
DREF operation n° MDRMW009
GLIDE n°FL-2012-000210-MWI
30 November 2013

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

Summary: CHF 326,090 was allocated from the IFRC's Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF) on 7 February 2013 to support Malawi Red Cross Society (MRCS) in delivering assistance over 3 months to some 1,600 families affected by floods in the district of Mangochi.

However, after verification of those registered as beneficiaries, MRCS reduced the number of targeted families to 1,421 families. This reduction was coordinated and supported by the District Commissioner's office. MRCS's response was in line with the directive from the DC's office.



Part of Sokole camp in Mangochi. Make shift houses made of tarpaulins provided by MRCS through DREF funds. Photo: MRCS

[Update No 1](#) for this operation was issued on 14 May, 2013.

A second allocation of CHF 4,603 from the DREF was made to support a review of the intervention which took place in June 2013, taking the total DREF budget to CHF 330,693.

With this DREF, the MRCS was able to fulfil its planned objectives to provide shelter, relief items, promote and improve hygiene, and provide the necessary logistics to respond to the needs of flood affected communities in the areas they had moved to.

MRCS was the first to respond by deploying volunteers. Relief support was provided within two days after disaster was reported. MRCS provided 500 tarpaulins and 2 cholera kits to Mangochi District after being approached by the Government a day after the floods were reported. The cholera kits were quickly deployed to affected areas and chlorine diluted and distributed to the affected households.

Financial situation: The Malawi Kwacha was devalued by more than 150% during the course of the DREF implementation resulting in massive price increases almost on daily basis coupled with shortage of foreign currency and fuel. This resulted in over expenditure on a number of items e.g. NFI, first aid kits, etc. Quotations from suppliers were valid only for one day because of price volatility. As for the high financial charges, these were as a result of currency revaluations. Funds were transferred in Malawi Kwacha (which was depreciating daily) but expenses reported in CHF. WatSan costs such as borehole repairs and sanplats were wrongly coded to construction. National Society staff and volunteer per diems

were increased to mitigate against hyperinflation, as were training and workshops. Overspends were also encountered for fuel as a result of increasing prices. There is a balance of CHF 18,184 occasioned by the length of time taken to report on expenses before subsequent funds were advanced to MRCS for the DREF implementation. This meant that the project time frame ended and it was too late to advance any more funds. The remaining balance will be returned to the DREF.

IFRC assisted MRCS with the DREF's supervision and advice on crucial areas. IFRC conducted an internal evaluation of the operation where key players and volunteers were present. The approach for this workshop was participatory and used new methodologies which the participants liked. As part of internal evaluations, IFRC met some key stakeholders in the district. Prior to the internal evaluation, a lessons learned meeting was conducted on 2 and 3 May, 2013 which attracted 25 participants from the District Assembly, Police, Education, Agriculture, Branch and community representatives. Key players from MRCS headquarters were the DPAD, the DM, the WASH Manager, the PMER Officer and the Logistician.

Lessons learned

- There is a need to standardize the assessment tools. Both data collection tools used (District and MRCS) missed out important data on gender, known vulnerability like disability and age.
- Visits by IFRC were short, which did not allow sufficient time for adequate transfer of skills to MRCS
- It is important that when vulnerability of communities are seen, opportunities to assist them can be sought e.g. when MRCS was invited to be part of the assessment team and raised the plight of the Sokole people, it was possible for them to lobby for support on their behalf and the Government, through DODMA, organized a site visit to the areas and planned to relocate the people.

The major donors and partners to the DREF include the Australian, American and Belgian governments, the Austrian Red Cross, the Canadian Red Cross and government, Danish Red Cross and government, DG ECHO, the Irish and the Italian governments, the Japanese Red Cross, the Luxembourg government, the Monaco Red Cross and government, the Netherlands Red Cross and government, the Norwegian Red Cross and government, the Spanish Government, the Swedish Red Cross and government, the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID), the Medtronic and Zurich Foundations, and other corporate and private donors.

[<click here for the final financial report, or here to view contact details>](#)

The situation

Malawi had been receiving heavy rains from mid-December 2012 to mid-January 2013, resulting in flooding in several districts. Mangochi district in the southern part of Malawi was one of the three districts that was severely impacted as it had a higher number of people affected out of the three districts. The district continued to receive heavy rain from 6 to 11 January 2013 resulting in flooding. The areas affected were in traditional authorities of Nankumba, Mponda and Chimwala. Houses collapsed, some were partially destroyed and roads rendered impassable, livestock and crops washed away. The communities were taken unawares and had difficulties coping with the floods as the areas is not considered flood-prone.

An initial assessment that was done by district authorities on 12 January indicated 16,370 individuals (3,274 households) were affected. A second assessment was done by an interagency joint assessment team on 15 January that comprised representatives of the clusters of shelter, health, agriculture, security and protection based in Lilongwe. MRCS was represented by the council member for Mangochi and the volunteers.

In accordance with the Malawi Disaster Act, the Department of Disaster Management (DODMA) is tasked with activating this committee when it is reported that a disaster has affected 1,000 people or more. Further, the committee should be on the ground within 48 hours of the disaster. The DODMA announces and asks for assistance for the disaster after the findings of this committee. The District Assembly did the coordination of the flood response at District level, while at national level it was the responsibility of the DODMA. MRCS participated at both these levels, with the branch at District level and the Headquarters at national level.

A verification exercise by Malawi Red Cross Society in March, which involved the District authorities, reduced the original number of planned beneficiaries from 1,600 to 1,421 after MRCS checked the listed beneficiaries and found some duplication or people requesting assistance but not meeting Red Cross criteria.

The DREF covered shelter needs (tarpaulins, shelter kits, poles, axes, sickles), WASH - rehabilitation of boreholes, provision of chlorine, health - hygiene promotion and first aid.

Efforts to stabilize the situation were hampered by continuous rains which had made some roads impassable. The district also lacked readily available funds to cover costs associated with fuel, upkeep for staff during registration and proper registration tools. However the communities adhered to the advice and instruction by the authorities, which facilitated the rescue operations and the establishment of the camps. The presence of Red Cross volunteers made the operation easier for authorities, although MRCS was not present in some areas where branches do not exist.

Red Cross and Red Crescent action

MRCS through the Mangochi Branch engaged volunteers for rescue, camp set up, registration and verification exercises, shelter management, hygiene promotion, first aid and distribution of relief items. As soon as the DREF was approved, MRCS called a meeting of district officials to brief them on MRCS's objectives and sought their support. After the meeting, a small committee with district heads responsible for water, environment, disaster coordinator and the MRCS branch formed a technical committee. At all times, MRCS worked with the district's approval.

MRCS PMER unit conducted a verification exercise to determine who qualifies for aid. To qualify for assistance, several factors were considered:

- Families whose houses had collapsed or partially damaged
- Households headed by either the elderly, women or children,
- Households with chronically ill members or physically challenged
- Poor households with limited sources of livelihood

The results of this verification reduced the number of targeted households from 1,600 to 1,421. The exercise involved the volunteers, district officials, civil protection committees and local leaders.

While the PMER unit was doing the verification, the WASH Manager, with the assistance of volunteers, was assessing the hygiene conditions and identified potential people for training in hygiene promotion. He worked with Water Department and Ministry of Health officials based in the area not district officials. At same time, the First Aid Coordinator was identifying the people to be trained. Both the hygiene promotion and first aid training were done concurrently to maximize use of resources and available time.

By the end of the operation, MRCS had rehabilitated 3 boreholes, trained 36 volunteers in good hygiene practices, 30 in first aid, 30 in shelter and camp management and had re-activated the dormant sub-branches.

MRCS took special interest in the 67 residents of Sokole camp. This community was relocated to the area by the Government because of insufficient land that was suitable to use within their vicinity. Unfortunately, they were settled on a flood prone area. At this site, their houses were completely destroyed and the community was then moved to a school, which caused tension and discrimination between the relocated people and the local community. Besides the planned relief items of poles, axes, sickles, nails, twine and soap, MRCS provided additional assistance to these 67 families, including giving some of them piece work as a means of earning an income.

MRCS used the community leadership structures to implement its objectives, but was disappointed to find that some community leaders were not aware of, or were not adhering to, the criteria set by MRCS.

The assistance given by MRCS was the largest and most relevant that the vulnerable communities received, according to the 35 key district stakeholders during debriefing

This DREF has helped to improve the capacity of Mangochi Branch with training in hygiene promotion, First Aid and shelter and camp management. The DREF helped the local Branch to revive sub-branches. The DREF has improved the visibility of the Branch as it is registering more members wanting to be recruited after seeing the work MRCS did in this operation.

Achievements against outcomes

Relief distributions (basic non-food items)	
Outcome: The immediate shelter needs of 1,600 displaced households in TAs Nankumba, Mponda and Chimwala are met.	
Outputs (expected results)	Activities planned:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emergency shelter assistance is provided to the target households • Essential household items/NFIs are provided to the target population • Emergency school shelter is provided to the target communities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct rapid emergency needs and capacity assessments using checklist. District Government officials responding to disaster being part of the assessment • Develop beneficiary targeting strategy and registration system to deliver intended assistance in transparent manner. • Conduct beneficiary registration and verification • Distribute relief supplies as detailed above and control supply movements from point of dispatch to end user. • Monitor and evaluate the relief activities and provide reporting on relief distributions.

One major criteria for a family to benefit from relief aid was whether their house had collapsed. Most houses in this area are made of un-burnt bricks or mud. This type of structure cannot withstand flood waters which went to window level. One issue that materialised is that people could point to uninhabitable shelters and claim that they were theirs, while in fact their own homes were intact. The district staff and volunteers had difficulties in accessing some areas due to impassable roads and relied on information from local leaders which was questionable. Some affected households who had no place to lodge were housed in tents or classrooms. MRCS assisted in erecting tents in four areas. Despite putting women separate from the men, some families opted to stay together. The women thought that by staying together with men they were protected. But for women without spouses, this arrangement did not go well as culturally it is not acceptable for the two sexes to share sleeping quarters.

MRCS trained 25 volunteers in erecting temporary shelters using tarpaulins and locally available materials. This approach prompted other households to return to their original homes and make simple shelter.

Challenges

- Although the DREF was approved, MRCS had no funds to kick start the operation.
- The district had no proper guidelines or templates for collecting data. There is need to build capacity in monitoring and evaluation.
- Despite distributing 500 tarpaulins within three days of the disaster, MRCS delayed in the distribution of other relief items (not distributed until April partly due to administrative delays and partly due to on-going bad weather conditions)
- The data collection tools used by the district were not harmonised as some missed some key points like gender, age and other relevant information on vulnerability.
- The initial or preliminarily registration was not properly supervised; in some cases the chiefs registered individuals and brought names to the district.
- MRCS had no volunteers in some areas therefore coverage was limited in these areas

Emergency health

Outcome: The risks of deaths, illnesses and impact from diseases reduced among affected communities through the provision of preventive measures at community level.	
Outputs (expected results)	Activities planned
First aid provided to those affected by the disaster	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify and train 36 volunteers (10 in each TA and 6 from Mangochi Division) in first aid Provide first aid and referral to health facility Purchase 15 first aid kits (5 kits per TA)
The risk of contracting cholera and other waterborne related diseases are reduced.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mobilize and recruit 30 volunteers at community level for the prevention of cholera and other diarrhoea diseases Conduct training of 30 volunteers and 6 Health Surveillance Assistants (HSAs) using the CBHFA curriculum for 5 days Produce and distribute IEC materials to communities for disease prevention with focus on cholera, diarrhoea and malaria

The MRCS branch WASH and first aid coordinator identified volunteers during the household surveys to participate in the trainings. On April 5 to 10, 36 people were trained in First Aid (10 in each TA and 6 from Mangochi District). This enabled the volunteers to provide ongoing First Aid services and make referrals to health facility. 15 first aid kits were purchased and distributed (two TAs received 5 kits, one received 3 kits, additional 2 provided to the division).

In the dissemination campaigns the first aiders trained people on how to manage some simple cases they may encounter before medical help.

30 volunteers were mobilized and recruited at community level for the prevention of cholera and other diarrhoea diseases. Volunteers used dramas to educate the community (17 performances have been completed to date).

Other volunteers were identified and between 28 March and 10 April, two 5-day trainings on hygiene promotion and Community Based Management (CBM/management of water, sanitation and hygiene facilities) took place (including training on the repairing and management of water points). Participants included 30 volunteers as well as 6 Health Surveillance Assistants (HSAs) government staff working in the area on hygiene promotion using the CBHFA.

Challenges:

- Despite claiming to be volunteers, the spirit of monetary gain was observed in some people.
- Some areas could not be reached by the volunteers with awareness raising and drama performances campaigns due to long distances.
- Initially some officers at the Ministry of Health thought that MRCS was taking on their role (not complementing it), however this was clarified and resolved through meetings.

Water, sanitation, and hygiene promotion

Outcome: To reduce the occurrence of water and sanitation related diseases among 3,274 households through improved access to water and sanitation facilities and improved hygiene practices.	
Outputs (expected results)	Activities planned
Increased access to safe and portable water, sanitation and improved hygiene practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct water point and access to sanitation facilities assessment to identify critical needs; Rehabilitate ten (10) boreholes to improve access to safe and portable water; Facilitate Community Led Total Sanitation (CLTS) with affected communities; Provide water treatment products (Chlorine, Life straws & cholera treatment modules) for water filtration and treatment to 3274 families. Facilitate hygiene promotion campaigns in all the three TAs



Commissioning a bore rehabilitated by DREF funds in Mangochi: Photo MRCS

There were no cases of waterborne diseases reported. This could be attributed to the results of the hygiene promotion exercise that took place in addition to the distribution of chlorine for water treatment. The MOH distributed diluted solutions and sachets to Health Surveillance Assistants (HSA) to chlorinate all sources of water including areas that were not affected by the floods. The ITNs assisted in preventing malaria however not all used them because of lack hanging space in tents and make shift shelters as the people were crowded.

The trained committees were the entry points for other stakeholders like Ministry of Health in disseminating information. The rehabilitated boreholes provided clean and

safe water to the community. All activities were completed within the time frame of the DREF

Challenges:

- There were long distances travelled by the community volunteers to reach the affected communities with dissemination messages.
- It was difficult to estimate the people that were reached with chlorination because MRCS operated within the MOH structures reaching people who were outside the DREF operation area (the plan was to reach 3,274 but more were reached).
- Due to scarcity of some products in Malawi, some items like chlorine were delivered in portions. MRCS used its buffer stock in the distribution and were replaced later.
- The borehole rehabilitated in Sokole is a long distance from the most affected community - a 4.5km walk to draw water. A request was made to the district to consider constructing another bore hole in this area to enhance access to water.
- It was reported that some beneficiaries sold ITNs to fishermen who used them for fishing

Logistics

Outcome: Relief operation is supported and delivers a range of relief items in line with the operational priorities in a cost effective and timely manner.	
Outputs (expected results)	Activities planned
The operation has coordinated mobilization of relief items and efficiently and timely dispatched goods to the final distribution points in good order	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procure relief items and other material needed for the operation • Preposition stocks in strategic areas • Establish the best sourcing strategy for relief materials so that cost efficient and timely delivery of relief is ensured • Control efficient supply movements to end user

Procurement:

- The items bought by this DREF were procured through a 3-quotation basis with a committee approving it. The committee was instituted to quicken the procurement process.
- Items procured were tarpaulins, basins, soap, chlorine, blankets, mosquito nets and kitchen sets. Services engaged were hiring of transport, media coverage, and distribution services. All items were procured within the implementation period.
- Some items were timely procured but reached beneficiaries late due to joint distributions system.
- Other items were bought to replenish stocks which MRCS had used. These included kitchen sets, chlorine and tarpaulins

Challenges:

- There was problem of storage at the final distribution points (FDPs) because the warehouse or storage facilities and security were inadequate.
- People who did not qualify for assistance tried to claim benefits on the basis that as long as water passed through their village, they should qualify.
- The replenishment of some items was done at the very end – almost beyond the time frame of the DREF which would have made the procurement under the DREF ineligible.

- The Malawi currency fluctuation affected prices of most commodities including fuel prices and hiring charges

Total Relief Items Distributed

MANGOCHI DISTRIBUTION POINTS	HOUSEHOLDS			NFI DISTRIBUTION													
	Male HoH	Fem HoH	Total HHs	DISTRIBUTION Dates (#/HH)	Blankets	Kitchen sets	Soap	Mosquito nets	Basins	Shelter kits	Tarpaulins	Poles	Nails (1kg 6", 1kg 5")	Axes	Sickles	Bamboo (bundles)	Rope (bundle)
MPONDASI CENTRE 1	78	223	301	13-Apr	602	301	602	602	301	30	602	0	0	0	0	0	0
MAKAWA CENTRE 2	?	?	136	12-Apr	272	136	272	272	136	13	272	0	0	0	0	0	0
NTATATAKA CENTRE 3	318	512	830	11-Apr	1660	830	1660	1660	830	82	1660	0	0	0	0	0	0
PAKAMWA CENTRE 4	?	?	87	17-Apr	174	87	174	174	87	9	174	0	0	0	0	0	0
SOKOLE Centre 5	50	17	67	12-Apr;5-May	134	67	201	134	67	67	134	1675	134	67	67	268	268
Total	396	735	1421		2842	1421	2909	2842	1421	201	2842	1675	134	67	67	268	268

* Sokole households received 6 due to conditions.

** 1 per 5 households (10 beneficiaries)

Contact information

For further information specifically related to this operation please contact:

- **In Malawi:** Ethel Kaimila ,Secretary General; Phone: +265 999949 084; email: ethelkaimila@malawiredcross.org
- **IFRC Regional Representation:** Alexander Matheou Regional Representative for Southern Africa; Gaborone; phone: +267 3712700, mob: +267 71395340, fax: +267 3950090; email: alexander.matheou@ifrc.org
- **IFRC Africa Zone:** Daniel Bolaños, Disaster Management Coordinator for Africa; Nairobi; phone: +254 (0)731 067 489; email: daniel.bolanos@ifrc.org
- **IFRC Geneva:** Christine South, Operations Quality Assurance Senior Officer; phone: +41.22.730.45 29; email: christine.south@ifrc.org
- **IFRC Zone Logistics Unit (ZLU):** Rishi Ramrakha, Head of zone logistics unit; Tel: +254 733 888 022/ Fax +254 20 271 2777; email: rishi.ramrakha@ifrc.org

For Resource Mobilization and Pledges:

- **In IFRC regional representation:** Diana Ongiti, Senior RM Officer; phone +254 20 2835 276; email: diana.ongiti@ifrc.org

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

- **IFRC Africa Zone:** Robert Ondrusek, PMER/QA Delegate for Africa; Nairobi; phone: +254 731 067277; email: robert.ondrusek@ifrc.org

How we work

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

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

www.ifrc.org
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

MDRMW009 - Malawi - Floods

Timeframe: 06 Feb 13 to 07 Jun 13

Appeal Launch Date: 06 Feb 13

Final

Selected Parameters

Reporting Timeframe	2013/2-2013/	Programme	MDRMW009
Budget Timeframe	2013/2-2013/	Budget	APPROVED
Split by funding source	Y	Project	*

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

I. Funding

	Raise humanitarian standards	Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people	Strengthen RC/RC contribution to development	Heighten influence and support for RC/RC work	Joint working and accountability	TOTAL	Deferred Income
A. Budget		330,694				330,694	
B. Opening Balance		0				0	
Income							
<u>Other Income</u>							
<i>DREF Allocations</i>		312,510				312,510	
C4. Other Income		312,510				312,510	
C. Total Income = SUM(C1..C4)		312,510				312,510	
D. Total Funding = B + C		312,510				312,510	

* Funding source data based on information provided by the donor

II. Movement of Funds

	Raise humanitarian standards	Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people	Strengthen RC/RC contribution to development	Heighten influence and support for RC/RC work	Joint working and accountability	TOTAL	Deferred Income
B. Opening Balance		0				0	
C. Income		312,510				312,510	
E. Expenditure		-312,510				-312,510	
F. Closing Balance = (B + C + E)		0				0	

Disaster Response Financial Report

MDRMW009 - Malawi - Floods

Timeframe: 06 Feb 13 to 07 Jun 13

Appeal Launch Date: 06 Feb 13

Final

Selected Parameters

Reporting Timeframe	2013/2-2013/	Programme	MDRMW009
Budget Timeframe	2013/2-2013/	Budget	APPROVED
Split by funding source	Y	Project	*

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

III. Expenditure

Account Groups	Expenditure						TOTAL	Variance
	Budget	Raise humanitarian standards	Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people	Strengthen RC/RC contribution to development	Heighten influence and support for RC/RC work	Joint working and accountability		
	A					B	A - B	
BUDGET (C)			330,694			330,694		
Relief items, Construction, Supplies								
Shelter - Relief	86,687		73,394			73,394	13,293	
Construction Materials			1,616			1,616	-1,616	
Clothing & Textiles	87,200		106,962			106,962	-19,762	
Water, Sanitation & Hygiene	7,125		6,353			6,353	772	
Medical & First Aid	29,100		40,100			40,100	-11,000	
Teaching Materials	875						875	
Utensils & Tools	43,200		36,864			36,864	6,336	
Other Supplies & Services	4,800						4,800	
Total Relief items, Construction, Sup	258,987		265,289			265,289	-6,302	
Logistics, Transport & Storage								
Storage	200						200	
Distribution & Monitoring	4,500						4,500	
Transport & Vehicles Costs	10,562		10,425			10,425	137	
Total Logistics, Transport & Storage	15,262		10,425			10,425	4,837	
Personnel								
International Staff			200			200	-200	
National Society Staff	7,950		23,189			23,189	-15,239	
Volunteers	740		2,099			2,099	-1,359	
Total Personnel	8,690		25,488			25,488	-16,798	
Workshops & Training								
Workshops & Training	15,328		18,082			18,082	-2,754	
Total Workshops & Training	15,328		18,082			18,082	-2,754	
General Expenditure								
Travel	7,900		9,514			9,514	-1,614	
Information & Public Relations	810						810	
Office Costs	1,588		392			392	1,196	
Communications	1,227		1,251			1,251	-24	
Financial Charges	1,000		-37,004			-37,004	38,004	
Total General Expenditure	12,525		-25,847			-25,847	38,372	
Indirect Costs								
Programme & Services Support Recovt	19,902		19,073			19,073	829	
Total Indirect Costs	19,902		19,073			19,073	829	
TOTAL EXPENDITURE (D)	330,694		312,510			312,510	18,184	
VARIANCE (C - D)			18,184			18,184		

Disaster Response Financial Report

MDRMW009 - Malawi - Floods

Timeframe: 06 Feb 13 to 07 Jun 13

Appeal Launch Date: 06 Feb 13

Final

Selected Parameters

Reporting Timeframe	2013/2-2013/	Programme	MDRMW009
Budget Timeframe	2013/2-2013/	Budget	APPROVED
Split by funding source	Y	Project	*

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

IV. Breakdown by subsector

Business Line / Sub-sector	Budget	Opening Balance	Income	Funding	Expenditure	Closing Balance	Deferred Income
BL2 - Grow RC/RC services for vulnerable people							
Disaster response	330,694	0	312,510	312,510	312,510	0	
Subtotal BL2	330,694	0	312,510	312,510	312,510	0	
GRAND TOTAL	330,694	0	312,510	312,510	312,510	0	