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N° of people affected: 52,000

N° of people targeted: 21,000

N° of people assisted: 66,000 (approximately 11,000 households as per government classification, which estimates one household to be consisting of an average of 6 persons).

The total number of people reached through this operation exceeded the target that was set in the Emergency Appeal. In all, some 66,000 people were reached with water, sanitation and hygiene promotion, as well as health activities; 1,428 households received emergency shelter kits and 2,878 households received household kits.

However it is recognized that there may be some overlap in the beneficiary figures. Beneficiaries (especially within evacuation centres) would have received water, sanitation and hygiene promotion activities, and also received either a household kits or emergency shelter kits. This scenario, coupled with the continual movement of people in flood-affected communities and their very limited means to identify themselves, resulted in challenges for data recording.

Apart from the work within the evacuation centres in Honiara, other distributions to communities for water, sanitation and hygiene promotion and non-food items (NFIs) by SIRCS were carried out in separate geographic locations as described below:

- NFI distributions - SIRCS worked primarily within the Guadalcanal wards of Ghaobata, Aola, Sahalu and Savulei. Within these areas, over 400 communities were covered by the SIRCS.
- Water, sanitation and hygiene promotion services primarily focused on the Visale area within Guadalcanal province.

Host National Society: Prior to the floods, Solomon Islands Red Cross Society (SIRCS) had 86 active volunteers, 33 staff and four branches, with an established high profile in disaster response. During the flood response under this appeal, SIRCS utilized all 33 staff and existing volunteers from across its four branches. Furthermore, the National Society attracted 33 new, spontaneous, volunteers form Honiara who were utilized throughout the response.

Red Cross Red Crescent Movement partners actively involved in the operation: As well as the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), Australian Red Cross, Fiji Red Cross Society, French Red Cross, New Zealand Red Cross and Papua New Guinea Red Cross Society supported the SIRCS response.

Other partner organizations involved in the operation: Non-Movement actors involved in the response included the Government of the Solomon Islands, including the National Disaster Management Office and the Honiara City Council; Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade; New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade; United Nations Agencies including: UNOCHA, WHO, UNICEF, UNDP and the World Food Program; international non-government organisations such as: World Vision, Save the Children, ADRA, Oxfam, Caritas, Anglican Aid and Médecins Sans Frontières-Holland.

Local organizations that participated in the flood response include the Solomon Islands Development Trust, Development Services Exchange and faith-based women’s group such as DOCAS of the local Seventh Day Adventist Church and the Mother’s Union of the Anglican Church of Melanesia.
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Summary

Overall response

The Solomon Islands Red Cross Society (SIRCS), with the support of the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) and Partner National Societies, undertook significant activities in addressing the most important humanitarian needs of flood-affected communities. These activities included registering people in evacuation centres, undertaking needs assessments, delivering water, sanitation and hygiene promotion activities (including producing and delivering safe drinking water) and distributing non-food items (NFIs) specifically household kits and emergency shelter kits. From the onset of the floods, it was readily observable and agreed by all key stakeholders that those were the most pressing humanitarian needs which SIRCS had the mandate, experience and ability to address. The IFRC and Partner National Societies supported the SIRCS in mobilizing resources, including an earlier DREF allocation and subsequent launch of an Emergency Appeal, providing NFIs and support roles. As the efforts required to fulfil these obligations were extensive, SIRCS did not take on a role for the recovery work, with recovery needs addressed by other agencies.

Review findings

A ‘Review of the Emergency Appeal Plan of Action’ (“the Review”) was undertaken in August 2014. It was noted by the majority of beneficiaries, SIRCS personnel, IFRC and Partner National Societies’ personnel as well as external stakeholders that the relief support provided by SIRCS in terms of relevance, quality and quantity of services and materials, was of a good standard and was directed towards meeting the basic humanitarian needs.

The SIRCS mobilized resources, including significant numbers of volunteers, very quickly following the floods and this was a significant contribution to the disaster response. This provided surge capacity when majority of agencies were depending upon staffing to provide initial response. Partner National Societies, IFRC personnel and field assessment coordination team (FACT) members, peer exchange participants from Fiji Red Cross Society assisted SIRCS through providing immediate support in the early stages of the response. Peer exchange was reported as being very effective in providing support to SIRCS.

The allocation from IFRC’s disaster relief emergency fund (DREF) enabled SIRCS to address the urgent humanitarian needs of water supply, relief distributions, mobilization of volunteers, and assessment processes before the Emergency Appeal was launched and donor contributions were able to be received. Resources mobilized via the Emergency Appeal then further supported the efforts of SIRCS in addressing the needs of affected communities, including provision of safe drinking water, water, sanitation and hygiene promotion activities, repairs for damaged transitional shelter at the Festival of Pacific Arts (FOPA) evacuation centre, and the distribution of NFIs including emergency shelter kits.
By large, the outcomes and outputs outlined in the Emergency Appeal were met. There was some initial postponement of activities before assessments and distribution commenced. For a short period, the implementation by SIRCS of programmes outlined in the Emergency Appeal was delayed. Nevertheless, the numbers of non-food items distributed to the localities and number of beneficiaries reached is in line with the targets planned in the Emergency Appeal, with the exception of the number of shelter kits distributed.

The water, sanitation and hygiene promotion activities exceeded the scope of work, given the extension of time during which evacuation centres remained open and internally displaced persons (IDPs) continued to receive safe drinking water. Hygiene promotion activities, implemented in conjunction with provision of safe drinking water for the Visale locality, were well met. The Review could not ascertain if the appropriate level of hygiene promotion activities were carried out within the evacuation centres for IDPs.

The operation had envisioned training on the appropriate use of shelter kits, as well as hygiene promotion activities to take place at the same time as the distribution of hygiene kits. None of the beneficiaries surveyed and communities visited recalled this training or hygiene promotion activities occurring.

Throughout the Review, it was noted by many stakeholders that there are significant areas in which the SIRCS, which is comparatively a small National Society, can improve on to better address the frequent number of minor to large scale disasters such as those experienced throughout the recent history of the Solomon Islands. For instance, it was observed that the widely-valued response activities of SIRCS continually drain the time, energy and resources of the small National Society away from its genuine efforts to enhance its capacity and to manage ongoing programmes. It is imperative, therefore, for SIRCS partners to support organizational development and institutional preparedness initiatives.

**Financial summary**

The Emergency Appeal sought CHF 684,277, and contributions totalling CHF 610,162 were received (translating to a 89 percent coverage). The amount spent within the timeframe of the operation was CHF 422,932 (69 per cent of income), and a balance of CHF 187,230 remains at the closure of the operation. Of the total expenditure, CHF 175,396 went to operational costs (including procurement of non-food items and implementation of water, sanitation and hygiene activities) while the rest of expenditure covered costs that enabled the delivery of assistance to beneficiaries, such as logistics, distribution and monitoring and staffing.

The remaining balance is attributed to late receipt and availability of a portion of funds towards the Emergency Appeal. While flooding occurred in early April 2014, assessments were not possible until early May 2015, upon whose completion the Emergency Appeal was launched. The Emergency Appeal launch came near the end of the critical window of global attention on the flooding disaster. From May until September 2014, there was continuous uncertainty regarding the finances available to undertake relief operation activities. This situation affected operation planning and decision making. In this context, those responsible for operational management had to take a conservative approach and committed the available funds to relief activities ahead of National Society capacity building activities. Ultimately, approximately 20 per cent of the Emergency Appeal funding was recorded between August 2014 and early 2015. This meant that finances became available after the relief operation phase and with a relatively short period to undertake planned national society capacity building activities.

IFRC will continue to support the National Society capacity building initiatives that commenced under this operation within the community programming component of regional development programme. The IFRC seeks approval from its donors to reallocate this balance of CHF 187,230 to the Pacific regional development operational plan to support community programming. Partners/donors who have any questions in regards to this balance are kindly requested to contact IFRC within 30 days of publication of this report. Pass this date the reallocation will be processed as indicated.

See attached the final financial report [here](#).
A. Situation analysis

Description of flash floods:

Prolonged heavy rainfall associated with a tropical depression passing over the Solomon Islands on 3 April 2014 resulted in severe flooding in the capital Honiara and the northern Guadalcanal Plains. Associated damage was also recorded in the Guadalcanal region, together with the Makira, Malaita and Isabel Provinces. The flooding tragically resulted in: 22 direct deaths (18 in Honiara, 2 in Guadalcanal and 2 in Isabel Province. The floods also resulted in many people being injured, as well as trauma for people who were caught in, or witnessed the flooding. The floods caused massive destruction and damage to public infrastructure, houses, water sources, sanitation facilities, livelihoods and agriculture. An estimated 52,000 people were known to be affected by the floods across the Solomon Islands (total national population of 515,870). Initially, around 12,000 people were displaced, who primarily sought emergency shelter within 26 evacuation centres.

The first responders were the people and communities living and working in the destructive path of the floods - trying to warn others, assisting in rescuing people and supporting many to reach safety. Extended families, friends and neighbours, all provided assistance, with many becoming host families to those who had lost their homes.

The SIRCS and Partner National Society staff and volunteers were equally caught within the flooding. They assisted people to get out of the flood waters and reach safety, and evacuated the flooded offices. Some staff and volunteers also had their homes flooded, and other key workers were cut off from Honiara.

Summary of Solomon Islands Red Cross Society (SIRCS) response:

The Solomon Islands Red Cross Society (SIRCS) played a pivotal role in registering evacuees and facilitating the administration of relief to those most affected by the floods.

The overall objective of SIRCS’s plan was to deliver humanitarian assistance to 21,000 of the most affected and vulnerable people. This was estimated according to the joint assessments undertaken and the coordinated efforts with other agencies. This included providing non-food relief, emergency shelter, water and sanitation assistance, as well as providing flood affected communities with important information through health and hygiene promotion messages. It was readily agreed by all key stakeholders, that these were the most pressing humanitarian needs which the SIRCS had the mandate, experience and ability to address.

Resourcing the initial relief activities were made possible through the IFRC, bilateral support to SIRCS from regional Partner National Societies and in-country donors. IFRC released CHF 158,099 from its DREF, which also assisted in the mobilization and deployment of additional resources including support from regional Partner National Societies (Australian Red Cross, Fiji Red Cross Society, French Red Cross and New Zealand Red Cross).

IFRC supported SIRCS to develop an Emergency Appeal (EA) and emergency plan of action. The Emergency Appeal for CHF 1,365,761 was published within the first three weeks of the response. The Emergency Appeal was revised three months later to CHF 684,278 targeting the same amount of beneficiaries, but focusing only on relief outcomes.

An IFRC field assessment coordination team (FACT) leader and a communications delegate were deployed to support SIRCS in the initial stages of the response for the development of the Emergency Appeal and provision of relief items. Two senior disaster management staff from Fiji Red Cross Society were also deployed to assist SIRCS with logistics and coordination while a senior disaster management officer from Papua New Guinea Red Cross Society supported the Review of the operation.

Overview of non-International Red Cross Red Crescent Movement actors in country

A state of national disaster was declared on 3 April 2014, when the Solomon Islands Government (SIG) declared Honiara and other areas of Guadalcanal a disaster zone. On 5 April 2014, the government requested the regional support of the Pacific Humanitarian Team (PHT). Aid personnel and supplies began arriving from 6 April 2014 after Honiara International Airport was reopened.
The Solomon Islands Government led the response with the support of the Pacific Humanitarian Team (PHT), UN Agencies, SIRCS, national and international non-governmental organizations and donor partners. A humanitarian action plan (HAP) was developed and endorsed by the government in late April 2014.

SIRCS worked closely with the government and other humanitarian actors through various clusters. This has included working with Government of the Solomon Islands, including the National Disaster Management Office (NDMO) and the Honiara City Council; Rural Water Supply and Sanitation; Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade; New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade; United Nations agencies including: UNOCHA, WHO, UNICEF, UNDP; and international non-government organizations such as: World Vision, Save the Children, ADRA, Oxfam, Médecins Sans Frontières Holland.

Needs assessment, analysis and scenario planning

SIRCS was either the lead or an active partner in the following assessment and needs analysis processes to identify flood affected communities’ needs:

- SIRCS worked closely with NDMO in registering approximately 12,000 evacuees who sought shelter within the initial 26 centres, immediately after the floods.
- SIRCS completed joint household assessments with World Vision International (WVI) covering 7,795 affected households in total (approximately 40,000 people) in Guadalcanal Province and Honiara. This survey covered shelter; water, sanitation and hygiene promotion, and community assessment for health and protection;
- SIRCS participated in the needs analysis assessments for supporting the Humanitarian Action Plan (HAP) under water, sanitation and hygiene promotion and shelter sectors;
- SIRCS agreed to evaluate needs in remaining evacuation centres to assist gathering information required to classify beneficiaries regarding their land status;
- All assessment information was shared with government and other key actors through clusters for improved coordination and beneficiary selection processes;
- SIRCS worked in close coordination (through clusters) for the selection of beneficiaries and the distributions of water, sanitation and hygiene promotion and non-food items.

Shelter damage from the flooding was significant. Shelter was estimated to represent approximately 56 per cent of the total value in monetary damages. This was 2.5 times greater than the transport sector (the next most affected sector), 20 times greater than the combined health and education sectors, and 25 times greater than the water and sanitation

---

1 The shelter sector includes private housing. It does not include public housing, social infrastructure or evacuation centre management.
Response phase assessments identified that 758 houses were totally destroyed and 638 houses suffered significant but repairable damage. Many more household kitchens, which are generally smaller detached out-buildings, were also destroyed, resulting in the loss of household cooking equipment. There were 26 evacuation centres at the commencement of the response, which generally were schools, and also included community halls and the Festival of the Pacific Arts (FOPA) village at the Solomon Islands National University.

Coordination and partnerships
All response activities were coordinated through the Humanitarian Action Plan (HAP) with all national, regional and international stakeholders providing input and sharing information, while the UNOCHA team in Suva had responsibility to share regular update (weekly or bi-weekly). SIRCS worked closely with the government and other humanitarian actors through various clusters including the NDMO, Save the Children and Oxfam across all aspects of their response assessments, registration, water, sanitation and hygiene promotion, and non-food items. It was reported by implementing partners (within the Review undertaken in August 2014) that SIRCS has continued to enhance its relationships with government and key partners throughout this flood response.

Shelter coordination: the IFRC, as Emergency Shelter Cluster co-convenor, deployed a shelter sector coordinator (supported by Australian Red Cross) for seven weeks until the end of May 2014. The Solomon Islands Government Ministry of Lands, Housing and Survey (MLHS) officially concluded engagement with the emergency shelter response activities on 12 June 2014. The state of emergency was officially lifted by NDMO on 28 July 2014. Aside from SIRCS, IFRC and MLHS, other actors involved in the shelter sector included World Vision International, Oxfam, and UN-Habitat.

B. Operational strategy and plan
The response of the Emergency Appeal (EA) focussed on four sectors: health; water, sanitation and hygiene; shelter and settlements and National Society capacity building. As described under each sector, SIRCS primarily completed its humanitarian response to the Solomon Islands flood operation in August 2014 with a few remaining tasks (especially in capacity building) to be completed after that time.

The response operation timeframe remained unchanged throughout the operation with relief activities planned for the first five months while strengthening SIRCS’ existing response capacity was expected during the remaining four months. It was anticipated that the capacity building activities would have been completed in January and February 2015, unfortunately SIRCS was not able to undertake these tasks within the timeframe, and following the closure of the Emergency Appeal, these funds were not able to be released to enable those activities to occur.

Key findings from the review undertaken in August 2014, demonstrated that it was equally recognized by beneficiaries, key partners, stakeholders as well Movement staff and volunteers that SIRCS has provided an exceptional response to the flash flooding, especially in consideration to the extent of the disaster and the size of SIRCS. Respect and trust in the role of SIRCS to address the humanitarian needs of flood affected people was evident during the review.

There were several findings from the review which highlighted the drain of time, energy and resources of SIRCS in continually responding to frequent disasters, whilst equally trying to build capacity and manage longer term programmes. Several recommendations explored the inter-relationship between the widely valued disaster response work of SIRCS and ongoing programmes to meet community vulnerabilities. Whilst there are recognised limitations of SIRCS (and it is clear by the review recommendations that SIRCS growth needs to occur in step with building internal capacities) it is agreed that there are many opportunities to build bridges between these activities.

Key areas for capacity development include: Assessment processes; volunteer management procedures; water, sanitation and hygiene promotion; shelter; training and mentoring; finance; logistics; monitoring; media and

2 Government of Solomon Islands (May 2014), Rapid Assessment of the Macro and Sectoral Impacts, Flash Floods April 2014 (p.7).
communications; Long term organizational development and overall capacity building; relationship building with partners, and; information management system assessment and potential upgrade.

**Overall Objective**

The total number of people supported by the SIRCS exceeded the target set in the Emergency Appeal. However it is recognized that there is some overlap within these figures. Beneficiaries (especially within the evacuation centres) would have received water, sanitation and hygiene promotion activities, and also received either a household kit or emergency shelter kit. This scenario, coupled with the continual movement of people in flood-affected communities and their very limited means to identify themselves, resulted in challenges for data recording.

**Number of people assisted attributed through activities:**

- water, sanitation and hygiene promotion, and health activities reached 66,000 people;
- emergency shelter kits were distributed to 1,428 households;
- household kits were distributed to 2,878 households.

**Proposed strategy**

Due to the broad extent of the communities’ needs and the distribution of effort across all actors, SIRCS, in consultation with national partners, decided to focus only on the immediate relief under the Emergency Appeal, while some other national partners (Save the Children and World Vision International) oriented their actions on early recovery. SIRCS (through the support of the Emergency Appeal) focussed on health; water, sanitation and hygiene; shelter and settlements and National Society capacity building.

The following is a summary of a key findings from the review in August 2014 which were validated by beneficiaries, SIRCS personnel (staff and volunteers) Partner National Societies, IFRC and key external partners.

**Did the Emergency Appeal plan of action keep within flood affected communities’ humanitarian needs?**

The operation applied its efforts to addressing the most immediate humanitarian needs for the flood-affected communities for safe drinking water, sanitation and hygiene promotion activities, repairs for transitional shelter at FOPA evacuation centre, and the distribution of non-food items including emergency shelter kits.

Overall it was stated that the relief support provided by SIRCS in terms of relevance, quality and quantity of services and materials, was of a good standard and was directed at the basic humanitarian needs. Challenges were identified regarding the coordination arrangements within Solomon Islands for the assessment processes, beneficiary selections, verifying distributions, and shelter.

**Beneficiary survey/feedback on water, sanitation and hygiene promotion activities**

As a component of the review completed in August 2014 of the activities undertaken through the DREF and Emergency Appeal (EA), a beneficiary survey was undertaken to seek feedback regarding the water, sanitation and hygiene promotion activities provided by SIRCS in selected communities. The beneficiary surveys were carried out on 29 and 30 July 2014, and recorded using a form agreed to by the Red Cross Review team and Save the Children. Four out of ten communities were identified: Laovavasa, Veratabalo, Visale and Chapuru. People from each of the identified communities were randomly selected to participate in the survey.

Overall beneficiaries were well satisfied with the response, based on the fact that the vast majority of those questioned used the service provided, and were satisfied with taste as well as timeliness. Whist the quality of the water supplied was generally considered acceptable, the quantity was considered by some beneficiaries to be insufficient to meet their family’s needs. It is not clear if people thought the water was also be provided for washing and other usage or just for drinking. In future, greater care is to be taken to communicate to affected communities regarding the provision of water for drinking purposes only.
Hygiene promotion activities were considered very valuable and the survey questions showed that the vast majority of those interviewed (85 per cent) attended the hygiene promotion sessions and out of those a vast majority (90 per cent) remembered key hygiene messages.

Two-way beneficiary communication was not as effective as planned, with only 10 per cent of beneficiaries knowing who to contact if they wanted to provide feedback to SIRCS. In future, further consideration needs to be given to how to communicate more effectively with beneficiaries and their representative.

**Beneficiary survey/feedback on the distribution of NFIs (shelter kits and household kits)**

Within the review undertaken a beneficiary survey was also undertaken for the distribution of NFIs, as well as focus group meetings with beneficiaries. In the main beneficiaries provided strong feedback including:

- SIRCS was often reported as being the first organization visibly responding to meet the humanitarian needs of the people within the flood affected communities;
- Overall the communities were mainly satisfied and appreciative of the assistance provided by SIRCS;
- SIRCS staff and volunteers were considered to be mostly experienced in their respective roles, with the right mind set and attitude of serving the people;
- SIRCS personnel were visible to the community and readily identified by wearing the emblem; and
- Assistance provided by SIRCS was readily available and delivered in accessible locations close to the people requiring the support services.

Conversely, there were areas for improvement and these included:

- Several respondents, community members, felt that they missed out on being on ‘the list’, and therefore did not receive NFIs. From feedback obtained it appears this mostly occurred because these people were not in the area when the assessment took place. The regular movement of people throughout the assessment and distribution process was a significant challenge for many organizations, including SIRCS;
- There was mixed feedback on the timeliness of some of the support and provision of NFIs with several commenting it was late;
- Some of the non-food items were not of sufficient quality and broke quickly, and some community members expressed they were unhappy with the quantity within the kitchen sets; and,
- There was little knowledge or participation within the provision of training on the appropriate use of shelter kits.

**Emergency Shelter Response Review**

The IFRC deployed a shelter coordinator (supported by the Australian Red Cross) for seven weeks until the end of May 2014. Following completion of emergency shelter activities, the IFRC wished to conduct a review of the emergency shelter response (the Emergency Shelter Response Review). Recognizing the close link between emergency shelter response and longer term shelter solutions, the emergency shelter response review received support from the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). The report is titled ‘Review of the Emergency Shelter Response to the April 2014 Flooding in Solomon Islands’. It was undertaken for the Ministry of Lands Housing and Survey with support of IFRC, UNDP and the European Commission’s Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection department (ECHO).

The emergency shelter response review found that, whilst the emergency shelter response may have addressed the immediate shelter needs, it had not addressed the longer term, underlying vulnerability. Communities do not build back safer. As one informant put it ‘Next year we will be again distributing (shelter kits / non-food items) to them. For example, Burns Creek: every year since 2010 we have distributed shelter kits, non-food items and I recognize the
**Human resources (HR)**

In April 2014, SIRC had to suspend its entire programme and projects for two months in order to mobilize all staff (both national and provincial) for the flood response operation. Four in-country delegates from Australian Red Cross and French Red Cross were also mobilized to assist in the operation. Each member of staff and delegate was allocated a role within the operation. As usual in any disaster volunteers played a very important role. In this flood response SIRC was able to mobilize 93 volunteers, including 20 volunteers coming from the SIRC provincial branches.

The cost for travel, accommodation, allowances and catering for all the volunteers were accessed from the flood operation Emergency Appeal funds. There were also some expatriate volunteers who came in from time to time to provide technical assistance for example in communications and data entry.

Other human resources who assisted in the operations came from IFRC, New Zealand Red Cross, French Red Cross, French Red Cross, Fiji Red Cross Society and Papua New Guinea Red Cross Society during the operation review.

**Logistics and supply chain**

During the response, the Logistics Cluster met on a daily basis for the first three weeks. The WFP was appointed as the focal point, managing and coordinating all agencies from procurement, fleet management, non-food items distribution plans, warehousing to collating of all data on logistics. However after the second month, responsibility for logistics was handed back to individual agencies with information-sharing becoming the responsibility of each agency. A logistics tracking table was disseminated to all agencies and daily updates provided (by individual agencies) and shared as part of the wider situation reports circulated by the NDMO.

The majority of procurement for the Emergency Appeal operation was undertaken directly by SIRC to support the flood response. Most of the locally procured items were requested through the SIRC logistics team. Upon receiving a request for goods or services, the SIRC logistics team sourced quotations from suppliers and checked if the items and services were available locally, completed the requisition for the requested items and services and then forwarded to SIRC finance team for approval and purchasing.

Fuel for the operation was managed by the SIRC logistics team. A fuel voucher was issued and completed by the staff member requesting the fuel before obtaining the fuel from supplies. A budget was allocated for personal protective equipment (PPE), with some equipment provided and sent by IFRC. Other items were purchased locally by SIRC.

SIRC logistics team prepared the paper work and ensured the clearing of all containers that arrived in country (including all donated items that were sent through by Solomon Islands communities in Brisbane and Fiji).

All requested non-food items were approved and signed off by the SIRC disaster management officer before issuing out of available stock. SIRC logistics team prepared and coordinated all non-food items during distributions, with the SIRC relief team carrying out the distribution across all the flood-affected communities in Honiara and Guadalcanal. Rented vehicles were also managed by the SIRC logistics team. A weekly contract was made and signed off by the truck owners and a SIRC representative. SIRC logistics team also coordinated all other types of distribution such as water delivery to camps and non-food items distribution to communities and other clerical administrative requirements.

**Communications**

From the first day of the flood response, SIRC was receiving requests for updates from both local and international media outlets. One of the first requests from SIRC to IFRC was for a communications delegate, who arrived with the first international response team 72 hours after the disaster. The New Zealand Red Cross funded the deployment of

---

2 Review of the Emergency Shelter Response to the April 2014 Flooding in Solomon Islands: Sept 2014 undertaken for the Ministry of Lands Housing and Survey – through the support of; IFRC, UNDP and ECHO.
the communications delegate who was able to set up important steps to support SIRCS’s management of the media in this large scale disaster. All interviews with international media outlets were done by SIRCS’s senior management team prior to the arrival of the communications delegate.

This was also the first time for SIRCS to use social media for the purpose of providing updates and sharing of information. SIRCS continues to maintain its Facebook page (administered through the dissemination and communications program during peacetime) which was used extensively during the initial flood response period. The management of the page is under the responsibility of the planning team and the communications delegate. An update of actions taken by SIRCS was provided daily to the local media, which included both print and radio outlets.

The IFRC supported SIRCS remotely through updates on DMIS and other information outlets. With work carried out by more than 90 volunteers and 33 staff from across the country the visibility and profile of the national society was enhanced through the deployment of the communications delegate, however opportunities for SIRCS in this area should be supported by both Partner National Societies, ICRC and IFRC to enable the national society to scale up its communications capacity and output when required.

Security

There were no significant identified security issues. At one point of time it was identified that the internally displaced persons (IDPs) who were residents of one of the major evacuation centres, were expressing their dissatisfaction and exhibited signs of unrest. Briefings were provided to staff and volunteer regarding taking extra precautions. No dissident behaviours were exhibited towards any SIRCS staff or volunteers.

Planning, monitoring, evaluation, & reporting (PMER)

Review of the activities undertaken through the DREF and Emergency Appeal

The Review was conducted in August 2014, led by the IFRC with support of Partner National Societies and SIRCS. The purpose of the review was to examine if the Emergency Appeal plan of action addressed the major humanitarian needs, was timely, and had met its planned goals. The Review also highlighted the key achievements, challenges, and captured the major learnings identified by beneficiaries, other partner actors, Red Cross and Red Crescent staff and volunteers as well as external stakeholders who had been involved in the flood operation.

Locations, focus and feedback from beneficiaries: The services that SIRCS provided to communities varied, according to the communities’ needs and the coordination arrangements. For example, SIRCS commenced providing water, sanitation and hygiene promotion activities (including safe drinking water) to the Ghaobata area. However, after further negotiations through the Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Cluster, it was agreed that another organization would remain in that locality and SIRCS would relocate to focus primarily on the Visale area, as well as the evacuation centres.

When the Review team visited the communities to obtain their feedback, the focus of the questions and information collected was primarily on what had been provided to the communities by SIRCS. The Review team obtained feedback through a range of different methods from a number of communities throughout Guadalcanal. Methods included:

- Non-food items beneficiary survey report - (East Guadalcanal), Ghaobata area,
- Water, sanitation and hygiene promotion beneficiary survey report - (West Guadalcanal) Visale area,
- Separate women’s and men’s focus groups to primarily discuss NFIs (East Guadalcanal), Ghaobata area;
- Separate women’s and men's focus groups to primarily discuss water, sanitation and hygiene promotion (West Guadalcanal) Visale area; and
- Interviews at ROVE evacuation Centre Honiara with a small group of evacuees.

Beneficiaries who participated in any of the above methods were selected randomly throughout the communities.

During the Review, it was clearly recognized that SIRCS has provided an exceptional response to the flash flooding, especially in consideration to the extent of the disaster and the size and capacity of SIRCS. Respect and trust in the role of SIRCS to address the humanitarian needs of flood affected people was evident in all conversations. The
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following provides a summary of key findings which were validated by beneficiaries, SIRCS personnel (staff and volunteers, Partner National Societies, IFRC and key external partners.

Did the Emergency Appeal plan of action reach its identified goals, outcomes and outputs?

By large, the outcomes and outputs within the Emergency Appeal have been met. The numbers of non-food items distributed to the localities and the number of beneficiaries are within (or exceeding) the planned scope of work within the Emergency Appeal.

The water, sanitation and hygiene promotion activities have exceeded the scope of work given the extension of the time for the evacuation centres to remain open and internally displaced persons (IDPs) continued to receive safe drinking water. Hygiene promotion activities in conjunction with provision of safe drinking water for the Visale communities were well met.

The Emergency Appeal planned for training on the appropriate use of emergency shelter kits, as well hygiene promotion activities to take place at the same time as the distribution of hygiene kits. It is not clear that this was effectively implemented across all communities.

Was the Emergency Appeal plan of action timely in the response provided?

All of the groups interviewed agreed that initially there were delays through the coordination mechanisms, to commence the assessments and to provide relief services. Following the initial delays, it is agreed that SIRCS undertook its response activities in a timely manner, especially water, sanitation and hygiene promotion activities.

Was the Emergency Appeal within SIRC’s capacities and mandate?

From interviews and feedback it has been clearly validated, that the capacities of SIRCS in the main fitted the scope of the work as identified within the Emergency Appeal. SIRCS is viewed by government and several key partners as a trusted and dependable partner. In comparison to another Emergency Appeal in 2007, this time SIRCS took on the lead responsibility and established improved leadership visibility and relationships. SIRCS mobilized resources including significant numbers of staff and volunteers very quickly following the floods and this was a significant contribution to the disaster response. It is worth noting that SIRCS is a small National Society which has to, very frequently, respond to disaster. This significantly impacts upon its ability to focus on longer term organizational development and capacity building initiatives.

Has the Emergency Appeal been provided with sufficient support and resources?

The initial allocation from the IFRC DREF disaster relief emergency fund (DREF) fulfilled its function in providing immediate financial support to address the urgent humanitarian needs of: water supply, relief distributions, mobilization of volunteers, and assessment processes before the Emergency Appeal was launched and donor contributions were able to be received. Partner National Societies, IFRC, IFRC FACT and peer exchanges, all assisted SIRCS through providing immediate support in the early stages of the response. The Emergency Appeal provided a common platform for resourcing and for promoting the work of the SIRCS and its partners regionally/internationally.

Further to the Review, internally, IFRC reflected on what can be done better next time. While flooding occurred in early April 2014, assessments were not possible until early May 2015, upon whose completion the Emergency Appeal was launched. The Emergency Appeal launch came near the end of the critical window of global attention on the flooding disaster. From May until September 2014, there was continuous uncertainty regarding the finances available to undertake relief operation activities. This situation affected operation planning and decision making. In this context, those responsible for operational management had to take a conservative approach and committed the available funds to relief activities ahead of National Society capacity building activities. The positive development is that this experience has led to review and improvement in internal systems and practices which will impact on future disasters, including planning in the run up to the decision about launching an Appeal.
## C. Detailed operational plan

### Health

The focus on health was closely integrated within the water, sanitation and hygiene promotion activities - therefore there is some duplication of reporting across these sectors and outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People planned to be assisted</td>
<td>2,500 households in Honiara and Guadalcanal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% assisted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome 1**: The immediate risks to the health of affected populations are reduced.

**Output 1.1**: Community-based disease prevention and health promotion (acute watery diarrhoea, dengue and malaria prevention) is provided to the target population 2,500 households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 1.1.1</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reprint/reproduce Information Education Communication (IEC) materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SIRCS printed 600 copies of IEC materials, pictures messages on the F-chart (presenting information on faeces, fingers, fluids, flies, fields/floors, food) which the volunteers used as a resource during the awareness campaign along with other resources such as household water treatments – which was primarily focused on acute watery diarrhoea. These were used for activities, together with existing IEC materials.</td>
<td>100% implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 1.1.2</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conduct training for volunteers to refresh them on priority diseases, including use of dissemination material and techniques.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Twenty SIRCS health volunteers were trained in February 2014 prior to the operation. The training covered priority diseases (mainly acute watery diarrhoea), use of dissemination material and techniques for reaching out to community members. Subsequently, these volunteers along with 10 other SIRCS volunteers and 20 volunteers from Save the Children and World Vision were provided with refresher training by water, sanitation and hygiene promotion delegate in July 2014.</td>
<td>100% implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 1.1.3</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobilize trained SIRCS volunteers to disseminate dengue and malaria prevention messages in priority communities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Given the context that evolved of reports of outbreaks of acute watery diarrhoea, the messaging was primarily tailored to address acute watery diarrhoea issues.</td>
<td>100% implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Each of the trained volunteer teams provided training for 3 to 5 communities per day. In total, 116 communities were reached in Guadalcanal province.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There are a number of communities in each of the target areas (i.e. subsections of the Ward). Meetings were set up with each community to address hygiene promotion activities. The volunteer team made an effort to undertake door-to-door visits for any community members who did not attend the meeting. An alternate date or venue was mutually agreed for the next meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The majority of attendees for these community meetings were women and children. Upon which, the women shared this information with their family members. (More details reported under Activity 2.2.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Achievements against this outcome

- During the joint assessments, SIRCS volunteer teams reached 116 communities in Guadalcanal province through dissemination of disease prevention and health promotion messages.
- Key health and hygiene promotion messages and associated materials were developed in coordination with the Health Promotion Unit (HPU) of Ministry of Health (MoH) and Medical Services;
- 600 copies of IEC material related to rotavirus were printed and distributed to priority communities in Guadalcanal province. In addition, SIRCS supported MoH in printing health information flyers.
- The volunteers who received training (or refresher training) in July 2014 were again mobilized for the measles awareness campaigns held in September and October 2014.
- There was an increase in reported cases of diarrhoea following the floods in the Visale communities as recorded by the registered nurse at Visale Clinic. Following the SIRCS response, including the provision of safe drinking water and the hygiene promotion awareness messages, the numbers of people presenting with diarrhoea reduced significantly.
- SIRCS response activities in Visale were implemented in close consultation with the local people, especially the registered nurses at Visale Clinic and the nearby communities.

Lessons learned

- The focus on health was closely integrated within the water, sanitation and hygiene promotion sector activities. Please refer to the lessons learned under the next section on water, sanitation and hygiene promotion.

---

4 Rotavirus is the most common cause of severe diarrhoea among infants and young children. The virus is transmitted by the faecal-oral route. In addition to its impact on human health, the virus also infects animals.
Water, sanitation and hygiene promotion

**Coordination for geographic and community responsibilities:** SIRCS commenced providing water, sanitation and hygiene promotion activities (including safe drinking water) to the Ghaobata area, but after further consultations through the Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Cluster, it was agreed that another organization would remain in that locality. SIRCS relocated the water, sanitation and hygiene promotion activities to primarily focus on the Visale area within Guadalcanal province, as well as the evacuation centres.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water, sanitation and hygiene promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People planned to be assisted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% assisted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Outcome 2: Targeted populations have similar or better access to water and sanitation in Honiara city and Guadalcanal province. |

| Output 2.1: Daily access to safe water which meets Sphere and WHO standards in terms of quantity and quality is provided to target population at evacuation centres in transit area in Honiara and other communities in Guadalcanal Province. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 2.1.1</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Distribution of water to evacuation centres and targeted communities through water trucking from a borehole following treatment with NOMAD and chlorination in tankers.**

Distribution of safe drinking water to people within evacuation centres and selected communities was provided consistently throughout the operation.

The water, sanitation and hygiene promotion activities exceeded the scope of proposed work given the extension of the time for the evacuation centres to remain open and internally displaced persons (IDP) continuing to receive safe drinking water. Water was obtained from existing sources, treated with NOMAD units and chlorinated at the source and delivered using locally hired transport.

The quality of water was monitored by performing regular water quality tests at distribution points, using methodology agreed with Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Cluster partners. The quality of water supplied was in accordance with WHO drinking water guidelines.

The quantity of water supplied did not fully meet Sphere indicators. However the tanks were continuously topped up and it was reported by the teams that the tanks were very seldom empty or near-empty.

Residual chlorine was added to the drinking water to reduce the risk of post-delivery contamination. The levels of residual chlorine added were reduced following feedback from communities.

Water treatment and distribution throughout this operation consisted of providing over 2.43 million litres of safe drinking water. A breakdown of the water distribution is as follows:

**East Guadalcanal:**
- Provided over 370,000 litres to 150 communities comprising of 53,000 beneficiaries.

**West Guadalcanal:**
- Provided over 360,000 litres to 13 communities consisting of 3,600 beneficiaries.

**Honiara:**
- Provided over 1.7 million litres to 41 health facilities and evacuation centres consisting of 10,000 beneficiaries.

100% implemented
Continuous assessment of water, sanitation, and hygiene situation is carried out in targeted communities and emergency evacuation centres.

The quality of water was monitored by performing regular water quality tests at distribution points, using methodology agreed with Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Cluster partners. The quality of water supplied was in accordance with WHO drinking water guidelines.

Output 2.2: Hygiene promotion activities which meet SPHERE standards in terms of the identification and use of hygiene items provided to target population in evacuation centres and targeted communities in Guadalcanal Province.

Conduct hygiene promotion in targeted communities.

As per agreement established with the Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Cluster to ensure effective coordination of activities, SIRC conducted hygiene promotion activities as listed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity- hygiene promotion</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th># people reached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compliment NFI delivery of hygiene kits</td>
<td>Ghaobata, Aula</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompany delivery of safe drinking water</td>
<td>West Guadalcanal</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to increase in reported diarrhea cases</td>
<td>West Guadalcanal (Visale Clinic)</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of exit strategy (household water treatment)</td>
<td>West Guadalcanal</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other key activities included:
- Collaboration with Ministry of Health (MoH) Solomon Islands Government, Hygiene Promotion Unit, to determine the key hygiene promotion messages, develop and print Information, Education and Communication (IEC) materials.
- 20 hygiene promoters from SIRC were trained to facilitate the key hygiene promotion messages.
- Hygiene promotion sessions were well attended by a majority of the Visale community.
- Refresher training on household water-treatment (Training of Trainers) was conducted for 39 persons from MoH Hygiene Promotion Unit, SIRC and other Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Cluster partners.

Disseminate safe household water treatment in emergencies messages to targeted communities in Guadalcanal Province.

Outcome 3: The risk of waterborne and water related diseases has been reduced among 2,000 families in Honiara town and Guadalcanal

Output 3.1: Water and faecal-born disease vectors are controlled in evacuation centres and targeted communities in Guadalcanal Province.
### Activity 3.1.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Aug</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction of semi-permanent latrines in evacuation and transit centres in Honiara by Rural Water Supply and Sanitation officers with advice from SIRCS.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- SIRCS supported the Rural Water Supply and Sanitation officers in the construction of semi-permanent latrines in evacuation and transit centres in Honiara. The support consisted of technical advice for the design of latrines and the provision of materials including tarpaulins and plastic slabs.

- SIRCS was requested to undertake urgent repairs at the FOPA evacuation centre to empty pit toilets and undertake repairs to the ablution block to improve sanitary conditions. It was confirmed that responsible agencies didn’t have the capacity to undertake this work and the sanitary conditions were very unsafe and humanitarian needs were high. SIRCS agreed to provide these additional repairs and cleaning of latrines within the evacuation centre and the tasks were completed in July 2014. Evacuation centres remained open for an extended timeframe well beyond original planned.

100% implemented

### Activity 3.1.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction of hand washing facilities in evacuation centres and transit centre in Honiara.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Approximately 100 hand washing stations (Tippytaps) were installed in the Honiara evacuation centre.

- 50 additional Tippytaps were also installed in Guadalcanal Province while carrying out hygiene promotion community awareness sessions.

- There was an increase in reported cases of diarrhoea following the floods in the Visale communities as recorded by the registered nurse at Visale Clinic. The same nurse reported that following the Red Cross response, the numbers of people presenting with diarrhoea then reduced. Therefore the response had met the identified needs of the people including the provision of clean water and the hygiene promotion awareness messages to prevent sickness.

- SIRCS response activities in Visale were implemented in close consultation with the local people, especially with the registered nurse at Visale Clinic and the nearby communities.

100% implemented

### Achievements against this outcome

- The water, sanitation and hygiene promotion activities exceeded the scope of work given the extension of the time that the evacuation centres remained open and beneficiaries continued to receive safe drinking water. Hygiene promotion activities in conjunction with provision of safe drinking water for the Visale locality was well met.

- SIRCS regularly communicated with other agencies in the Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Cluster to report on the progress of water, sanitation and hygiene promotion activities completed, to ensure coordination with other actors, as well as identify and respond to any gaps.

- SIRCS completed all water deliveries and treatments by late August 2014.

- Before water production ceased for the selected Guadalcanal communities, the water, sanitation and hygiene delegate ascertained that water sources had returned to pre-flooding conditions, as indicated by decreasing diarrhoea cases and cross-checked by indicative microbiological testing.

- The exit strategy included hygiene promotion sessions focusing on household water treatment. These were done in cooperation with Save the Children, who carried out early recovery activities in the area.

- SIRCS installed a water tank in the SIRCS School for Children with Disabilities to ensure future water harvesting and access to safe drinking water for the children who have disabilities.
Water, sanitation and hygiene promotion asset management tasks were completed by end of August with a completed stocktaking list of available assets shared with key partners and additional small repairs/maintenance tasks undertaken by SIRCS in order to store assets in good condition.

At the end of the water distribution activities, one NOMAD on loan was returned, leaving SIRCS with three working NOMAD units and one non-working unit (which is not viable to repair and will be used for spare parts). SIRCS will maintain these NOMAD units in Honiara, as a central location from a transport/logistics point of view for deployment for future disasters, and ease of maintenance.

Lessons learned

- In conjunction with RWASH (the rural water sanitation and hygiene coordination group of the Solomon Islands Government) and key partners, to develop standardized hygiene promotion messages, tools and assessments processes which are accepted by government agencies.

- Conduct more combined training with other key partners on hygiene promotion and household water quality and treatment, to further establish relationships and increase the ability of agencies to provide quality standard messages to communities.

- SIRCS to maintain a water, sanitation and hygiene promotion focal point during every disaster response for leading operations, as well as a SIRCS leadership member to have representation on Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Cluster.

- SIRCS to develop a capacity building plan for water, sanitation and hygiene promotion.
Shelter and settlements

Coordination for geographic and community responsibilities for distributing non-food items - SIRCS worked across the evacuation centres within Honiara and primarily within the Guadalcanal wards of Ghaobata, Aola, Sahalu and Savulei. Within these areas, over 400 communities were visited by SIRCS volunteers.

Definition of people per household: To ensure consistency, NDMO requested agencies to apply the same formula for number of people within a household with an average of six people per household to be used in all reporting.

| People planned to be assisted | 2,500 households in evacuation centre in Honiara city and Guadalcanal province | 100% assisted |

Outcome 4: Immediate needs of 2,500 households in Honiara and Guadalcanal Province are met through distributions of in-kind

Output 4.1: Affected households have access to non-food items to meet their household needs

Activity 4.1.1 | Apr | May |

Carry out needs assessment in Guadalcanal Province and Honiara by SIRCS’s Emergency Response Teams (ERT)

- SIRCS undertook a comprehensive household survey throughout 2,021 households in Guadalcanal Province and Honiara. The comprehensive survey was undertaken in partnership with other agencies and covered shelter, water, sanitation and hygiene promotion, and community assessment for health and protection.
- All assessment information was shared with government and other key actors through clusters for improved coordination and beneficiary selection processes.

Activity 4.1.2 | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep |

Locally and regionally mobilize and distribute 2,500 ‘household kits’

To suit the Pacific context and availability of items, the ‘household kit’ was slightly modified. A family (household) was counted as receiving a household kit if they received the following:
- Kitchen set;
- Hygiene kit;
- Mosquito net;
- 1 or 2 blankets;
- Plastic sleeping mat (if available – refer below notes); and
- Either a 10-litre water container or a 14-litre bucket.

SIRCS distributed household kits to 2,878 households (~17,268 people) in flood affected communities. Distribution exceeded original Emergency Appeal intent. Through interagency coordination it reached as many affected households as possible with available items.

Activity 4.1.3 | Jul | Aug |

Developing tools to capture data as well as enable beneficiaries feedback

- SIRCS developed a beneficiary feedback survey, and SIRCS volunteers in conjunction with Save the Children undertook a survey from 100 beneficiaries on the distribution of non-food items and to provide information for Emergency Appeal review undertaken in August.
- One of the recommendations from the Emergency Appeal review is for SIRCS to establish a stronger system for accountability and beneficiaries’ communication, which can also provide valuable input to recovery programmes.
Activity 4.1.4

Distribution monitoring visits carried on by trained staff and volunteers

- As per Activity 4.1.3, SIRCS developed and undertook a beneficiary survey. SIRCS volunteers directly interviewed beneficiaries when completing these surveys.
- Survey feedback provided to implementing partners for lessons learnt workshop.
- Whilst this was one effective way to obtain feedback, SIRCS recognizes that additional monitoring throughout the distribution process would have been preferable. One of the recommendations from the Emergency Appeal review is for SIRCS to establish stronger monitoring systems and provide further training for staff and volunteers.

Output 4.2: 1,000 affected households have access to shelter goods to meet their emergency needs

Activity 4.2.1

Carry out needs assessment Guadalcanal Province and Honiara City by SIRCS’ Emergency Response Teams (ERTs).

SIRCS undertook a comprehensive household survey throughout 2,021 households in Guadalcanal Province and Honiara. The comprehensive survey was undertaken in partnership with other agencies and covered Shelter, water, sanitation and hygiene promotion, and community assessment for health and protection. All assessment information was shared with government and other key actors through clusters for improved coordination and beneficiary selection processes.

Activity 4.2.2

Provide sufficient training and awareness raising for families to build adequate emergency shelters.

During distribution of ‘emergency shelter kits’, SIRCS volunteer teams provided a demonstration of how to effectively use the kit. SIRCS volunteer teams would identify the most vulnerable persons/households within a community, and support that person to construct their emergency shelter while other beneficiaries watched and learnt.

Activity 4.2.3

Regionally mobilize and distribute 1,000 emergency shelter kits (2 tarpaulins and 1 shelter tool kit) to families whose homes have been destroyed or rendered inhabitable and irreparable.

Given non-food items availability, ‘emergency shelter kit’ was modified - family/household (HH) counted as receiving ‘emergency shelter kit’ received shelter tool kit and 1 or 2 tarpaulins. SIRCS distributed ‘emergency shelter kits’ to 1,428 HH (~8,688 people), 1,127 HH received 2 tarpaulins and shelter tool kit, whereas, another 332 HH received 1 tarpaulin and shelter tool kit. Distribution exceeded original Appeal intent. Through interagency coordination it reached as many affected households as possible with available items.

Output 4.3: SIRCS’s capacity to effectively implement emergency programs is enhanced

Activity 4.3.1

Shelter Kit Training conducted for SIRCS volunteers who then supported affected community with training / awareness-raising to build adequate emergency shelters.

With Shelter cluster, over 20 SIRCS volunteers and 10 World Vision and Ministry of Lands staff were trained to support families erect emergency shelters - training completed under supervision of a Technical Advisor for shelter coordination.
Achievement against outcomes

- Shelter Cluster: The IFRC deployed a Shelter Coordinator for seven weeks until the end of May 2014.

- Emergency evacuation centres: the Ministry of Infrastructure Development conducted structural assessments of evacuation shelters at FOPA in May 2014, which were submitted to the Shelter Cluster. SIRCS was subsequently tasked to undertake this work for evacuation shelters and partitioned and repaired FOPA huts.

- Emergency evacuation centres: repairs of additional 14 temporary shelters were undertaken by SIRCS. As described under water, sanitation and hygiene promotion sector, SIRCS also provided safe drinking water, assistance to build latrines, as well as undertaking maintenance and repairs to sanitation facilities within FOPA evacuation centre.

Lessons learned

- Links need to be developed between emergency shelter response and shelter disaster risk reduction elements to reduce the need for the former.

- Shelter and resettlement issues: the issues arising from the displacement of many flood affected people was very complex due to many of these people either having moved to Honiara from other islands to seek employment; not appearing to have the required family or community support available to them to co-locate; living in poverty; living in a flood risk area in substandard shelters; residing within unplanned urban and peri-urban settlements; having no land or residency rights; or having a history of tensions caused by immigration of people from other areas of Solomon Islands into Guadalcanal. Therefore the capacity of internally displaced persons (IDPs) to resettle and move out of the evacuation centres was limited, resulting in evacuation centres remaining open for far longer than anticipated. This resulted in a strain between the need of government agencies and the land owners of the evacuation centres wanting internally displaced persons to leave in order to close the evacuation centres; and the humanitarian actors supporting the immediate relief and early recovery needs of these people. An example of feedback received in the course of the Emergency Shelter Response Review was that: “Whilst some non-food items were distributed to IDP’s in the evacuation centres at the commencement of the response, this was curtailed by NDMO who did not wish to encourage people to stay in the evacuation centres. Later, IDP’s were issued with various shelter kits and non-food items depending upon the damage status of their home. For those whose home was destroyed, the shelter kits were supplemented with corrugated iron roofing sheets by NDMO.” There is a resettlement process, with exchange of land, being established for those people who lost their homes in Honiara, and/or who cannot return to their original area of residence as it has been determined within the ‘no- go’ zone. The people who can access this scheme are those who have known land tenure-ships or ownership rights.

- There was not sufficient focus placed upon transitional shelter needs within the Emergency Appeal plan of action or undertaken by SIRCS and no key focal point was established within SIRCS to keep oversight of this sector. The recommendation is that a key focal point to be established within SIRCS to keep oversight of the shelter sector.

- There were many challenges relating to distribution and quality of non-food items, coupled with a lack of understanding of roles and responsibilities within the SIRCS team, as well as overlaps and gaps in distributions between agencies. Recommendations are:
  - Implementation of standard logistics procedures in addition to a review of the quality and specification of some non-food items.
Future discussions with government agencies and other key partners on the potential to use vouchers and cash instead of non-food items. Initial awareness raising and forums to be held on these tools.

Developing improved processes with the cluster partners, on ways to achieve beneficiary identification, validating distribution and ensuring effective coverage without overlap or gaps through coordination.

- Regarding activity to locally and regionally mobilize and distribute 2,500 ‘household kits’, the challenges were:
  - At points within the distribution, the operation did not have access to, or had depleted certain items and could not procure them;
  - For those households that did not initially receive a plastic sleeping mat through the distribution (due to short supply) through coordination by mid-July, an implementing partner NGO was able to distribute sleeping mats to the majority of the households that missed out initially; and
  - It was intended to include a solar lamp with ‘household kits’ as these are widely used by people within the Solomon Islands. In this operation, the initial stock of solar lamps proved unreliable when distributed, and there was a shortage of tested solar lamps available. Therefore, early in the distribution it was decided not to continue distributing solar lamps.

- Regarding activity to provide sufficient training and awareness raising for families to build adequate emergency shelters, the challenges were:
  - SIRCS staff, volunteers and other partners were under extensive time pressure to respond to the communities needs following the floods;
  - The movements of IDPs who had lost their homes were not conducive to a geographic method for training provision;
  - When IDPs left the evacuation centres with their ‘emergency shelter kits’ they dispersed to outlying communities and/or continued to frequently relocate;
  - Small numbers of SIRCS staff and volunteers reported that they had carried out some training within some of the communities. They acknowledged that the training was not delivered across all communities, and was a minimalist approach which was rushed;
  - Therefore whilst SIRCS and other agencies staff and volunteers provided some community training, is not clear regarding the extent of delivery and/or effectiveness of this training;
  - When beneficiaries were questioned within the surveys or for focus groups for the Emergency Appeal review, they could not recall this training or any learning from it if they did participate.

- Regarding regional mobilization and distribution of emergency shelter kits to families whose homes have been destroyed or rendered inhabitable and irreparable, the challenges were:
  - There was an initial shortage of tarpaulins;
  - SIRCS had distributed over 500 emergency kits by the end June 2104. Due to the shortage of tarpaulins up to the end June 2104, of those 500 emergency shelter kits already distributed, 226 kits had only one tarpaulin included, with the remaining 274 having two tarpaulins;
  - The anticipated shipment arrived soon thereafter and the majority of the remainder of emergency shelter kits distributed were able to include two tarpaulins;
  - Emergency shelter kits were not necessarily distributed with the ‘household kits’. The emergency shelter kits were often distributed separately because these were only provided to those families that had had their homes completely destroyed; and
  - NDMO requested that the emergency shelter kits be provided to internally displaced persons (IDPs) upon their departure from the evacuation centres. Due to an extended timeframe of the evacuation shelters remaining open, the distributions to the IDPs continued throughout July and into August 2014 when these people finally left the evacuation centres in Honiara.
**National Society capacity building**

**Overview of SIRCS capacity:** SIRCS is a legally constituted association, officially recognized by the government as a voluntary relief society and auxiliary to the public authorities with the Solomon Islands Red Cross Society Act of 1983. SIRCS is viewed by government and several key partners as a trusted and dependable partner.

SIRCS mobilized resources including trained staff and 93 volunteers very quickly following the floods and this was a significant contribution to the disaster response. This provided surge capacity when the majority of agencies were depending upon staffing to provide initial response. Additionally SIRCS offices were flooded and several staff and volunteers were directly affected by the floods.

Within the scope of the work identified for the Emergency Appeal, the capacities of SIRCS have been clearly demonstrated. Nevertheless SIRCS is a relatively small National Society and experiences a high demand to respond to disasters. Therefore, one of the major challenges facing SIRCS, is trying to implement ongoing programmes (which are vital for addressing the community vulnerabilities) whilst carrying out response operations. This significantly impacts upon the ability of SIRCS to focus on longer term organizational development.

The below activities were identified to further build the capacities of SIRCS to address the recent flash floods as well as future disasters. The capacity building activities were planned to be undertaken in the second phase of the operation.

### National Society capacity building

| People planned to be assisted | 25 national office staff and 130 branch volunteers | 40% assisted to date |

**Outcome 5:** Solomon Islands Red Cross Society’s infrastructure and communications capacity to respond to emergencies is strengthened.

**Output 5.1:** SIRCS headquarter logistics capacity is augmented.

#### Activity 5.1.1

**Build additional logistics storage space at SIRCS Headquarters**

- It was planned through repair and extension of size of existing storage sheds to expand storage capacity for NFIs, with this additional storage space to be achieved before end of this operation. Quotes had been sought from contractors (as per procurement code) for this work to be undertaken. Work is ready to commence but has not been completed within the timeframe of the Emergency Appeal.

- **0% implemented**

#### Activity 5.1.2

**Identify needs and procure sufficient SIRCS-branded shirts and vest for use of volunteers**

- Procurement and delivery of over 200 t-shirts for staff and volunteers was finalized. Vests have already been procured.

- **100% implemented**

#### Activity 5.1.3

**Relocation of existing 40ft containers**

- Truck/forklift provider organized, relocation site was prepared, but relocation of the container did not happen by the time this operation’s timeframe was ending.

- **25% implemented**

#### Activity 5.1.4

**Maintain SIRCShas Headquarters generator so that it is kept at an operational level at all times**

- Due to damage of floods to office and associated infrastructure, the generator was damaged. Partner National Society French Red Cross undertook repairs in December 2014 to address this need.

- **100% implemented**
**Output 5.2:** SIRCS Headquarters building infrastructure and communications technology upgrade based on needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 5.2.1</th>
<th>Assess state of SIRCS Headquarters roof and make repairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Due to damage by floods to office, current roof was damaged and developed extensive leaking, and repairs are required. It has been assessed as requiring replacement of some structural timber and galvanized iron roofing. Quotes were sought from three contractors (as per procurement code) for repairs to be undertaken. Work is ready to commence but was not completed within the appeal timeframe.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 5.2.2</th>
<th>Improve vehicle garage structure by installing concrete slab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A concrete slab over existing dirt floor between offices, storeroom and containers will assist greatly during preparation of non-food items for distributions. Quotes have been sought from three contractors (as per procurement code) for the slab to be laid. Work is ready to commence but was not completed within the timeframe of the Emergency Appeal.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 5.2.3</th>
<th>Industrial strength photocopier purchased and installed in SIRCS Headquarters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIRCS had minimal office equipment and facilities. The French Red Cross procured a new photocopier during the recent flood response to assist the operation. This need has, therefore, been addressed.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 5.2.4</th>
<th>Teleconference facilities procured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>An open phone system was procured to enable teleconferences to be held.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Output 5.3:** Media communication and data management strategies and plans are established and implemented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 5.3.1</th>
<th>Develop and revise media communication and data management strategies based on needs analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not commenced.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 5.3.2</th>
<th>Media communications training conducted for selected staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial media communications induction has been carried on for the new communications officer. The planned communications training for staff was not undertaken within the term of Emergency Appeal timeframe.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 5.3.3</th>
<th>Data management training conducted to volunteers for future evacuation centres registrations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>It was proposed that the SIRCS disaster management officer would conduct this training in November 2014. However, the training is still to be held.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Activity 5.3.4

**Volunteer management system developed**

- The SIRCS disaster management officer has started the process of developing a system for SIRCS national office, Guadalcanal and Malaita branches. There are additional needs to establish the system in three more branches.
- An MS Excel spreadsheet developed to be used at branch level with the master copy updated at SIRCS national office and compilation of volunteer data base is underway.

#### Activity 5.3.5

**Conduct Lessons Learned Workshop with SIRCS volunteers and staff/IFRC Pacific regional office**

The flood response review was led by IFRC and undertaken with Partner National Societies and SIRC representatives during August 2014.

- A component of the review was a debrief/workshop with all staff available and a debrief/focus group workshop with volunteers;
- A full report is available on review findings with key recommendations. Two separate reports are also available on volunteers debrief and staff workshop;
- The review was to provide a timely inquiry into the activities undertaken within the Emergency Appeal plan of action to assist SIRCS in finalising the operation and planning for future disaster events, especially as it is recognized that SIRCS historically does not have long periods of time between disasters occurring; and
- Key points from the review are included within this report.

#### Activity 5.3.6

**Conduct RC Orientation session for new volunteers**

- The SIRCS disaster management officer conducted a half-day orientation for 40 new volunteers who played a role in the floods operation. Additional training to complete the induction and skills development in disaster management was provided in November 2014 for these 40 new volunteers.

### Achievements against outcomes

- SIRCS has applied its efforts to meeting the needs of the most vulnerable. For example, the majority of people residing within the evacuation centres were women, children and people who were landless. SIRCS mobilized resources including significant numbers of staff and volunteers very quickly following the floods and this was a significant contribution to the disaster response. During the Review, it was clearly recognized that SIRCS has provided an exceptional response to the flash flooding, especially in consideration to the extent of the disaster and the size and capacity of SIRCS. Respect and trust in the role of SIRCS to address the humanitarian needs of flood-affected people was evident in all conversations. From interviews and feedback it has been clearly validated, that the capacities of SIRCS in the main fitted the scope of the work as identified within the Emergency Appeal. SIRCS is viewed by government and several key partners as a trusted and dependable partner. In comparison to an Emergency Appeal in 2007, this time SIRCS took on the lead responsibility and established improved leadership visibility and relationships.

- It was the intention within the Emergency Appeal operation for SIRCS to complete a number of capacity building activities as outlined above. Unfortunately, SIRCS could not meet the time limitations and the Emergency Appeal was closed. Although SIRCS was not able to access the Emergency Appeal funds for those planned capacity building activities, several significant tasks have been progressed through the work of the SIRCS team. The initiatives that commenced will be continued using the balance remaining, upon final go-ahead by donors and partners to carry over the balance to the Pacific regional development plan.
Lessons learned

- SIRCS is a small national society which responds to a high frequency of disasters. This significantly impacts upon the ability of SIRCS to focus on longer term organizational development and capacity building initiatives. There were several findings which highlighted the drain of time, energy and resources of SIRCS in continually responding to frequent disasters, whilst equally trying to build capacity and manage longer term programmes.

- SIRCS has also established a draft proposal which outlines the future plan for SIRCS to undertake capacity building work across organizational development and disaster preparedness initiatives. This work will enable SIRCS (its branches and communities where it works) to more effectively plan for, respond to and recover from disasters. SIRCS is consulting with partner national societies and IFRC about this proposal, to aim to establish a ‘one plan’ approach which consolidates future work occurring with SIRCS.

- Key areas for SIRCS to undertake capacity building work across organizational development and disaster preparedness initiatives include:
  
  1) Protocols and procedures
     - updating of SIRC disaster management (DM) plan, clarification of roles in national DM plan and contingency planning with IFRC regional office
     - updating volunteer management procedures
     - reviewing and updating financial policies and procedures supporting disaster operations
     - reviewing and standardizing key relief items and common approaches in logistics
  
  2) Skilled human resources and stronger systems for implementing response
     - conducting training on assessments and planning in water, sanitation and hygiene areas.
     - strengthening PMER mechanisms
     - media and communications training.
     - Undertaking organizational capacity assessment and certification (OCAC) self-assessment.
     - joint preparedness activities with communities and key partners in response:
       - strengthening information management systems
       - strengthening beneficiary communications and accountability processes
  
  3) Support to the national shelter cluster
     - Conducting shelter kit training for SIRC volunteers other partners agencies
     - Undertaking advocacy on emergency shelter and IDPs issues
  
  4) Coordination with NDMO other national partners
     - Contributing to the establishment of standardized national assessment, analysis and reporting processes
     - Developing standardized hygiene promotion messages/tools/assessments processes in coordination with Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Cluster
  
  5) Addressing underlying risks
     - conducting training on undertaking risk assessments and managing risks to integrate into response programming. The disaster management training should include a stronger focus on understanding the ways a disaster might affect different vulnerable groups and ways to ensure protection of these groups.
Contact information

For further information specifically related to this operation please contact:

- **Solomon Islands Red Cross Society** (phone +688 20706):
  - Joanne Zoleveke, secretary general, email: secgen@redcross.org.sb

- **IFRC Pacific regional office, Suva** (phone +679 3311 855):
  - Aurélie Balpe, head of regional delegation, office phone: +679 331 1855; mobile: +679 999 2485; email: aurelia.balpe@ifrc.org
  - Vuli Gauna, regional disaster management coordinator, office phone: +679 331 1855; mobile: +679 999 2509; email: vuli.gauna@ifrc.org

- **IFRC Asia Pacific zone office, Kuala Lumpur** (phone: +603 9207 5700):
  - Martin Faller, head of operations; email: martin.faller@ifrc.org
  - Nicolas Verdy, operations coordinator, email: nicolas.verdy@ifrc.org
  - Florent Chane, zone logistics coordinator, email: florent.chane@ifrc.org
  - Peter Ophoff, head of planning, monitoring, evaluation and reporting; email: peter.ophoff@ifrc.org
  - Nathan Rabe, humanitarian diplomacy coordinator; nathan.rabe@ifrc.org

- **IFRC Geneva**:
  - Christine South, operations quality assurance senior officer; phone: +412 2730 4529; email: christine.south@ifrc.org

Click here

1. Final financial report [below](#)
2. Click [here](#) to return to the title page

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 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](https://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  
**MDRSB003 - Solomon Islands - Floods**  
**Timeframe:** 11 Apr 14 to 11 Jan 15  
**Appeal Launch Date:** 02 May 14  
**Final Report**

### 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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>684,277</td>
<td>684,277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B. Opening Balance

**Income**

**Cash contributions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Red Cross</td>
<td>139,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Red Cross</td>
<td>2,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Red Cross (from Australian Government*)</td>
<td>55,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Red Cross (from Canadian Government*)</td>
<td>44,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian Government Bilateral Emergency Fund</td>
<td>60,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Red Cross Society</td>
<td>45,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea Intern. Coop. Agency (KOICA)</td>
<td>44,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Red Cross</td>
<td>45,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Crescent Society of the United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>8,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross of Monaco</td>
<td>18,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore Red Cross Society</td>
<td>9,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Government</td>
<td>32,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF - United Nations Children's Fund</td>
<td>44,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERF/WHO Voluntary Emergency Relief</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C1. Cash contributions</strong></td>
<td>552,966</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inkind Goods & Transport**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian Red Cross</td>
<td>29,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C2. Inkind Goods &amp; Transport</strong></td>
<td>29,348</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inkind Personnel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Red Cross</td>
<td>27,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C3. Inkind Personnel</strong></td>
<td>27,848</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. Total Income = SUM(C1..C4)**                           | 610,162 |

**D. Total Funding = B + C**                                | 610,162 |

* Funding source data based on information provided by the donor

### 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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>610,162</td>
<td>610,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Expenditure</td>
<td>-422,932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-422,932</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Closing Balance = (B + C + E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>187,230</td>
<td>187,230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)*
## III. Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Groups</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>684,277</td>
<td>684,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief items, Construction, Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter - Relief</td>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>2,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction - Facilities</td>
<td>4,788</td>
<td>4,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Materials</td>
<td>5,027</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing &amp; Textiles</td>
<td>29,600</td>
<td>6,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water, Sanitation &amp; Hygiene</td>
<td>114,504</td>
<td>16,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical &amp; First Aid</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utensils &amp; Tools</td>
<td>57,000</td>
<td>8,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Supplies &amp; Services</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Relief items, Construction, Sup</td>
<td>211,629</td>
<td>36,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land, vehicles &amp; equipment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers &amp; Telecom</td>
<td>1,197</td>
<td>1,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office &amp; Household Equipment</td>
<td>5,387</td>
<td>5,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Land, vehicles &amp; equipment</td>
<td>6,584</td>
<td>6,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics, Transport &amp; Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution &amp; Monitoring</td>
<td>97,566</td>
<td>32,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport &amp; Vehicles Costs</td>
<td>12,162</td>
<td>72,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics Services</td>
<td>1,467</td>
<td>1,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Logistics, Transport &amp; Storage</td>
<td>109,728</td>
<td>106,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Staff</td>
<td>76,610</td>
<td>50,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Staff</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>9,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Society Staff</td>
<td>8,509</td>
<td>26,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>95,860</td>
<td>57,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Staff Benefits</td>
<td>4,693</td>
<td>4,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Personnel</td>
<td>185,979</td>
<td>147,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops &amp; Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops &amp; Training</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Workshops &amp; Training</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>46,915</td>
<td>75,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information &amp; Public Relations</td>
<td>8,376</td>
<td>8,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Costs</td>
<td>27,811</td>
<td>12,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>17,048</td>
<td>8,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Charges</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other General Expenses</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total General Expenditure</td>
<td>100,750</td>
<td>104,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td>41,709</td>
<td>23,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Indirect Costs</td>
<td>41,709</td>
<td>23,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pledge Specific Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pledge Earmarking Fee</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>2,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pledge Reporting Fees</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Pledge Specific Costs</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>3,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURE (D)</td>
<td>684,277</td>
<td>422,932</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Selected Parameters

- Reporting Timeframe: 2014/4-2015/5
- Budget Timeframe: 2014/4-2015/1
- Split by funding source: Y
- Subsector: *

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)
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### III. Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Groups</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Raise humanitarian standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthen RC/RC contribution to development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heighen influence and support for RC/RC work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joint working and accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td><strong>A - B</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUDGET (C)</td>
<td>684,277</td>
<td>684,277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIANCE (C - D)</td>
<td>261,345</td>
<td>261,345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selected Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Timeframe</th>
<th>Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014/4-2015/5</td>
<td>MDRSB003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Timeframe</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014/4-2015/1</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Split by funding source</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subsector: *

**All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)**