

www.ifrc.org  
Saving lives,  
changing minds.

# Emergency Plan of Action Final Report

## Zimbabwe: Floods



<b>DREF</b>	<b>Operation:</b> MDRZW010; <b>GLIDE n°:</b> EP-2015-000001-ZWE
<b>Date of Issue:</b> 26 August, 2015	<b>Date of disaster:</b> December, 2014
<b>Operation start date:</b> 12 January, 2015	<b>Operation end date:</b> 12 May, 2015
<b>Host National Society:</b> Zimbabwe Red Cross Society	<b>Operation budget:</b> CHF 192,292
<b>Number of people affected:</b> 6,000 people (1,200HH)	<b>Number of people assisted:</b> 2,500 people (500 HH)
<b>National Societies involved in the operation:</b> Danish Red Cross, Norwegian Red Cross, Finnish Red Cross, ICRC, IFRC SARO.	
<b>Other partner organizations involved in the operation:</b> UNOCHA, IOM, World Vision	

## A. Situation analysis

### Description of the disaster

From December 2014, Zimbabwe experienced continuous heavy rainfall, which led to widespread flooding across the country, with the worst affected provinces including: Manicaland, Mashonaland Central, Mashonaland East, Mashonaland West and Midlands. According to preliminary assessments, approximately 6,000 people (1,200 households) were affected, of which 2,500 people (500 households) were identified as in urgent need of assistance. Many houses collapsed due to flooding, belongings were washed away including food and livelihoods items, and water and sanitation infrastructures contaminated.

In January 2015, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) released CHF 192,292 from the Disaster Relief and Emergency Fund (DREF) to support the Zimbabwe Red Cross respond to the immediate needs of the affected population, with emergency food, relief, shelter assistance, water, sanitation and hygiene promotion in Manicaland, Mashonaland Central, Mashonaland East, Mashonaland West and Midlands provinces; over a period of three months. 98 per cent of the activities have been completed.

An extension of one month was approved in order to carry out a [DREF operational review/lessons learned exercise](#). This operational review/lessons learnt was originally intended to be carried out the week commencing 22 March 2015, however it had to be postponed until the 20 April 2015. This was due to unavailable resources from ZRCS and ODK equipment that was required to carry out beneficiary satisfaction survey.

The IFRC zone office and southern Africa regional office (SARO) developed a Terms of Reference and team members were identified from Disaster Management and PMER units. A representative from British Red Cross also participated in this exercise. As part of the operational review/lessons learnt, refresher training on the use of ODK technologies for ZRCS volunteers was done in the field a day before the exercise, thus it was used to carry out the beneficiary satisfaction survey. The DREF operation was completed by 12 May 2015.

This DREF was partially replenished by DG ECHO. The major donors and partners of the DREF included the Red Cross Societies and governments of Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg,

Monaco, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden and the USA, as well as DG ECHO, the UK Department for International Development (DFID) the Medtronic, Zurich and Coca Cola Foundations.

The IFRC, on behalf of the Zimbabwe Red Cross Society would like to extend many thanks to all partners for their generous contributions.

<click [here](#) for the contact details and [here](#) for the final financial report>

## Summary of response

### Overview of Host National Society

Upon approval of the DREF, the NS managed to catapult the emergency response mechanisms forward, which had been set in motion in late December and part of January 2015. Provincial level teams were deployed to carry out further detailed needs assessment in order to establish a comprehensive picture of the emergency situation and the needs of the affected populations. In some districts, joint assessments were carried out with other Civil Protection Committee (CPC) members to promote coordination and increase efficiency, transparency and beneficiary accountability of all agencies. This also included civil societies that were planning interventions in the affected areas. The findings proved not to be too far from the projections of the initial rapid assessments in terms of the scale and geographic coverage of the affected area, notwithstanding the useful recommendations for long term recovery and sustainability. The appeal was planned for revision, however the assessments were done in conjunction with other members of the civil protection unit and they only advised ZRCS that they were unable to fulfil their commitments to the revision, once the DREF had been finalised.

The detailed assessments also generated more in depth information on the target beneficiaries including the list of names, which aided the relief distributions that followed the conclusion of the procurement processes. Almost 90% of the procurements were done locally and for expediency and relevance to the local contextual realities, with exception only to the tarpaulins which were procured abroad as the local market prices were too steep. Key staff and volunteers in the operation were also trained on the Sphere Standards as a way of strengthening the capacity for effective response.

The National Society (NS) using the DREF document continued to canvass for additional support through local and international well-wishers and as such, independently managed to receive a donation from the Rotary Club of the UK for water filters and school/education support. Local well-wisher's also donated second hand clothing and footwear. All this complemented the DREF relief package quite significantly. The final round of the distributions was eventually concluded on the 25 March, and a beneficiary satisfaction survey had been carried out to establish the effectiveness of the support given from the beneficiary perspective. A review of the floods operation was carried out from the 22 to 24 April culminating in a lessons learnt workshop on 27 April to assess its effectiveness, capture lessons learnt and identify areas for improvement of future operations. Through the review, a case study was developed to demonstrate to key partners/donors of the efforts that were undertaken by the ZRCS to respond to the flooding situation in the country through the DREF. Feedback on the initial findings of the review was shared with the NS on the 28 April.

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

Within the reporting period, ZRCS continued to work in collaboration with in-country Partner National Societies which include the Danish Red Cross, Finnish Red Cross and the Norwegian Red Cross that have positively supported the response actions by offering critical resources, such as project vehicles, during various phases of the emergency. Movement coordination meetings have been opportune platforms for updates on the general progress of activities, including the DREF operation.

### Overview of non-RCRC actors in country

As noted earlier, there was improved coordination of the response with the Department of Civil Protection increasingly leading and coordinating the response actions of the varied agencies. As such, assessments in Mashonaland West and Central provinces were joint interagency assessments. Beneficiary's lists were considered as the authentic list for any distributions which significantly improved efficiency and effectiveness by preventing costly overlaps and double dipping. Other agencies and civil societies also came forward to assist the affected population and the District of Civil Protection committees managed to prevent any overlaps. The Department of Social Services, National Health Care Trust, and Lower Gुरुve Development Association are among the few agencies to distribute items such as hygiene and farming inputs for some beneficiaries that were not covered by the planned ZRCS response.

## Needs analysis and scenario planning

Ongoing assessments by field teams were carried out by ZRCS and continuously pursued the plan to support 2,500 people and 500 households, with only slight variations; particularly on targets for safe drinking water (distribution of plastic buckets) that increased from 500 to 600 households, and in some instances the beneficiaries received more than one storage container depending on the family size and need. The increase of beneficiary households was a result of detailed surveys which exposed the need to widen the reach as the contamination of water sources exposed greater geographic areas and were not limited to only the affected households. This was in view of the threat of a cholera outbreak near the target populations. The cholera threat also confirmed the need to improve hygiene awareness with focus on cholera prevention whilst ensuring the prevention of all diarrheal conditions and ensuring general good hygiene practices. The turnaround period from ordering relief stocks from suppliers and their eventual delivery was delayed from the supplier, extending delivery period by almost five weeks. Some of these items like tarpaulins were for replenishment of the NS stocks. Some households did not receive shelter i.e. plastic sheets and tarpaulins as they had already instituted local recovery initiatives by either repairing their damaged structures and/or rebuilding.

### Risk Analysis

ZRCS were unable to access some of the affected areas as the roads needed repairing and land cruisers could not manage the terrain especially whilst flooding was still apparent. In addition to this, there were logistical delays with the coordination of volunteers as the call out system which had been put in place, did not include checks to confirm that volunteers were available. It was assumed that teams would be on the ground and ready to respond, however this was not the case. This resulted in the lack of available resources and compromised assistance on the ground.

## B. Operational strategy and plan

### Overall Objective

The flood-affected population's survival and immediate needs were met through the provision of essential emergency relief, food and shelter items, water and sanitation, hygiene promotion targeting a total of 2,500 people (500 households) in Manicaland, Mashonaland Central, Mashonaland East, Mashonaland West and Midlands provinces.

### Proposed strategy

A breakdown of the households per province and number of affected households that received RC support is outlined below.

**Table 1: Number of households who received RC support, segregated by gender of head of household and location.** (Source: Provincial update reports – 2015)

Province	District	Number of affected households	Number of affected HHs who received RC support (Gender disaggregated by household head)		
			M	F	Total
Mashonaland Central	Mbire	498	30	50	80
	Mt. Darwin	552	43	37	80
	Muzarabani	163	39	21	60
	Harare	980	68	82	150
Mashonaland West	Hurungwe	10	9	1	10
	Makonde	5	8	4	12
	Zvimba	23	3	2	5
Midlands	Gokwe North	26	0	0	0
	Gokwe South	5	0	0	0
Manicaland	Mutare	180	81	99	180
	Chipinge	15	6	9	15
<b>Totals</b>		<b>2,457</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>592</b>

ZRCS implemented the prioritised activities within the EPOA, and many of these activities were fulfilled sufficiently. A summary of these activities are as follows:

- Needs assessment and analysis for validation of the needs of the flood-affected population completed,
- Procurement and distribution of NFIs: 1,000 blankets (two blankets/family); 250 kitchen sets (priority was given to the 250 vulnerable households whose utensils got damaged/lost during floods), and 500 mosquito nets. NFIs were distributed to 500 people (100 households) and will be replenished.
- Procurement and distribution of 500 food parcels to households affected for one month (20kg mealie meal, 2kg beans, 2 litres cooking oil, 500g salt, 2kg sugar, 500g powdered milk and 2kg flour). Based on the information from preliminary assessments and also informed by the actions of other players, a one month food support was provided to the flood-affected populations in the form of parcels based on the standard food basket.
- Provision of temporary shelter (1,000 tarpaulins, 2,000 timber pieces and 50 rolls plastic sheeting) for 2,500 people (500 households) affected families. Shelter was a priority provision and was sensitive to gender disparities and needs as guided by the SPHERE standards. Tools to support shelter construction are locally owned by the communities and volunteers were deployed to provide demonstration/assistance as required;
- 4,480 water guards were distributed for 3 months (3 bottles of 150mls/household/month)
- Procurement and distribution of 500 hygiene kits (soap, Vaseline, sanitary pads, mosquito repellents) and 500 buckets (for water storage);
- Printing and distribution of Information, Communication and Education (IEC) materials to the affected communities and carrying out hygiene promotion;
- Training of staff and volunteers on SPHERE standards;
- Procurement of Mega V/ODK equipment and training of staff and volunteers on its use for surveys/distributions in collaboration with the IFRC Zone and SARO.

In the delivery of the DREF operation, the most vulnerable populations who were in need of immediate life-saving assistance, and not being targeted by other agencies, were prioritized – this includes: children and the chronically ill orphans, people living with disabilities, widows, and women. The needs of women and children and other disadvantaged groups have been taken into consideration.

The following items were procured and delivered, food hampers, hygiene kits, and kitchen sets, mosquito nets, plastic sheeting and timber.

## **Operational support services**

### **Human resources (HR)**

The DREF operation required personnel which involved volunteers and NS staff. The following provides a break down on the roles and responsibilities:

- 50 trained volunteers participated during the operation to carry out shelter construction, distributions, assessments loading, offloading and shelter construction. Working a maximum of four hours a day, these volunteers required insurance, travel cost, allowances and refreshments during the operation. An RDRT trained officer was assigned as the project officer to manage the operation and received a fulltime salary support for the three months.
- 12 members of staff at provincial and HQ level provided the required services from the beginning of the operation and some NDRT participated in the operation as required and in rotation. HQ staff provided coordination of the operation. They were paid per diem, accommodation costs, and travel costs as determined by the NS per diem policies. The 12 staff supported the project officer as and when required in the five provinces targeted by the operation. The number was cognizant of the geographic spacing of the affected areas.

### **Logistics and supply chain**

The earlier envisaged logistics plan remained in place and was followed.

- Procurement plans: Locally available material was procured by the ZRCS. This included water sanitation items and food parcels. Procurement procedures followed standard IFRC protocol.
- Use of prepositioned non-food items at both NS Level and IFRC regional level: The ZRCS received a donation of NFIs from IFRC (tarpaulins/kitchen sets) that were used and required replenishing.
- Warehouse and storage plans: While ZRCS had originally planned that procured items will be stored at ZRCS main warehouse and/or delivered straight to the provincial warehouse, this has not been the case as in some instances, for expediency, goods were requested from ZRCS main warehouse and delivered straight to the

distribution points. However, paper trail of relevant documentation is kept to account to track stock during distribution activities.

- Transport and fleet needs: The ZRCS allocated project vehicles to the operation. ZRCS was given a
- VRP vehicle on rent from IFRC Global Fleet Unit in country. The NS truck was also hired for transport of NFIs to distribution and storage sites, while another bigger 30 tonne truck was also hired for delivery of relief stocks to Mashonaland Central. Fuel costs for the local assessments and distribution costs however were higher than earlier planned, ZRCS had to utilise other underutilised fuel budgets to cover the gap.

## Information technologies (IT)

All communications costs directly related to the operation were covered by the NS. ZRCS used existing IT equipment and no additional capital expenditures were covered by the DREF budget.

## Communications

ZRCS held press conferences with local media to profile the response operations. Use of social media platforms such as the ZRCS Facebook and Twitter sites were critical, and at the same time posting updates on the ZRCS website. Communications material gathered during the operation was shared with IFRC for posting on the recently launched Africa web page [www.ifrc.org/africa](http://www.ifrc.org/africa). This material was also shared within ZRCS for their own use. Furthermore, the NS was invited to use radio stations to promote the work being done in the operation. The humanitarian ambassador for ZRCS was also engaged to reach out to the media fraternity, as well as his fans by posting updates on his own social media sites. A case study of the DREF was also developed when the DREF review was done, and therefore shared as part of the DREF Review Report.

## Security

No security issues were encountered.

## Planning, monitoring, evaluation, & reporting (PMER)

PMER was key to the delivery of the planned operation to ensure evidence based reporting was used, accountability was upheld and established standards were compliant. While the disaster situation remained quite stable, PMER continued to regularly track the effects and impact of response actions, progress of activities, delivery of outputs below, and track beneficiary perceptions on the assistance being rendered. A beneficiary satisfaction survey was also carried out towards the end of operation to measure accountability. As a result of the survey, it was clear that the areas that were severely affected were not traditionally hit areas e.g. there had never been any floods in the Mbire district. The response from humanitarian organizations, however, was not sufficient to the level of need as some vulnerable households went without any form of support. As much as ZRCS support was timely, the number of households targeted versus the numbers in need of support was greater. In terms of the provision of relief items, ZRCS was the first responder and the assessment teams carried a few supplies for distribution to the neediest cases, prior to the major distribution. In some cases, since the initial distribution package was the same, households were getting items that they did not need (e.g. kitchen utensils) and less of what they needed (e.g. food items). There were also cases in Muzarabani where households received aluminum pots, but these were not appropriate as most families cook over open fires. Other items that were needed by the community and were not distributed include cement for construction of more hardy houses, stationery and school items for children.

Recommendations that came out as a result of the beneficiary survey include the need for ZRCS to categorize the different beneficiaries so that during distributions, households get only the relevant items that they need. It was also recommended that for future operations, there is an opportunity for a revision of the operation, especially if the number of households targeted were less than the households in need. This will enable ZRCS to cater for as many vulnerable people as possible. It was also recommended that there should be regular coordination meetings at the district, provincial and national level by all stakeholders so that it is possible to review the operation and increase support as needed, based on the number of vulnerable households yet to be supported.

An operational review/lessons learnt workshop was carried with technical support from the IFRC Zone, SARO and a representative from the British Red Cross. Recommendations for long term interventions were given. Some of the recommendations that were raised were that, support requirements for the reconstruction of livelihoods should be considered. For example, in addition to giving food rations there should be support given towards the beneficiaries own food production (seeds) thereby contributing towards the enhancement of food security for the affected communities. In terms of preparedness in urban settlements, there should be provision for suitable temporary shelter, in consultation with

the local authorities. This became evident as some tarpaulins were not allowed in some of these urban areas affected by the floods.

## C. DETAILED OPERATIONAL PLAN

### Quality Programming / Areas Common to all Sectors

Needs assessment			
Programming / Areas Common to all Sectors			
Outcome 1: Continuous and detailed assessment and analysis is used to inform the design and implementation of the operation	Outputs		% of achievement
		Output 1.1 Emergency plan of action is updated and revised as necessary to reflect needs	
Activities	Is implementation on time?		% achievement (estimates)
	Yes	No	
Needs assessment survey which show beneficiaries are consulted	X		100%
Revision of EPoA based on consultation with beneficiaries, assessment and analysis	X		100%
Procurement of Mega V/ ODK equipment and training	NA	NA	NA

Achievements
<p><b>1.1.1 Needs assessment survey which show beneficiaries are consulted</b></p> <p>The detailed assessments carried out upon approval of the DREF established a comprehensive picture of the emergency situation and the needs of the affected populations. In some districts joint assessments were carried out with the civil protection to promote coordination and increase efficiency, transparency and beneficiary accountability by all agencies and civil society organisations planning interventions in the affected areas. The findings proved not too far from the projections on the initial rapid assessments in terms of the scale and geographic coverage of the affected area. There have been useful recommendations made for long term recovery and sustainability. The detailed assessments also generated more in-depth information on the target beneficiaries including the list of names which aided significantly in the relief distributions which followed the conclusion of the procurement processes.</p>
<p><b>1.1.2. Revision of EPoA based on consultation with beneficiaries, assessment and analysis</b></p> <p>There has been no revision of the EPoA but an extension of the operation was sought and approved to accommodate consolidation, the ODK training and the lesson learnt review. As noted above, the detailed assessments also generated more in-depth information on the target beneficiaries including the list of names which aided significantly to the relief distributions which followed the conclusion of the procurement processes.</p>
<p><b>1.1.3. Procurement of Mega V/ ODK equipment and training</b></p> <p>Following the launch of the DREF operation, the American Red Cross supported the Zimbabwe Red Cross with ODK equipment and training as part of its Urban Risk Reduction programming, and as such to avoid duplication this activity is no longer planned. Nonetheless, as part of the DREF operational review/lessons learnt exercise, there was a refresher on the use of ODK, to carry out the beneficiary satisfaction survey and future interventions.</p>
Challenges
<p>After other organisations completed their assessments and confirmed that they would not be able to assist some of the communities, the target areas/lists that ZRCS received, was very different to what was expected. This led to less people getting assistance in relation to the needs on the ground.</p>
Lessons Learned
<p>The fragmented approach of the various organisations in responding to the flood disaster did not adequately address the needs of the affected community, therefore in future, more coordination at the national, provincial and district level is needed amongst the various actors in order to give adequate response to the communities in</p>

need. There should be consideration of reviewing the operation scope and make changes as necessary in consultation with IFRC.

## Quality programming/areas common to all sectors

Programming areas common to all sectors			
<b>Outcome 2:</b> The management of the operation is informed by a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation system	Output		% of achievement
	<b>Output 2.1</b> Monitoring information informs revisions of emergency plan of action where appropriate		100%
	<b>Output 2.2</b> The findings of evaluations lead to adjustments in on-going plans and future planning as appropriate		100%
Activities	Was implementation on time?		% of achievement
	Yes	No	
Beneficiary satisfaction survey	X		100%
Monitoring visits	X		100 %
DREF Review workshop	X		100%
Achievements			
<b>2.1.1 Beneficiary satisfaction survey</b>	The ZRCS, in collaboration with the Africa zone and SARO PMER units, developed a beneficiary satisfaction survey. The first phase was carried out (using the ODK technology) to inform the NS on possible adjustments based on beneficiary feedback. The last part was carried out as part of the operational review/lessons learnt exercise, using the ODK technology (cell phone based survey).		
<b>2.1.2 Monitoring visits</b>	During 11 – 12 February 2015, the SARO Disaster Risk Management Coordinator and PMER Delegate carried out a monitoring mission to check progress on the implementation of the DREF operation.		
<b>2.2.1 DREF review workshop</b>	During the period 20 – 29 April 2015 operational review/lessons learnt was carried out. Team members were from SARO and the Zone office. British Red Cross also participated in this exercise. Pilot methodologies were used and as noted a beneficiary satisfaction survey was finalized with the intention of using them as standard for future DREF operational reviews/lessons learnt.		
Lessons learned			
The assessment of beneficiary's requirements as well as consultation and participation of the beneficiaries in the process should be improved to reduce the mismatch of items received. Beneficiary communication strategy needs to be considered and thus developed for the NS to enhance their operation accountability.			

## Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Promotion

**Needs analysis:** Most affected households lost their water storage devices along with most of their NFIs. While most protected water sources have been flooded and/or contaminated by flood waters. To avert potential water related illness it was paramount to provide water storage buckets that helped keep the water safe. Furthermore hygiene promotion through awareness raising campaigns during distribution of the relief items was done. Local volunteers continue to pass on messages to this effect. Hygiene kits were also procured and distributed to affected households for sanitizing their implements and living spaces.

**Population assisted:** 500 households in the Manicaland, Mashonaland Central, Mashonaland East, Mashonaland West and Midlands provinces, which are flood-affected, whose access to safe water supply and sanitation facilities has been disrupted; and are at increased risk of waterborne diseases.

<b>Water, sanitation and hygiene promotion</b>			
<b>Water, sanitation, and hygiene promotion</b>			
<b>Outcome 1:</b> Immediate risk of waterborne disease is reduced through the provision of safe water supply, sanitation facilities and hygiene promotion flood-affected areas of Zimbabwe over a period of three months	<b>Outputs</b>		<b>% of achievement</b>
	<b>Output 1.1</b> Target population in flood-affected areas is provided with access to safe drinking water supply in accordance with SPHERE and WHO standards (Target: 2,500 people / 500 households)		100%
	<b>Output 1.2:</b> Target population in flood-affected areas is provided with adequate environmental sanitation facilities (Target: 2 500 people / 500 households)		100%
	<b>Output 1.3:</b> Target population in the flood-affected areas are provided with hygiene promotion activities, which meet SPHERE standards (Target: 2 500 people / 500 households)		100%
<b>Activities</b>	<b>Was implementation on time?</b>		<b>% progress (estimate)</b>
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>NO</b>	
Water, sanitation and hygiene assessment	X		100%
Distribution of 4,480 water guard for three months (3 bottles of 150 mls/household/month)	X		100%
Sensitization sessions on use of aqua tabs	X		100%
Distribution of 500 plastic buckets with lids (for water storage) to the affected	X		200%
Distribution of 500 hygiene kits (soap, Vaseline, sanitary pads, mosquito repellants) procured for the 500 affected households	X		100%
Health and Hygiene promotion awareness sessions	X		100%
Distribution of IEC materials	X		100%
Training of staff and volunteers an SHERE standards	X		100%
<b>Achievements</b>			
<b>1.1.1 Water, sanitation and hygiene assessment</b>	<p>The detailed needs assessments cut across on all sectors to provide an in-depth understanding of each sector. These were carried out by personnel of multi-sectorial expertise. WATSAN personnel worked closely with the Environmental Health Technicians (EHTs) during the assessments. These assessments established the activities required. However, some identified needs sometimes went beyond the emergency phase to more development phase. Recommendations were shared with Ministry of Local Government authorities.</p>		
<b>1.1.2 Distribution of 45,000 aqua tablets</b>	<p>In total, 4,480 water guards (water guards were distributed to the 500 affected families, which equates to 100 per cent of the intended target). Water guard which is liquid in form, instead of Aqua tablets which are in tablet form were distributed to the beneficiaries. They served the same purpose of ensuring safe clean drinking water for the affected communities. In addition the National Society received a donation of 200 survival boxes with aqua filter water purification kits towards floods victims from Rotary Foundation based in London. The foundation paid for the transportation of goods and DREF contributed to customs clearance and storage fees of these goods. The kits benefitted 200 families in Mbire and Muzarabani districts of Mashonaland Central Province. The Water Survival Box is a rigid, reinforced 54 liter plastic container that becomes a receptacle for water when emptied of survival items; it includes a filtration pack including chlorine tablets – enough for family of 4 for some 4 months.</p>		
<b>1.1.3 Sensitization sessions on use of aqua tabs/waterguard</b>	<p>These were done pre-distribution. Beneficiaries were informed on the use of the water guards and a demonstration was done on site. In all instances the community welcomed the water guard over the powder water purifiers as it has less repulsive scent. However in these talks beneficiaries were reminded of the need to use other conventional water purification methods such as boiling of water, since the supply was likely to last them three months on average.</p>		
<b>1.1.4 Distribution of 500 plastic buckets with lids (for water storage) to the affected 500 households</b>			

In total, 1,000 buckets (two per family) were distributed to the 500 affected families. This is double the planned amount however they distributed from pre-positioned stocks, and have been replenished through the DREF allocation.

#### 1.2.1 Distribution of 500 hygiene kits (soap, Vaseline, sanitary pads, mosquito repellents) procured) to the 500 affected households

In total, 500 hygiene kits (soap, Vaseline, sanitary pads and mosquito repellent) have been distributed to the 500 affected families, which equates to 100 per cent of the intended target (500). These items were not available from pre-positioned stocks, and had to be procured, and following the late release of funding to the ZRCS were not received until the week 16 February 2015, which delayed their distribution.

#### 1.3.1 Health and hygiene promotion awareness sessions

Hygiene promotion was carried in some instances using CBHFA trained volunteers in the locality. At every pre-distribution address volunteers in conjunction with the EHT and village health workers carried out hygiene talks and demonstrations. Volunteers also carried out home visits for discussions on latrine maintenance general household cleanliness. In total 1,500 home visits were made during this period.

#### 1.3.2 Distribution of IEC materials

1,000 hygiene promotion leaflets were procured and distributed to the communities during the hygiene promotion activities.

#### 1.3.3 Training of staff and volunteers on SPHERE Standards

Staff were trained on the SPHERE standards with the aim of increasing the quality of RC response action thus increasing accountability to beneficiaries. A total of 26 staff members from the provinces and head office were trained over a period of 3 days.

### Challenges

In areas where ZRCS did not have active projects, many of the volunteers were dormant, hence there were only a few that responded in this operation in those areas, especially in the Mbire district. To assist with the gaps, the environmental health technicians created awareness among the displaced community members on the prevention of diseases such as diarrhea by promoting the treatment of water before drinking.

Water sources that were affected by floods are still in need of repair/disinfection. Some of these boreholes have been condemned, therefore communities near these water points have to travel far (some up to 5km) to get water or fetch from unprotected wells which are not safe. Without additional volunteers, the NS struggled to disseminate information on how the communities would make water safe for drinking through boiling it. This is something that will be factored in, during future operations.

### Lessons learned

It was encouraging to see that during the focus group discussion, volunteers who participated in the action said that they activated themselves. They remembered their training and they knew that they could help so they took it upon themselves to coordinate with village leaders to be involved in the assessment and verification process.

## Shelter and Settlements

**Needs analysis:** Provision of temporary shelter to 500 households with damaged houses: Two tarpaulins were distributed per family while 20 meters of plastic sheeting was provided for flooring purposes and/or covering partially damaged structures. Four lengths of treated timber were not distributed. Participatory designing of the shelters with the facilitation of shelter construction trained volunteers were done with locally available resources as timber was procured after distribution of prepositioned tarpaulins.

**Population to be assisted:** 500 households in the Manicaland, Mashonaland Central, Mashonaland East, Mashonaland West and Midlands provinces, which were flood-affected, whose homes have been damaged/destroyed and who had lost household assets.

### Shelter and settlements

Shelter and settlements

Outcome 1: Immediate shelter and settlement needs of the target population in flood-affected areas of Zimbabwe are met over a period of three months	Outputs		% of achievement
		Output 1.1 Distribution of NFIs and emergency shelter items undertaken to meet the needs of the target population in flood-affected areas (Target: 2,500 people / 500 households)	
Activities	Was implementation on time?		% of achievement
	Yes	No	
Procurement and distribution of NFIs and emergency shelter items (1,000 tarpaulins, 2000 treated timber, 250 kitchen sets, 500 bed nets and 1,000 blankets)	X		100% with the exception of timber procured and prepositioned.
Sensitization sessions on setting up shelter	X		100%

### Achievements

#### 1.1.1 Procurement and distribution of NFIs and emergency shelter items (1,000 tarpaulins, 2,000 treated timber, 250 kitchen sets, 500 bed nets and 1,000 blankets)

In total, 1,000 blankets (two per family), 500 bed nets (one per family) have been distributed to the 500 affected families, which equates to 100 per cent of the intended target. In addition, 250 kitchen sets have been distributed to the most 250 vulnerable families, which also equates to 100 per cent of the intended target. These items were distributed from pre-positioned stocks, and being replenished through the DREF allocation.

1,000 tarpaulins from the NS prepositioned stock were distributed to 500 families. 2,000 pieces of treated timber were not distributed as there were delays with procurement and in the meantime, beneficiaries improvised by supplementing the timber with locally available materials. This was due to some structures that were only partially affected (i.e. varied need across the target beneficiaries). The replenishment tarpaulins were externally procured.

#### 1.1.2 Sensitization sessions on setting up shelter

Volunteers trained in shelter construction provided sensitization and support to the communities during the setting up of the shelter structures. Provincial NDRT response teams earlier trained with support from ECHO were also part of the teams that provided the shelter support. The focus was on handing over the skills of shelter construction to the communities for sustainability.

### Challenges

In some cases, the blankets that had been identified for use in the distributions were not urgently needed. Additionally there were households that received items that they did not need e.g. kitchen sets when what the beneficiaries really needed was food.

### Lessons learned

Looking at the level of response versus the needs of the affected community, there was need for ZRCS to scale up its response especially when other humanitarian organizations did not give adequate support. Many other needy households were left without support in the critical days after the floods occurred. In future, there should be consideration of reviewing the operation scope and changes made as necessary, in consultation with IFRC.

## Food Security, Nutrition and Livelihoods

**Needs analysis:** The flood-affected population were in dire need of food after their food stocks were destroyed by flooding, moisture and exposure to elements.

**Population to be assisted:** 500 households in the Manicaland, Mashonaland Central, Mashonaland East, Mashonaland West and Midlands provinces, which are flood-affected, who have lost food items and livelihood assets. The food parcel provided comprised of 20kgs mealie meal, 2kgs beans, 2 litres cooking oil, 500g salt, 2kg sugar, 500g powdered milk and 2kg flour.

### Food security, nutrition and livelihoods

Food security, Nutrition, and Livelihoods			
Outcome 1 Immediate food needs of the target population in the flood-affected areas of Zimbabwe are met over a period of three months	Outputs		% of achievement
		Output 1.1 Appropriate food rations are distributed to the target population Target: 2,500 people / 500 households)	
Activities	Is implementation on time?		% progress (estimate)
	Yes	No	
Procurement of 500 food parcels ( locally)	X		100%
Distribution of 500 food parcels	X		100%
Achievements			
<p>1.1.1 Procurement of 500 food parcels locally). Food parcels were not available from pre-positioned stocks and had to be procured Unfortunately the late release of funding to the ZRCS meant they were not received until the week 16 February 2015, which delayed their distribution.</p> <p>1.1.2 Distribution of 500 food parcels. In total, 500 parcels have been distributed to the 500 affected families, which equates to 100 per cent of the intended target (500).</p>			
Challenges			
<p>Not all vulnerable households/people were reached. There was high demand for support yet only low response was received to meet the needs of the affected community. The amount of support from Red Cross and all other actors combined did not reach all the needy households. From the FGDs, it became clear that once the food distribution was done, the households that received the food rations further divided with other needy members in their villages who had been missed out in the distributions and were in a vulnerable situation.</p>			
Lessons learned			
<p>In addition to giving support to disaster relief, there should be some support given towards reconstruction of livelihoods for example, in addition to giving food rations, there should be support given towards own food production (seeds) thereby contributing towards enhancement of food security for the affected communities</p>			

## D. THE BUDGET

### Financial summary:

- The balance of CHF 47,256 at the close of the operation will be returned to DREF.
- There is a 38% positive variance on shelter budget line. Only 500 instead of 1,000 tarpaulins were bought for replenishment. This due to the reason that when the requisition was being raised the National Society forecasted to distribute only 500 tarpaulins but ended up distributing 1,000.
- Variance of 41% negative on the storage budget line. This line was used to pay for the donation received by from Rotary Foundation based in London.
- Workshop and training variance of 19% due to additional travel costs of IFRC team that went to support the DREF review and lesson learned workshop.
- Negative variance on financial charges budget line is due to Currency Revaluation costs.

## Contact information

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

- **Zimbabwe Red Cross Society:** Maxwell Phiri, Secretary General; phone: +263.4.332638; +263.4.332197; email: [phirim@redcrosszim.org.zw](mailto:phirim@redcrosszim.org.zw)
- **IFRC Regional Representation:** Michael Charles; Tel. +26771395339; Email: [michael.charles@ifrc.org](mailto:michael.charles@ifrc.org)
- **IFRC Africa Zone:** Carla Taylor, Africa Zone DMC; phone: +254 20 283 5253; email: [carla.taylor@ifrc.org](mailto:carla.taylor@ifrc.org)

### For Resource Mobilization and Pledges:

- **IFRC Africa Zone:** Fidelis Kangethe, Partnership and Resource Development Coordinator, Addis Ababa, phone: +251 (0) 930 03 4013; Email [fidelis.kangethe@ifrc.org](mailto:fidelis.kangethe@ifrc.org)

### For Performance and Accountability (planning, monitoring, evaluation and reporting queries):

- **IFRC Zone:** Robert Ondrusek, PMER/QA Delegate, Africa phone: +254 731 067277; email: [robert.ondrusek@ifrc.org](mailto:robert.ondrusek@ifrc.org)

## How we work

All IFRC assistance seeks to adhere to the Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in Disaster Relief and the Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Disaster Response (Sphere) in delivering assistance to the most vulnerable.

The IFRC's vision is to inspire, encourage, facilitate and promote at all times all forms of humanitarian activities by National Societies, with a view to preventing and alleviating human suffering, and thereby contributing to the maintenance and promotion of human dignity and peace in the world.

[www.ifrc.org](http://www.ifrc.org)  
Saving lives, changing minds.



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

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

**Disaster Response Financial Report**

MDRZW010 - Zimbabwe - Floods

Timeframe: 12 Jan 15 to 12 May 15

Appeal Launch Date: 12 Jan 15

Final Report

**Selected Parameters**

Reporting Timeframe	2015/1-2015/8	Programme	MDRZW010
Budget Timeframe	2015/1-2015/5	Budget	APPROVED
Split by funding source	Y	Project	*
Subsector:	*		

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

**I. Funding**

	Raise humanitarian standards	Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people	Strengthen RC/RC contribution to development	Heighten influence and support for RC/RC work	Joint working and accountability	TOTAL	Deferred Income
<b>A. Budget</b>		192,291				192,291	
<b>B. Opening Balance</b>							
<b>Income</b>							
<u>Other Income</u>							
<i>DREF Allocations</i>		192,292				192,292	
<b>C4. Other Income</b>		192,292				192,292	
<b>C. Total Income = SUM(C1..C4)</b>		192,292				192,292	
<b>D. Total Funding = B + C</b>		192,292				192,292	

\* Funding source data based on information provided by the donor

**II. Movement of Funds**

	Raise humanitarian standards	Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people	Strengthen RC/RC contribution to development	Heighten influence and support for RC/RC work	Joint working and accountability	TOTAL	Deferred Income
<b>B. Opening Balance</b>							
<b>C. Income</b>		192,292				192,292	
<b>E. Expenditure</b>		-145,706				-145,706	
<b>F. Closing Balance = (B + C + E)</b>		46,586				46,586	

## Disaster Response Financial Report

### MDRZW010 - Zimbabwe - Floods

Timeframe: 12 Jan 15 to 12 May 15

Appeal Launch Date: 12 Jan 15

Final Report

#### Selected Parameters

Reporting Timeframe	2015/1-2015/8	Programme	MDRZW010
Budget Timeframe	2015/1-2015/5	Budget	APPROVED
Split by funding source	Y	Project	*
Subsector:	*		

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

## III. Expenditure

Account Groups	Budget	Expenditure					TOTAL	Variance
		Raise humanitarian standards	Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people	Strengthen RC/RC contribution to development	Heighten influence and support for RC/RC work	Joint working and accountability		
	A					B	A - B	
<b>BUDGET (C)</b>			<b>192,291</b>			<b>192,291</b>		
<b>Relief items, Construction, Supplies</b>								
Shelter - Relief	21,122		13,107			13,107	8,016	
Shelter - Transitional	1,000						1,000	
Clothing & Textiles	31,631		28,670			28,670	2,961	
Food	25,510		25,004			25,004	506	
Water, Sanitation & Hygiene	7,806		7,125			7,125	681	
Utensils & Tools	9,184		9,172			9,172	12	
<b>Total Relief items, Construction, Sup</b>	<b>96,253</b>		<b>83,077</b>			<b>83,077</b>	<b>13,175</b>	
<b>Logistics, Transport &amp; Storage</b>								
Storage	612		1,494			1,494	-882	
Distribution & Monitoring	15,332		6,239			6,239	9,094	
Transport & Vehicles Costs	12,830		11,979			11,979	851	
<b>Total Logistics, Transport &amp; Storage</b>	<b>28,774</b>		<b>19,712</b>			<b>19,712</b>	<b>9,063</b>	
<b>Personnel</b>								
National Staff			19			19	-19	
National Society Staff	17,004		14,577			14,577	2,427	
Volunteers	6,830		3,741			3,741	3,089	
<b>Total Personnel</b>	<b>23,834</b>		<b>18,337</b>			<b>18,337</b>	<b>5,497</b>	
<b>Workshops &amp; Training</b>								
Workshops & Training	14,000		16,675			16,675	-2,675	
<b>Total Workshops &amp; Training</b>	<b>14,000</b>		<b>16,675</b>			<b>16,675</b>	<b>-2,675</b>	
<b>General Expenditure</b>								
Travel	5,400		5,923			5,923	-523	
Information & Public Relations	7,672		4,691			4,691	2,981	
Office Costs	1,102		530			530	572	
Communications	2,092		1,949			1,949	143	
Financial Charges	1,429		-14,081			-14,081	15,510	
<b>Total General Expenditure</b>	<b>17,695</b>		<b>-988</b>			<b>-988</b>	<b>18,682</b>	
<b>Indirect Costs</b>								
Programme & Services Support Recove	11,736		8,893			8,893	2,843	
<b>Total Indirect Costs</b>	<b>11,736</b>		<b>8,893</b>			<b>8,893</b>	<b>2,843</b>	
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURE (D)</b>	<b>192,291</b>		<b>145,706</b>			<b>145,706</b>	<b>46,585</b>	
<b>VARIANCE (C - D)</b>			<b>46,585</b>			<b>46,585</b>		

**Disaster Response Financial Report**

MDRZW010 - Zimbabwe - Floods

Timeframe: 12 Jan 15 to 12 May 15

Appeal Launch Date: 12 Jan 15

Final Report

**Selected Parameters**

Reporting Timeframe	2015/1-2015/8	Programme	MDRZW010
Budget Timeframe	2015/1-2015/5	Budget	APPROVED
Split by funding source	Y	Project	*
Subsector:	*		

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

**IV. Breakdown by subsector**

Business Line / Sub-sector	Budget	Opening Balance	Income	Funding	Expenditure	Closing Balance	Deferred Income
<b>BL2 - Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people</b>							
Disaster response	192,291		192,292	192,292	145,706	46,586	
Subtotal BL2	192,291		192,292	192,292	145,706	46,586	
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>192,291</b>		<b>192,292</b>	<b>192,292</b>	<b>145,706</b>	<b>46,586</b>	