha'snek. The communities participated in being part of help desks, assisting in construction and roofing affected houses. Discussions to ensure that prevention of sexual abuse and exploitation (PSEA) considerations were mainstreamed in all interventions and humanitarian responses were intensified with NS management and LRCS staff and volunteers. The training was not limited to PGI, PSEA, and CEA but First Aid and psycho-social support, were made available. Volunteer meetings were planned monthly depending on the need, and together with the open and constant communication, created an avenue for volunteers to register or report issues. A WhatsApp group was created and used for communication, especially during COVID 19 safety measures. Transport for volunteers was provided.

Based on the plan, all 70 volunteers and 15 staff members received refresher training on First Aid and Psycho-Social Support (PSS). PGI was mainstreamed throughout the intervention to ensure affected communities' dignity, access, participation, and safety. Furthermore, 70 volunteers and LRCS staff were briefed on PSEA and received the LRCS Code of Conduct, thus familiarizing themselves with its contents before deployment to participate in the response operation.

**Operational Support Services**

**Human Resources:** LRCS trained 70 volunteers (55 female, 15 male) to support the cash intervention. A volunteer database was developed, and volunteers were insured. In the kick-off meeting, volunteers were oriented on the project, on Kobo, PGI, and CEA.

**Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation:** Various meetings were organized including both face-to-face and remote meetings (at headquarters and the field) to monitor the implementation of the DREF operation. In addition, on site monitoring during distributions and post-distribution monitoring were conducted by LRCS volunteers, DM, and PMER staff of the NS. A Lessons learned workshop was done jointly with LRCS staff and DDMT to share the experience of this operation and set up strategies for future operation.

PMER activities were rolled out to ensure the quality of programme implementation throughout the operational management cycle. Several monitoring visits were conducted by the assigned divisional secretaries accompanied by the Disaster Management officer to follow up on the progress of implementation at the community level. Reporting on the operation was carried out per IFRC minimum reporting standards, but only one operation update was able to be issued due to unavoidable circumstances. A lesson learned workshop was also conducted according to the plan of action. The lessons learned were held to suggest a standard monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan for all operations to improve systems and levels of written records and reporting for future operations.

**The following are the key outcomes of the lessons learned workshop:**


- The participants discussed and understood the advantages of using both cash and in-kind modalities to respond, as well as the challenges and solutions in using both modalities
- Participants understood well the requirements for developing a proposal for DREF and their roles in the overall process
- The NS received feedback from the community on what should be improved in future emergency responses. To Mention a few, For NS to advocate and assist the affected to access Identity Cards where it becomes difficult with relevant Ministry, NS to consider procurement of phones for affected people since some from hard to reach areas, since Cash transfers through phones seem to be a way to go worldwide, continuous education on mobile cash transfer even during the normal time since some people were not catching up quickly with phone usage, thus delayed to recognize cash messages displayed in their phones

**Procurement and Logistics:** All procurements were carried out per the IFRC standard procurement procedures. For the Cash Assistance, LRCS has had a pre-existing agreement with a financial service provider, Vodacom, since 2018 as part of their cash preparedness work.

**Communications:** Maintaining effective communication with key stakeholders and audiences was important to increase and maintain public, government, and donor support. From the onset of the disaster to the end of the operation, the National Society effectively used various forms of media intending to promote the operation and the profile of the NS; with monthly newsletters sent out to those subscribed on the mailing list, regular operational updates were shared through mass media outlets like national television, radio and the NS's official Twitter and Facebook pages, and press

releases and media advisories, were published on the NS website regularly throughout the operation. This to a greater extent assisted the NS to reach a lot of people from all parts of the country.

## C. DETAILED OPERATIONAL PLAN

 <b>Livelihoods and basic needs</b> People reached: 2,550 Male: 1,020 Female: 1,530		
Indicators:	Target	Actual
% of affected households supported by multipurpose cash report that they meet their immediate needs	90% or 459 households	100% or 510 HH
FSP contract updated within 8 weeks lead time	YES	YES
# of people supported with cash for emergency shelter materials, household and hygiene items	810 people or 162 HH	810 people or 162 HH
# of people supported with cash for food items	1,740 people or 348 HH	775 people or 155 HH
# of people supported with cash for household items only	1,740 people or 348 HH	2,550 people or 510 HH
% of assisted households which effectively used the provided cash assistance for emergency shelter materials	70%	100%
# of volunteers and staff trained (refreshers) in cash and voucher assistance (Target)	70 volunteers	70 volunteers
# of cash disbursements made to targeted households	1	4
# of PDM conducted	4	4
<b>Narrative description of achievements</b>		
<p>Overall, 100% of targeted households were reached with cash grants during this operation. The financial service provider contract was updated within allocated 8 weeks' timeframe. Although as planned, this is however considered a delay as the families had to wait 8 weeks before receiving support. This led to the affected in Quacha's nek receiving cash for food support from WFP instead.</p> <p>The households with their homes and assets severely damaged were assisted with unconditional cash to meet their immediate needs. Indeed, 110 households were reached in Quacha's nek while 52 were reached in Thaba Tseka. For a total of 162 households (810 people) reached. It was identified during post-distribution monitoring that the affected households repaired and replaced their damaged assets and homes. Most families who had their houses damaged by the storm either had lost household assets or had their house damaged, including roof and walls, Since the market was operational, beneficiaries purchased the needed tools and materials or assets themselves.</p> <p>In total, only 155 households (775 people) in Thaba Tseka received cash support for their food needs. That said, although they were less people, they received the cash for four months instead of the planned two, because WFP provided cash for food in Quacha's nek. This forced LRCS was forced to scale down its planned target for food support to avoid duplication of resources and working in collaboration with other actors led to minimized duplication of efforts instead improved complementarity of support provided. As such, four distributions were made in Thaba Tseka district in October, November, December 2021, and January 2022 to ensure the families could cover their food needs. This was appreciated by the local authorities who had waited for support from different partners.</p> <p>Overall, 510 households (2,550 people) received cash to support replacement of household items (155 HH in Thaba Tseka and 355 HH in Quacha's nek).</p> <p>All the cash distributions were made electronically, and volunteers contacted recipients to get correct information when there was a mismatch. The volunteers were oriented in cash transfer programming, and common issues emerged in the cash transfer</p> <p>All recipient families were able to purchase needed items on the local markets, which indicates market functionality and sufficiency of the grants for the purpose. Based on the post-distribution monitoring, over 80% of the beneficiaries stated that the cash amount was sufficient to cover their needs.</p> <p>To establish the feasibility of functional markets with relevant and enough stock, two market assessments one for each district was conducted for the cash and voucher assistance implementation Qacha'snek and Thaba Tseka</p>		

districts. These assessments enabled monitoring of the prices and commodities availability to support the decided response modality and minimum expenditure basket.

Through this operation, 100 mats and 100 blankets sourced from Lesotho red Cross warehouse and used to commence response were replenished.

As an evidence-based result post each cash distribution, one PDM in each district for shelter and one PDM in each district for cash for food were conducted. The PDMs conducted in all two districts and supported LRCS to learn from the implemented activities for future operations.

The key findings:

- Cash was used in covering different needs for the families and 100% utilized the cash to buy food and other households' items.
- 100% preferred cash as the best response modality
- Crisis modifier funds are necessary for covering other needs that are not covered through DREF support.
- More resource mobilization is needed in the DM sector, as there are huge needs.

### Challenges

Cutting across all the components of operation (cash for shelter, food, and household items), some of the beneficiaries did not have identity cards and this was a secondary process for the targeted beneficiaries to process identity cards with their respective local administrations for opening bank their Vodacom mobile money accounts, hence, delaying the cash disbursement.

The beneficiaries had no specific suggestion or complaint about the cash transfer except for the fact that some elderly recipients did not remember their mobile money password. However, Vodacom, the financial service provider, and their staff supported them in setting new passwords.

Another challenge noted was that families who were not selected were disgruntled as many families were affected but did not receive support because they did not meet the selection criteria during the targeting. This was resolved through community engagement, which helped clarify selection criteria and resolve the matter.

The funding targeted the most hard-hit households, however through continuous assessments it was learnt that more people were in fact affected. This then resulted in the overall limited funds to cover more emerging households as time evolved.

During the first PDM, it was established that 80% of the supported families were being hosted by their relatives and families, which increased the size of the target household. More crucial, due to WFP support in Qacha'snek, of 355 households, the initial target of 510 households decreased, reaching 155 households in Thaba Tseka only, therefore this brought quite significant unspent funds and thus reimbursed back to IFRC.

### Lessons Learned

It was recommended that the community engagement and accountability approach needed improvement during the operation, especially as the cash beneficiaries were unaware of the hotline mechanism. It was concluded that a more effective way to give the beneficiaries more accessibility to communicate needs should be sought. For example, airing the LRCS operation information on National Radio and TV (the TV channel where rural dwellers tune and watch mostly). It was furthermore important to involve community radios since they broadcast in each district.

Beneficiaries were happy with the LRCS toll-free number, and it was recommended to widen dissemination of this feedback tool to cover a larger number of community members prior, during, and after the disaster.

The cash provision was implemented due to LRCS working hand in hand with the local authorities and partners like WFP to avoid duplication of support. LRCS also learned that working in collaboration with the government and other actors in a response operation is best for complementarity of the support provided and resource mobilization. Nonetheless, more support is needed in the shelter sector for repairing damaged homes.

The beneficiary list validation process is necessary to reduce errors. Indeed, the mismatched transfers experienced in 2016 when cash programming started in the National Society were no longer a problem this year. LRCS cooperated with the financial service provider to allow the National Society to validate the data and pay beneficiaries themselves. This service saved time used for exchanging emails and waiting. However, the LRCS Information Technology officer developed a web receiver to receive and deliver data to the FSP server.

During the lessons learned workshop, it was highlighted that hazard monitoring and the regional information-sharing mechanism should be strengthened.



## Health

People reached: 2,550 people

Male:1,020

Female: 1,530

Indicators:	Target	Actual
# of volunteers and staff trained in PSS	70	70
# of people affected reached by psychosocial support	based on needs	400
# PFA sessions provided to community members	4	4
# of households which received cash for dignity kits <i>(new)</i>	162 HH	348 HH
# of hygiene promotion sessions conducted <i>(new)</i>	Not planned	10
# of people reached with hygiene promotion <i>(new)</i>	Not planned	2,550

### Narrative description of achievements

A total of 70 volunteers and 15 staff members received refresher face-to-face training on First Aid and PSS. The training supported volunteers and staff to be well skilled and respond to the needs of the community. The participants were equipped with relevant skills to consider which groups within the affected community were hardest hit by the impact of windstorms and provide psycho-social support and information. After the refresher training, the volunteers conducted house-to-house visits, aimed at identifying families with particular psychosocial needs. With the information provided, an intensive PSS was provided to 162 identified heads of households (who came to collect the distributed cash) with PSS needs. Nonetheless, four PSS sessions were provided with the rest of the affected communities and at least 400 people were reached.

It was noted during the PDM that at least 348 of the overall recipient households used some of the cash received to purchase dignity kits. This is an increase from plan, as the cost for dignity kits was only factored in for the 162 families which had their houses completely destroyed.

All 510 affected and targeted households were further reached with hygiene promotion and awareness, as well as integrated COVID-19 prevention messaging in Qacha'snek and Thaba Tseka Districts.

The training was tailored in such a way that psycho-social support was accessible, appropriate, and adapted to all affected persons in the community, through adapting to local context and specific needs. Moreover, staff and volunteers were oriented on gender and diversity sensitivity, protection and exclusion risks from the consequences of windstorm effects, and of course prevailing COVID-19.

More importantly, staff and volunteers were equipped with relevant skills to ensure that responses planned were accepted by the community and aimed at maintaining their dignity, participation, and accessibility to all affected people, with consideration given to marginalized groups.

### Challenges

While there were no cases that needed First aid, PSS was of high priority though sessions were done with serious caution due to movement restrictions and allocation of a few hours for the gatherings. Nonetheless, PDM established that during the operation, 80% of people were hosted by relatives therefore this increased number of persons in the host household to approximately 7 to 10 people per household, thereby increasing strain on both relations and resources.

During the PDM exercise, it was realized that there was a big need for menstrual hygiene kits for the families compared to the support being provided, due to the increased number of household members inclusive of host families.

### Lessons Learned

While still working under Covid 19 era, LRCS needed to strengthen divisions and branch capacity in information dissemination to ease remote training and national as well as local technical support.

This operation strengthened a good collaboration between LRCS and other district and local stakeholders, therefore this resulted in common messaging to be disseminated to the direct and indirect beneficiary and the community at large. The recommendations from stakeholders suggested a need to collaborate even on ongoing projects to avoid duplication and maintain projects sustainability beyond short, medium, and long-term funding.

<b>Strategies for Implementation</b>		
<b>Indicators:</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
# of volunteers participating in the response and covered by relevant insurance	70 volunteers	70
# of volunteers trained in CEA, PGI and PSEA	70 volunteers	70
# supervision missions by the LRCS HQ team	3 missions	3
# of consultations with affected and targeted households on decision on primary recipient of cash grant per household	2 consultations	4
% of community feedback received and responded to	at least 80%	60%
# of IFRC monitoring missions	1 mission	0
# of lessons learned workshop conducted	1 LLW	1 LLW
<b>Narrative description of achievements</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A total of 70 volunteers (55 female, 15 male) received training in cash and voucher assistance (CVA) as well as a refresher face-to-face training on First Aid and PSS. The CVA training included common issues that emerge in the cash transfer and CEA to enable them to meaningfully support the intervention, which came in handy as they were able to support people who were facing challenges accessing their cash transfers. They were also briefed on Kobo, PGI, and CEA. A volunteer database was developed to keep track of those engaged and all were insured for the duration of the project.</li> <li>- Various meetings and remote meetings were held at headquarters and on the field to monitor the implementation of the DREF operation. Field visits were also conducted during distributions to ensure all was being implemented as planned and post-distribution monitoring was conducted to assess the satisfaction of communities with the services provided.</li> <li>- A total of four (4) consultations were held with affected and targeted households to decide on the primary recipient of cash grants per household. The consultation helped to dissipate potential disgruntlement in the community, for the families which did not receive the grant, as it clarified the selection criteria and only the most vulnerable were selected.</li> <li>- A feedback mechanism was set up, with LRCS providing feedback to at least 60% of the complaints which were sent in. Most of these complaints were around the functionality of the SIM cards. As a way of ensuring CEA approaches were adhered to on the operation consultation meeting with communities were conducted to minimize conflict in households and communities on criteria of beneficiaries and this ensured the success of the operation because community leaders and beneficiaries were all participatory. In addition, villagers with relevant skills were contracted by the beneficiaries to rebuild their houses. Complimentary cash transfers for food needs enabled beneficiaries to have their healthy food needs taken care of after the disaster. Beneficiaries themselves stated that losing a house was stressful but not having to worry about food enabled them to mainly focus their time and resources on rebuilding their houses.</li> <li>- No monitoring mission was conducted directly by IFRC to the country due to COVID-related restrictions and rising cases in Lesotho. However, regular virtual consultations were held between National Society and its Secretariat to ensuring activities were being implemented as planned and to provide technical guidance as needed.</li> </ul>		
<b>Challenges</b>		
N/A		
<b>Lessons Learned</b>		
<p>The lessons learned session was conducted centrally in Maseru. LRCS learned that at scale, capacity of volunteers and community-based help desks through training or refresher training positively impacts the implementation process within communities. For this, there were minimal queries addressed to HQ because there was supported to have queries resolved within communities.</p> <p>LRCS has MOUs with the FSP which provides for the National Society to validate the data and pay beneficiaries themselves. This gave LRCS the flexibility to process payment at their convenience upon required internal authorization levels. The process of validation of the beneficiary list is necessary to reduce errors, Further, it was learned that working in collaboration with the government and other actors in the operation is best for complementarity of the support provided and resource mobilization.</p> <p>It was recommended that the community engagement and accountability methodologies needed improvement during the operation, especially as the cash beneficiaries were unaware of the hotline mechanism. It was concluded that a more effective way to give the beneficiaries more accessibility to communicate needs should be sought. For example,</p>		

airing the LRCS operation information on National Radio and TV (the TV channel where rural dwellers tune and watch mostly). It was furthermore important to involve community radios since they are distributed in each district. Finally, beneficiaries were happy with the LRCS toll-free number and thus recommended more of its dissemination to cover a larger number of community members even prior, during, and after disaster.

Good collaboration with different stakeholders helped in pre-addressing issues of protection and inclusion. However, Red Cross branches should endeavour to recruit more female volunteers as an example of inclusion.

## D. Financial Report

The overall amount allocated for implementation of this operation was CHF 174,013 of which CHF 144,993 (83%) were expensed. A balance of CHF 29,020 has been returned to the DREF.

### Explanation of variances:

- **Clothing & Textiles** budget line was overspent by CHF 2,388 (82%) due to the magnitude of the windstorms damage; more blankets were needed during implementation.
- **Medical & First Aid** budget line remained unspent because there was finally no need for any such expenses.
- **Cash Disbursement** budget line was not fully spent and remained with a balance of CHF 23,696 (13%) because the food needs in Quacha's nek were covered by WFP and only 155 households, instead of the planned 510 households received cash support for food, albeit for 4 months.
- **Distribution & Monitoring** budget line remained unspent because the government provided support in the distribution of relief materials.
- **National Society Staff** budget line was spent although not budgeted for because the costing was coded incorrectly. This was to be booked under travel expenses.
- **Volunteers** budget line was overspent by CHF 690 (185%) because the needs for volunteers was overseen as more volunteers were required on the ground for longer periods and distances between communities were vast.
- **Workshops & Training** budget line was over expensed by CHF 1,146 (16%) due to prices of workshop venue and travel costs being higher than anticipated.
- **Travel** budget line remained unspent because expenses were coded to the National Society Staff budget line.
- **Communications** budget line was expensed by CHF 861 although not budgeted for because, although the government assisted with the provision of communication materials, other communication costs were not covered and were incurred during the operation implementation.

# DREF Operation

Selected Parameters			
Reporting Timeframe	2021/09-2022/4	Operation	MDRLS005
Budget Timeframe	2021-2022	Budget	APPROVED

## FINAL FINANCIAL REPORT

Prepared on 23/May/2022

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

### MDRLS005 - Lesotho - Windstorms

Operating Timeframe: 11 Sep 2021 to 31 Jan 2022

## I. Summary

<b>Opening Balance</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Funds &amp; Other Income</b>	<b>174,013</b>
DREF Allocations	174,013
<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>-144,993</b>
<b>Closing Balance</b>	<b>29,020</b>

## II. Expenditure by planned operations / enabling approaches

Description	Budget	Expenditure	Variance
PO01 - Shelter and Basic Household Items			0
PO02 - Livelihoods			0
PO03 - Multi-purpose Cash	150,462	127,481	22,982
PO04 - Health	824	1,137	-312
PO05 - Water, Sanitation & Hygiene			0
PO06 - Protection, Gender and Inclusion			0
PO07 - Education			0
PO08 - Migration			0
PO09 - Risk Reduction, Climate Adaptation and Recovery			0
PO10 - Community Engagement and Accountability	2,199	1,734	465
PO11 - Environmental Sustainability			0
<b>Planned Operations Total</b>	<b>153,485</b>	<b>130,351</b>	<b>23,134</b>
EA01 - Coordination and Partnerships	1,580	25	1,555
EA02 - Secretariat Services			0
EA03 - National Society Strengthening	18,948	14,616	4,331
<b>Enabling Approaches Total</b>	<b>20,528</b>	<b>14,641</b>	<b>5,886</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>174,013</b>	<b>144,993</b>	<b>29,020</b>

# DREF Operation

Selected Parameters			
Reporting Timeframe	2021/09-2022/4	Operation	MDRLS005
Budget Timeframe	2021-2022	Budget	APPROVED

## FINAL FINANCIAL REPORT

Prepared on 23/May/2022

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

### MDRLS005 - Lesotho - Windstorms

Operating Timeframe: 11 Sep 2021 to 31 Jan 2022

### III. Expenditure by budget category & group

Description	Budget	Expenditure	Variance
<b>Relief items, Construction, Supplies</b>	<b>133,796</b>	<b>111,713</b>	<b>22,083</b>
Clothing & Textiles	2,903	5,291	-2,388
Medical & First Aid	774		774
Cash Disbursement	130,119	106,422	23,696
<b>Logistics, Transport &amp; Storage</b>	<b>11,031</b>	<b>5,507</b>	<b>5,524</b>
Distribution & Monitoring	5,548		5,548
Transport & Vehicles Costs	5,483	5,507	-24
<b>Personnel</b>	<b>371</b>	<b>7,008</b>	<b>-6,637</b>
National Society Staff		5,947	-5,947
Volunteers	371	1,061	-690
<b>Workshops &amp; Training</b>	<b>7,096</b>	<b>8,242</b>	<b>-1,146</b>
Workshops & Training	7,096	8,242	-1,146
<b>General Expenditure</b>	<b>11,098</b>	<b>3,673</b>	<b>7,425</b>
Travel	3,548		3,548
Office Costs	1,110	634	476
Communications		861	-861
Financial Charges	516	23	493
Other General Expenses	5,925	2,155	3,770
<b>Indirect Costs</b>	<b>10,621</b>	<b>8,849</b>	<b>1,771</b>
Programme & Services Support Recover	10,621	8,849	1,771
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>174,013</b>	<b>144,993</b>	<b>29,020</b>

## Contact information

### Reference documents



Click here for:

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

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

#### In the Lesotho Red Cross National Society (ies)

- **Secretary General** (or equivalent); Kopano Masilo Mr, [kmasilo@redcross.org.ls](mailto:kmasilo@redcross.org.ls) +266313911
- **Operational coordination:** Sechaba Mokhameleli, [mokhgameleli@redcross.org.ls](mailto:mokhgameleli@redcross.org.ls) Phone: +266313911

#### IFRC Southern Africa Country Cluster

- Dr Michael Charles, Head of Cluster Office; phone: +278 34132988; email: [michael.charles@ifrc.org](mailto:michael.charles@ifrc.org)
- Naemi Heita, Operations Manager; Mobile: +27829264448; email: [naemi.heita@ifrc.org](mailto:naemi.heita@ifrc.org)

#### IFRC Regional Office

Adesh Tripathee, Head of DCPRR Unit, Kenya; phone: Mobile +254 731 067489; email: [adesh.tripathee@ifrc.org](mailto:adesh.tripathee@ifrc.org),

#### In IFRC Geneva

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

#### For IFRC Resource Mobilization and Pledges support:

- Louise DAINTREY-HALL, Head of Partnership and Resource Development, phone: +254 110 843 978; email: [louise.daintrey@ifrc.org](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:Philip.kahuho@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.

[www.ifrc.org](http://www.ifrc.org)

Saving lives, changing minds.

