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

CHF339,096 was allocated from the IFRC’s Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF) to support the National Society in delivering assistance to some 25,000 beneficiaries who were affected by the inundation of flood waters across Jakarta during the first months of 2013.

Period covered by this final report:
17 January 2013 - 16 April 2013

Summary
Heavy rains along with exceptionally high sea tides caused many parts of Jakarta to become inundated in flood waters on 16 January 2013. Ongoing heavy rains compounded by poorly maintained canals and exceptionally high water levels caused the dike of Ciliwung River to collapse. As a result, flood waters quickly immersed both the lower housing developments as well as the more developed business districts of the city.

At its peak, the floods immersed more than 97,000 homes and affected almost 250,000 people. Up to 20 people were reported killed, while at least 33,500 were forced to abandon their homes and be evacuated from low-lying areas of the capital; businesses were disrupted and travellers stranded.

Since the first day of the flood, the Indonesian Red Cross/Palang Merah Indonesia (PMI) has been involved in the relief operation through the evacuation of displaced communities and provision of basic first aid support. PMI also provided relief support with cooked food, relief items, drinking water, emergency health services,
hygiene awareness and psychosocial support activities. Later in the flood response, they also engaged in the early clean-up operation and provided hygiene kits and domestic environmental kits along with hygiene awareness programmes to assist flood-affected families to return and restore their damaged homes to a habitable condition.

In line with International Federation reporting standards, this final report provides an overview of the activities completed under this DREF operation. With expenditure that was slightly lower than anticipated, a balance of CHF 6,502 will be returned to the DREF.

Replenishment funds for this operation have been received from Canadian Red Cross/Canadian government, Netherlands Red Cross/Netherlands government, Tsunami residual funds, and Kraft Foods. Major donors to the DREF include the Irish, Italian, Netherlands and Norwegian governments, and the European Commission Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (DG ECHO).

The situation

Metropolitan Jakarta occupies a low-lying area covering the capital city of Indonesia and parts of the adjoining West Java and Banten provinces. It consists of Jakarta and the surrounding regencies of Bekasi and Bogor in West Java and Tangerang in Banten, which themselves incorporate the satellite cities of Bogor, Depok, Tangerang and Bekasi. The greater metropolitan area of Jakarta, also referred to as Jabodetabek, is home to an estimated 22 million people, making it the world’s fourth largest metropolitan area.

Jakarta is located in a deltaic plain crisscrossed by 13 natural rivers and more than 1,400 kilometers of man-made waterways. About 40 per cent of the city, mainly the area furthest north near the Java Sea, is below sea level. Jakarta is prone to flooding from water draining through the city from the hills in the south, and also from tidal flooding along the coastal strip in the north.

Floods are a recurrent problem for the Indonesian capital and have been increasing in severity during the past decade. The largest floods in Jakarta’s history are those that took place in 2002 and 2007. Jakarta’s floods are notorious and the resultant impact on the traffic flow, lost productivity and property damage is said to cost the city more than US$400 million per year (Indonesian National Board for Disaster Management, BNBP). In 2002, more than a quarter of Jakarta’s area was affected by flooding. However, the most disastrous flood to date, occurring in February 2007, cost 57 lives, displaced more than 422,000 people, and destroyed 1,500 homes, damaging many others. Total losses to property and infrastructure were estimated at USD695 million (WB).

Many of the previous efforts to prevent flooding, such as mangrove planting, canal construction and expansion of river floodplain areas have unfortunately been hampered due to rapid urbanization which has resulted in inadequate sanitation services, improper infrastructure development activities and other environmental encroachments. The main hazards for Jakarta presently relate to water management and flood control.

Extreme weather events cause overloading of the existing drainage system, while sea level rise coupled with land subsidence is making Jakarta increasingly vulnerable to tidal floods along its coastal fringe. Lack of piped water provision is driving large multi-use developments and small residential communities alike to drill wells to access groundwater. This extraction of groundwater is causing areas of Jakarta to sink rapidly, particularly in the north of the city. Along with sea level rise, land subsidence is one of the greatest challenges facing Jakarta. Furthermore, there is currently no city-wide solid waste management plan for Jakarta. The waste collection mechanisms in the city are largely contracted out to private companies, with wealthier areas paying more, while in the poorer locations, garbage is often discarded in vacant blocks or into nearby canals and rivers.

Floodwaters inundate the Hotel Indonesia traffic circle in Central Jakarta in January 2013. (Source: The Jakarta Globe, 16 January 2013)
In January 2013, heavy downpours within and around Jakarta resulted in excessively high river and dam levels. Several of the main rivers flowing through Jakarta broke their banks following continued heavy rain in the neighbouring city of Bogor. Bogor is located at a higher elevation than Jakarta at about 190 meters to 330 meters above sea level. Fearing further riverbank collapse and potential damage to the dams, the local administration was forced to release some of the water from the dams.

Fourteen sluice gates were opened including Katulampa in Bogor, upstream of Jakarta. Unfortunately the opening of the city’s main floodgate caused a 50-metre section of a canal to collapse, further inundating the city already swamped by the rains and resulting in extremely high water levels flowing into the central business district of Jakarta.

As a result, thousands of houses, buildings and roads were inundated by flood water. The Provincial Agency for Disaster Management (BPBD) DKI Jakarta reported on 16 January 2013 that 50 areas in Jakarta were totally or partially flooded, with East Jakarta the worst affected. Floodwaters blocked many major roads and paralyzed transportation in some parts of the city. Flood water levels rapidly increased over the following days, reaching more than three metres in some areas. In other locations on the outskirts of Jakarta, such as Bogor and Tangerang, floods caused landslides, with a number of casualties recorded.

The Merdeka presidential palace was also partially submerged, causing the President of Indonesia to delay state events with visiting state leaders and dignitaries.

Following the extensive flooding, the Jakarta Governor placed the entire capital under emergency status until 27 January 2013. However, by then, the meteorology department had forecast another period of heavy rain and storm activity forcing the government to introduce a cloud seeding programme. Five aircraft were used to spray clouds with salt seeds which caused rain water to quickly accumulate and fall from the clouds out over the sea, rather than in the Jakarta area. In addition, the local government quickly mobilized its public service workforce to clean out some of the city’s main rivers and canals.

Fortunately the expected storms did not occur in conjunction with the February high tides and another potential disaster was averted. By the end of January, a total 34 fatalities were recorded by Jakarta Disaster Management Agency (BPBD), with a remaining 1,288 persons displaced. The local government officially declared the emergency operation over on 27 January and then immediately commenced an emergency transition period, initially for one month. Even with the increased efforts of the local government to reduce rain fall in and around the city, and keep the canals and rivers open, several locations in downtown Jakarta and in neighbouring locations of Bogor, Bekasi and Bandung were still flooded up until 7 February. Heavy rains caused the banks of the Ciliwung and Cikeas rivers to break in several places, once again submerging many houses in East Bekasi in
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2 A weather modification process that, in this case, was aimed at making rain fall out over the sea instead of over the Jakarta area.
flood water between two to five metres deep. By 27 February, the water had drained from most of these locations allowing for the clean-up and restoration operation to cover all flood-affected and damaged locations.

Very often, it is the poor that are hardest hit in disasters such as this but this event also affected big businesses and those with greater economic resources. This was the first occasion in which floodwaters inundated the city’s Central Business District and brought all activity to a standstill. Factory assets were also destroyed, impacting income and livelihoods; significant disruption to the transportation networks also prevented workers getting to and from work and transporting products to markets. Livelihoods also suffered badly.

The impact of the 2013 flood was immense. Flooding inundated 500 neighbourhoods (RT), 44 villages and 25 districts in the entire city in DKI Jakarta. The Finance Ministry has estimated that the inflation rate increased by one per cent in January alone, due to the floods. The Association of General Insurance Companies estimated its members would have to pay out claims of around IDR 3 trillion (USD309 million). This is 50 per cent higher than the IDR 2.1 trillion in flood-related claims in 2007, which was, in turn, greater than the IDR 1.5 trillion paid out after the 2002 flood.

Six days after the flood, the Office of the Coordinating Economic Minister launched a Jakarta Coastal Defense Strategy to alleviate flooding in Jakarta. The strategy mainly focuses on structural mitigation financed by the central government, provincial governments and potential investors. It remains to be seen whether these efforts will be implemented and coordinated with other relevant agencies’ responsibilities. These include the Environmental Management Agency, the Sanitation Agency and the Public Housing Agency. Together they are responsible for the enforcement of spatial planning, groundwater use restrictions, optimizing reservoirs, optimizing riverbank usage, redevelopment of settlements, waste management for communities located along riverbanks and watershed conservation in the short, medium and long term.

Due to the excessive number of damaged and inundated buildings in downtown Jakarta, the Governor of Jakarta also set up an audit team to investigate why the 2013 flood was so destructive. Initial findings indicate that many buildings were built on land that was zoned for use as water catchment and green areas. Out of the 300 dams and lakes were built during colonial times to contain flooding, only 50 remain. Many of the inundated buildings were built on these former dam locations and have contributed to the disruption of the city’s drainage system. Along with the accumulation of garbage in the canals, the floodwater levels exceeded the height of the banks and flooded into the city. The Governor has vowed to continue to assess building structure, design and related land permits as soon as the city has finished with flood-related response and recovery efforts.

Accurate figures for the number of poor affected are difficult to calculate, given a lack of information on the informal labour sector, including micro and small enterprises run by street vendors and home-based industries. What is known is that among the 500,000 or so street vendors in Jakarta and over 100,000 beneficiaries of micro-enterprise financing facilities from the cooperative, few have insurance. Maps of Jakarta’s contours show that the more low-lying and flood-prone areas are where low-income housing and slums are more likely to be located. These floods have not only damaged or destroyed the assets of inhabitants in these areas, but have also caused high levels of anxiety and stress (WB).

**Coordination and partnerships**

Throughout the disaster, the Governor of Jakarta has been personally active in coordinating and overseeing relief operations. After the emergency period, the Governor announced that

- all remaining activities be focused on a quick return of the displaced population and a rapid clean-up of garbage and mud;
- any ongoing activities were to promote health, good hygiene and an overall improvement in the living conditions of affected communities;
- safe drinking water was a priority and Jakarta residents should avoid drinking water from outdoor wells which were still contaminated with mud and waste.

Repairs to the city’s water piping systems were prioritized, and in a few locations, water trucking delivery was an alternate source for drinking water until the wells had been cleaned. Sanitation and electricity services that had been affected by flooding were almost fully repaired by the end of January, paving the way for a quicker return to normal living.
The Provincial Government of DKI Jakarta set up an operations and coordination post to better ensure that assessment data was collated and analysed so that essentials were clearly identified and activities focused on priority areas based on needs. PMI seconded several staff to work in the governor’s office to ensure that their activities and plans were in support of the overall administrative priorities.

The Indonesian national society quickly mobilized its emergency response teams and supplies. Many supplies had already been stocked in local warehouses and villages prior to the rainy season, and these were dispatched quickly to the flooded areas. Search and rescue teams had already been training prior to the flood, and were ready and equipped to manage the boats, trucks and other relief materials.

The local government coordinated the dispatch of the PMI public kitchens along with other agencies’ portable toilets, boats and utilities. Red Cross volunteers and staff worked quickly to prepare food packages, deliver safe drinking water, provide clean and dry clothing, and administer complementary medical and first aid services. Together with PMI, the emergency operation also involved the country’s armed forces personnel, search and rescue (SAR) teams, technical government ministries, non-governmental organizations, UN agencies, and other humanitarian providers.

Under the government system, six priority sectors were set up which included: search and rescue; shelter, food and nutrition; health, hygiene and psychosocial support; water and sanitation; education; and emergency/early recovery.

The national disaster agency (BNPB) supported its provincial disaster arm (BPBD) to ensure all the relevant line ministries were clear in their roles and responsibilities. PMI also participated in their strategic planning meetings along with other national disaster response agencies.

A Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) meeting was led by the UN resident coordinator and the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UN OCHA) to meet with bi-lateral donors, (USAID, AusAID, AIFDR, JICA, New Zealand Aid and ECHO), representatives from the private sector (DRP and UN Global Compact) and other national stakeholders. Following the HCT meeting, the Humanitarian Coordinator met with the Head of BNPB to discuss the potential of providing international assistance to the Government of Indonesia. The BNPB response was to explain that (along with its national partners), it was presently able to manage with the disaster but welcomed any support offered. It highlighted the need for ensuring emergency readiness in other affected parts of Indonesia, particularly the inaccessible remote parts of the country and looked forward to future opportunities where the international community could assist in building capacity in these remote and vulnerable locations.

In addition to the national partners of the BNPB, other international organisations participated primarily in the clean-up and early recovery efforts. The local government is leading the coordination of these agencies as well as several other private sector corporations to ensure there is no duplication or major gap in the target groups.

Red Cross and Red Crescent action

In anticipation of excessive flooding in Jakarta during the rainy months of November through February, PMI conducted drills, simulations and emergency volunteer training activities focused on flood preparedness and response. These training sessions were held during September and October 2012. Based on its contingency planning analysis, the PMI chapter also set up a contingency stock of flood relief items and equipment (including rubber boats and traditional rafts made of styrofoam and bamboo) for immediate deployment in the event of a major flood.

Prior to the floods, PMI also worked closely with the local authorities and the private sector to identify key roles of responsibility in time of disaster. For example, PMI invited several business groups to assist in the soup and food kitchens around the locations of their businesses. Several of the companies that were involved included Coca-Cola (drinks), Indosat (telecommunications) and BCA (banking facilities).
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3 Daerah Khusus Ibukota = Special Capital City district
4 Badan Penanggulangan Bencana Daerah (BPBD)
5 United States Agency for International Development (USAID), Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID), Australia-Indonesia Facility for Disaster Reduction (AIFDR), Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), New Zealand Aid Programme and European Commission Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (ECHO)
The operation

Goal of PMI’s involvement in this emergency
To assist in the flood relief operation and to help people quickly recover from the effects of the flood.

Objectives
- To provide relief materials to those most affected by the flood.
- To reduce the risk of health and hygiene-related problems.
- To ensure timely and dignified access to sufficient and safe water

Relief distributions (food and basic non-food items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs (expected results)</th>
<th>Activities planned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Emergency relief items are distributed to 12,500 beneficiaries according to assessment and selection criteria that identify actual needs and vulnerable groups. | - Conduct rapid emergency needs assessment.  
- Identify beneficiaries to ensure effective distribution of assistance.  
- Distribute relief supplies and control supply movements from point of dispatch to end user.  
- Monitor and evaluate the relief activities and provide reporting on relief distributions. |

Achievements:

PMI participated in a rapid assessment led by the local government. Based on this initial assessment, PMI identified the activities stated above in this DREF as their priority areas of support. This assessment was completed by 18 January 2013.

In the first days of the flood, PMI quickly distributed relief items; prepared and cooked ready-to-eat meals and provided safe drinkable water. Regular discussions with the village leaders and community groups helped to ensure that the distribution of items reached those most vulnerable.

PMI used their prepositioned stocks to distribute relief assistance to the displaced and host families in a timely and proper manner. In total, the items distributed included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>No. of units</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>No. of units</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>No. of units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blankets</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Baby kits</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Family tents</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mats</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Hygiene kit</td>
<td>1,559</td>
<td>Tarpaulins</td>
<td>1,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing items</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>Family kits</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>Water drums</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby clothes</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>Kitchen ware</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>Buckets</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarong</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Baby diapers (packs)</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>Brooms</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School uniforms</td>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>Sanitary napkins (packs)</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>Shovels.</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School kits</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>Domestic environmental kits</td>
<td>3,230</td>
<td>Hoes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disinfectant sprayers and Virkon S disinfectant 25

The relief distribution carried out was based on the emergency assessment.

Other relief items that were partially used in the operation and subsequently used to replenish stock in the warehouses consisted of 5,000 blankets (2,000 of which were distributed under this operation), 5,000 domestic environmental kits (3,230 distributed) and 5,000 hygiene kits (1,559 distributed).
All relief items and materials distributed and utilized in this flood operation were obtained locally. PMI had recently finalised a framework agreement with local suppliers and transporters allowing for a relatively quick dispatch and delivery of most of the bulk items acquired for this disaster (e.g. hygiene kits and baby kits). Other items that were not available for procurement under the framework agreement were purchased through a short notice requests for tender. These included the 5,000 blankets and 5,000 domestic environmental kits.

As the Governor of Jakarta declared that the emergency phase was over at the end of January, effectively this meant that priority was given to cleaning and repair of equipment rather than to emergency relief. The balance of the relief items that were not distributed by PMI during the disaster were therefore stored as preparedness stock at PMI’s regional warehouse in Serang, Banten, including blankets, domestic environmental kits and hygiene kits.

### Water distribution and hygiene promotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome: The risk of waterborne and water related diseases has been reduced through the provision of safe water, hygiene kits and tools for household environmental sanitation together with hygiene promotion across the five flood districts of Jakarta.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outputs (expected results)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Provision of safe water to 3,500 families (or 17,500 beneficiaries) | • Assess the existing coverage with a view of ensuring availability of an adequate water supply  
• Provide potable water for 3,500 families for two weeks. |
| Provision of hygiene kits and tools for household environmental sanitation for 5,000 families | • Purchase and distribution of hygiene kits  
• Purchase and distribution of domestic environmental kits tools for household sanitation |
| Hygiene promotion and demonstrations on the use of hygiene kits and domestic environmental kits to the beneficiaries | • Conduct training/information programmes for Red Cross volunteers and beneficiaries, in particular hygiene promotion for 2,000 people per day over a two week period.  
• Reproduce and distribute hygiene promotion IEC material |

### Achievements

**Safe drinking water**

Based on the initial Jakarta flood assessment, PMI identified a lack of safe drinking water during flood disaster and offered to assist the government to filter and distribute safe drinking water until the local water systems was functional or the local suppliers were able to resume their services. PMI mobilised four filtration plants, each capable of providing 120,000 litres of safe drinking water a day.

They also dispatched a total of 19 water tanker trucks that distributed water to 500 water points spread out across the flooded suburbs. During its water service operation period from 21 January to 17 February 2013, PMI provided a total of 1,115,000 litres of fresh drinking water to the affected population.

**Environmental clean-up and vector control**

Along with the water distribution, PMI worked together with the Ministry of Social Welfare and social services to promote safe hygiene practices and mobilize community teams to clean up their neighbourhoods and homes.

Through the use of backpack mounted sprayers, two teams of 12 personnel walked through the inundated villages spraying disinfectant around houses, schools, houses of worship, stagnant water ponds, garbage piles and other vector breeding locations to prevent the increase of mosquitoes, flies and other potentially harmful insects and rodents. The disinfectant that PMI used has been tested and is harmless to people but very effective on a range of vectors. More than 5,000 households were reached with this service.

PMI was also asked by the government to provide hygiene kits and domestic environmental kits for families to clean up their homes and return to their daily routines. Originally the government had indicated that 5,000 kits would be required; however, during the distribution, it was found that the original number was too high and that
excess distribution would create duplication with other agencies. A total of 3,230 kits were eventually distributed and the remaining items were added to preparedness stocks in the regional warehouse.

**Health services and hygiene promotion**

Up to 304 emergency health volunteers were mobilized to provide health services to a total of 12,268 patients through mobile clinics and 11 temporary health posts.

Health promotion and psychosocial support activities were originally carried out simultaneously with relief distributions. After the relief phase had been concluded, PMI focused mainly on hygiene promotion and psychosocial support.

Hygiene promotion and training were conducted concurrently with the vector control spraying. The hygiene promotion kit that was adapted for the Indonesian context was also used to support this activity.

The psychosocial support programme (PSP) targeted mostly children, mothers and the elderly, and used creative methods of awareness raising such as singing, drawing, storytelling, puppetry, colouring, origami, cooking, relaxation and hand gymnastics. This programme reached more than 3,200 people.

**Challenges**

- Existing PMI human resources were mostly concentrated on supplementing government services such as public kitchens, clean-up and health posts. This led to some HR constraints (such as availability) for conducting other Red Cross services during the early days of the operation. More focus on surge capacity is needed.
- Availability and access to water rescue and evacuation equipment were insufficient in this flood response.
- Difficulties in telecommunication led to some level of confusion and a delay in the roll out of some activities.
- Access to vulnerable people was also difficult in some areas due to blocked roads or rubber boats that were too big to pass through narrow urban streets.

**Lessons learnt**

1. The role of the community-based action team (CBAT or Sibat) emergency volunteer as the first responder in conducting initial actions and providing emergency assistance to those nearby has proven to be a very important aspect of working in urban disasters.
2. Cross-administrative support from neighboring branches and chapters (e.g. PMI Province Banten and West Java) helped greatly in improving the affected chapter’s ability to respond and assist in the field.
3. Assorted donations such as food, medicine, clothing, baby equipment etc. from community groups, and the private sector as well as non-government organizations, can be a valuable asset in these disasters, if well-managed, vetted and distributed.
4. Strong public trust of PMI in the provision of emergency services was apparent in this disaster from both the community and government authorities.
5. PMI DKI Jakarta Province is a very experienced chapter in conducting flood response operations. However, opportunities are open for the province to further develop and enhance its expertise beyond its existing specialist response options.
6. The flooding had very different characteristics when compared with the Jakarta floods of 2002 and 2007. More consideration should be given to reflect on how best to intervene in the changing dynamics of urban disasters.
7. The local government has used this present flood to implement a number of assessments and audits to determine best the next steps for enforcing building codes, mapping high risk areas, identifying mitigation developments and many other longer term improvements for abating and mitigating future flood events.
8. Better preparation and increased levels of emergency stock will help to expand the reach of PMI’s services to those most vulnerable in a shorter time.
9. Vector control materials like sprayers really help to deter rodents and insects from multiplying. More attention should be applied to these activities in future flood responses.
10. Working with PMI, IFRC needs to carefully consider what next steps the national society takes to enhance its capability of responding and working in urban settings with dense populations. This will require a series of exercises to determine which activities are appropriate for both rural and urban settings and help to better understand necessary dialogue with the local governments about the role PMI will play. As such,
further analysis and discussion are needed in the areas of contingency planning, emergency assessment, disaster response, coordination, information-gathering, and kit development, as well as the use of technology and communications.

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

- **Palang Merah Indonesia (PMI)**
  Ir. Budi Atmadi Adiputro, secretary general; phone: +62 217 992 325; fax: +62 217 995 188; email: pmi@pmi.or.id or budi_adiputro@pmi.or.id

- **IFRC Indonesia country office**
  Phillip Charlesworth, head of delegation; mobile: +62 811 824 859, phone: +62 21 7279 3440; fax: +62 21 7279 3446; email: phillip.charlesworth@ifrc.org

- **IFRC Southeast Asia regional office, Bangkok**
  Anne Leclerc, head of regional office; office phone; +66 2 661 8201; fax: +66 2 661 9322; email: anne.leclerc@ifrc.org

- **IFRC Asia Pacific zone office, Kuala Lumpur**
  o Al Panico, head of operations ; phone +603 9207 5704, email: al.panico@ifrc.org
  o Andreas Weissenberg, operations coordinator, phone: +603 9207 5729; mobile: +6012 230 7895; email: andreas.weissenberg@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.

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.

IFRC’s work is guided by Strategy 2020 which puts forward three strategic aims:
1. Save lives, protect livelihoods, and strengthen recovery from disaster and crises.
2. Enable healthy and safe living.
3. Promote social inclusion and a culture of non-violence and peace.
### I. Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise humanitarian standards</th>
<th>Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people</th>
<th>Strengthen RC/RC contribution to development</th>
<th>Heighten influence and support for RC/RC work</th>
<th>Joint working and accountability</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Deferred income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Budget</td>
<td>339,096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>339,096</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Opening Balance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Income Other Income

| DREF Allocations            | 339,096                                 |                                            |                                            |                                  | 339,096 |                 |
| C4. Other Income            | 339,096                                 |                                            |                                            |                                  | 339,096 |                 |

| C. Total Income = SUM(C1..C4) | 339,096                                 |                                            |                                            |                                  | 339,096 |                 |
| D. Total Funding = B + C     | 339,096                                 |                                            |                                            |                                  | 339,096 |                 |

### II. Movement of Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise humanitarian standards</th>
<th>Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people</th>
<th>Strengthen RC/RC contribution to development</th>
<th>Heighten influence and support for RC/RC work</th>
<th>Joint working and accountability</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Deferred income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Opening Balance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Income</td>
<td>339,096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>339,096</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Expenditure</td>
<td>-332,594</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-332,594</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Closing Balance = (B + C + E)</td>
<td>6,502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## III. Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Groups</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Raise humanitarian standards</th>
<th>Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people</th>
<th>Strengthen RC/RC contribution to development</th>
<th>Heigthen influence and support for RC/RC work</th>
<th>Joint working and accountability</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUDGET (C)</td>
<td>339,096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>339,096</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief items, Construction, Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing &amp; Textiles</td>
<td>72,289</td>
<td>46,103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46,103</td>
<td>26,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water, Sanitation &amp; Hygiene</td>
<td>151,653</td>
<td>210,135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>210,135</td>
<td>-58,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utensils &amp; Tools</td>
<td>74,699</td>
<td>34,508</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34,508</td>
<td>40,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Relief items, Construction, Sup</td>
<td>298,641</td>
<td>290,746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>290,746</td>
<td>7,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics, Transport &amp; Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution &amp; Monitoring</td>
<td>1,566</td>
<td>947</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>947</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport &amp; Vehicles Costs</td>
<td>7,229</td>
<td>1,979</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,979</td>
<td>5,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Logistics, Transport &amp; Storage</td>
<td>8,795</td>
<td>2,926</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,926</td>
<td>5,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>6,265</td>
<td>16,055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,055</td>
<td>-9,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Personnel</td>
<td>6,265</td>
<td>16,055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,055</td>
<td>-9,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information &amp; Public Relations</td>
<td>4,699</td>
<td>2,568</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,568</td>
<td>2,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total General Expenditure</td>
<td>4,699</td>
<td>2,568</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,568</td>
<td>2,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme &amp; Services Support Recov</td>
<td>20,696</td>
<td>20,299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,299</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Indirect Costs</td>
<td>20,696</td>
<td>20,299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,299</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURE (D)</td>
<td>339,096</td>
<td>332,594</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>332,594</td>
<td>6,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIANCE (C - D)</td>
<td>6,502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Selected Parameters**

- **Reporting Timeframe:** 2013/1-2013/3
- **Programme:** MDRID007
- **Budget Timeframe:** 2013/1-2013/3
- **Budget:** APPROVED

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)
**IV. Breakdown by subsector**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Line / Sub-sector</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Opening Balance</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Closing Balance</th>
<th>Deferred Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BL2 - Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster response</td>
<td>339,096</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>339,096</td>
<td>339,096</td>
<td>332,594</td>
<td>6,502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal BL2</td>
<td>339,096</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>339,096</td>
<td>339,096</td>
<td>332,594</td>
<td>6,502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>339,096</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>339,096</strong></td>
<td><strong>339,096</strong></td>
<td><strong>332,594</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,502</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)