

# ***Central America: Hurricane Mitch Emergency relief, transitional relief and first phase rehabilitation***

15 August 2000

***appeals no. 33/98 and 02/99***

***situation report no. 4 (final)***

***period covered: October 1998 - 31 December 1999***

---

***Hurricane Mitch, Central America's most destructive hurricane, triggered one of the most extensive and complex relief operations ever faced by the Red Cross. Thousands of local volunteers, staff and delegates were mobilised to provide not only emergency aid in the early post-disaster weeks, but also longer term assistance after many agencies had pulled out. By its sheer size, and the response it generated the disaster overwhelmed the capacity of the four operating Societies and generated a rush of bilateral initiatives that drew attention to fundamental co-ordination and management issues. The surplus funds left over from the operation are being allocated to longer term disaster preparedness and organisational development programmes in Mitch affected countries in agreement with the donor.***

---

## ***The context***

The Hurricane Mitch operation evolved into one of the most extensive and complex operations ever undertaken by the Federation. The scope and intensity of the disaster drove the Operating National Societies (NS) into a scale of operational activity they had not envisioned and for which they were inadequately prepared, and spurred an unusually extensive involvement of bilateral Participating National Societies (PNS). The responses to Mitch by the Federation delegations and the Federation Secretariat, multilateral and bilateral Participating National Societies and the National Societies, as well as governmental and UN agencies and NGOs, have had a profound effect on the way in which all Red Cross elements now view complex disaster operations. How the Federation works in such circumstances has been the focus of much discussion and analysis.

The attention given to co-ordination issues has overshadowed and blurred the very real achievements of the Red Cross relief operations. Despite organisational shortcomings, the Red Cross played an important, even pivotal part in the response to the disaster. Thousands of volunteers, staff and delegates of the NS, PNS and Federation made a huge difference. More significant, if less dramatic, was the determination to remain after many others left.

The operation was the subject of two Appeals: the Revised Emergency Appeal (33/98) and the Transitional Appeal (02/99). The work of the Federation, the NS and the PNS has been fully documented in the regular Sitreps and Appeal Amendments and in a detailed Global Report completed in June 1999. While it will refer to and draw on these reports, it is not the intention of this report to summarise or

duplicate but rather to provide an overview of the whole operation. It is divided into two parts; a **descriptive summary** and an **operational analysis**. A financial summary is attached as Annex II.

This report should be read in conjunction with the following documents:

- . *Federation Appeals for Mitch.*
- . *Federation Sitreps.*
- . *Federation Framework for Rehabilitation (December 1999)*
- . *Federation "Hurricane Mitch Recovery Plan for the Consultative Group Meeting, Stockholm May 1999"*
- . *Federation Global Report on Operation Mitch, October 1998 to July 1999.*

From 25 October to 1 November 1998 Hurricane Mitch battered Central America, devastating Honduras, severely damaging many parts of Nicaragua and causing widespread destruction in parts of Guatemala and El Salvador. It was the most destructive hurricane in the history of the western hemisphere, directly affecting over 2.5 million people and indirectly an additional 4.5 million.

For years environmentalists, economists and humanitarian agencies had been warning of the possible consequences in Central America of environmental degradation (particularly deforestation and slash and burn agricultural practices), rural migration, changes in global climate, and the national debt load. The accuracy of these predictions was clear in the Mitch aftermath. (See "Federation Report to the Central America Reconstruction Consultative Group Meeting; Stockholm, June 1999" and annotated references).

The effects of Mitch included:

- Destruction and severe structural damage to homes and buildings by high winds;
- Exceptionally high rainfall (+ 2,000 mm) causing extensive flooding that led to mudslides that buried people, land and homes and destroyed water and sanitation infrastructure, as well as schools, clinics and hospitals;
- Secondary landslides down water-logged hillsides (causing approximately 1,400 deaths in one incident in Nicaragua alone);
- Surging river waters that ripped up trees and dislodged rocks which destroyed bridges and destroyed or severely damaged road systems, cutting off access and causing long term disruption to transport, trade and travel (in Honduras up to 80% of all bridges were either destroyed or so badly damaged as to be unsafe);
- The destruction of up to 50% of all agricultural land, including coffee and banana plantations, causing production losses and immediate and possibly long term unemployment.

The full impact of Mitch was visible in the wide swathe of devastation it caused across Honduras and Nicaragua: almost the whole of these countries was affected. The rural population, many of them living in vulnerable river valleys and on unstable slopes, found themselves literally washed away, as entire villages and communities were destroyed. Mitch also struck the Honduran capital, Tegucigalpa, causing huge loss of life and property, particularly on the steep slopes, ravines and river courses around the city where the poorest members of the population have traditionally been forced to live.

#### **Casualty Summary:**

|                  | <b>Honduras</b> | <b>Nicaragua</b> | <b>Guatemala</b> | <b>El Salvador</b> | <b>TOTAL</b>     |
|------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| <b>Dead</b>      | 6'600           | 2'873            | 263              | 240                | <b>9'976</b>     |
| <b>Missing</b>   | 8'800           | 1'000            | 120              | 20                 | <b>11'140</b>    |
| <b>Injured</b>   | 12'272          | 420              | 276              | 175                | <b>13'143</b>    |
| <b>Sheltered</b> | 285'000         | 65'000           | 50'000           | 56'000             | <b>456'000</b>   |
| <b>Evacuated</b> | 800'000         | 370'000          | 108'000          | 84'300             | <b>1'362'000</b> |

|                        |                  |                |                |                |                  |
|------------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|
| <b>Others affected</b> | 3'000'000        | 827'000        | 580'000        | 209'265        | <b>4'616'265</b> |
| <b>Total Affected</b>  | <b>4'112'272</b> | <b>900'000</b> | <b>738'646</b> | <b>350'000</b> | <b>6,468,524</b> |

### Estimated Damages in USD millions:

|                     |     |                                   |              |
|---------------------|-----|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Housing             | 550 | Water and Sanitation              | 50           |
| Manufacturing       | 32  | Trade, tourism, etc               | 80           |
| Education           | 60  | Energy sector                     | 30           |
| Roads, bridges, etc | 535 | Agriculture, livestock, fisheries | 1'800        |
| Health              | 440 | <b>Total</b>                      | <b>3,577</b> |

A total estimated 500,000 persons lost their homes and in all up to 6.4 million were directly or indirectly affected in the four countries.

## *Red Cross/Red Crescent action*

The Federation participated in the response in all four countries. This ranged from search and rescue operations, post emergency relief and recovery and rehabilitation to reconstruction and longer term capacity building, including disaster preparedness, community health and institutional development programmes.

The National Societies of the affected countries of the region went into action immediately, supporting civil defence and military rescuers. Branch networks participated in and often led the evacuation of survivors and injured to aid posts and shelters. First Aid posts were set up and relief supplies were distributed from warehouses. Early on, aid workers from neighbouring National Societies (El Salvador being the first, followed by Colombia and Costa Rica) spontaneously arrived with assistance. Immediate support was given by the Regional Delegation, beginning with support for publicising Red Cross services and informing the public on emergency health measures. Nevertheless, despite early warnings of the severity of the impending storm, national and community response systems, including those of the Red Cross, were rapidly overwhelmed.

### **The Appeals •**

By 30 October, four days after the hurricane's initial strike, the immensity of the disaster had become apparent and the Federation launched an international Emergency Appeal. The Preliminary Appeal was for CHF 3.2 million for 90,000 beneficiaries for a period of three months, but on 4 November this was amended to CHF 12.57 million for 180,000 beneficiaries. It was rapidly funded (150%). Initial assessments indicated an immediate priority of 40,000 victims, with an additional 120,000 likely to require assistance. Early identification of the most needy was complex and it was some weeks before a more accurate identification and location of beneficiaries was possible. By mid-December the operation had moved into a post emergency phase -- a period of transition in which pockets of ongoing relief needs continued to be identified while a start was made on rehabilitation and recovery.

On 23 December, a Transitional Relief and First Phase Rehabilitation Appeal was issued for CHF 31.965 million to assist 264,000 beneficiaries for six months. The appeal was later extended to the end of 1999 as practical limitations slowed down reconstruction. This appeal was approximately 60% covered. By this time, the Inter American Development Bank (IADB) was indicating 6 million people affected and destruction at about US\$ 5.4 billion. The Federation assessment stated that transitional assistance was needed over the coming harvest period and that rehabilitation could last five years.

## The Operation •

(Full details of the operation in each country can be found in the Global Report on the Federation web site )

### Appeal 33/98

The first phase of the operation lasted from the first days of the hurricane to approximately the middle of December 1998 and then moved directly into post emergency relief.

**Objectives and Plan of Action:** To address the needs of 180,000 beneficiaries over a period of three months. To act as an auxiliary to the public authorities.

The first phase, largely carried out by the NS, targeted and achieved success in the search, rescue and evacuation of over 1.3 million people, first aid and medical services in over 50 clinics, shelter management, emergency food support to the homeless in over 700 shelters, provision of temporary shelter (approximately 3,500 shelters) and housing repairs, clean drinking water, blankets, clothing, ambulance services, tracing. In addition, information and dissemination programmes were undertaken to provide instructions on hygiene, nutrition, and shelter. Evaluation of damage and needs was carried out but made difficult by the extreme weather conditions.

Altogether, the Red Cross helped evacuate more than 1.3 million people. Red Cross volunteers and staff worked in some 700 shelters.

For local procurements the Federation funded the NS directly. In kind supplies were delivered by National Societies through the Federation or bilaterally. A brief summary of some of the core support in the first phase is given below. Full details are available in Sitreps #1- 4 and the Global Report:

| Donations/Support Source                               | Goods /in Kind /Services   | Human Resources   |
|--|--|---|
| Operating National Societies with Federation/PNS funds | Food,Water,Clothing,Blankets, Hygiene/sanitation supplies; Kitchen sets (440 tons by 15/11/98) | 8,000 volunteers and staff. 127 volunteers from neighbouring NS |
| Federation   | Direct Funding CHF 6m by 15/11/98. Food WFP/Spanish/American RC/WFP (3,000 MT)                 | Assessment/Relief Teams (21 delegates)                          |
| British RC   | 3 Airlifts relief goods/medical Supplies and WHO kit   | Federation delegates  |
| Canadian RC  | 1 part of Canadian Govt. airlift of relief goods and aid workers                               |   |
| Mexican RC   |  | Tracing and psychological support teams                         |
| Swedish/Austrian/German/ Peru RC                       | Wat/San ERU teams (400/600,000 lit /day)   |   |
| Spanish RC   | Food support to Federation Bilateral assistance. Telecom ERU                                   | 19 delegates (bilateral and multilateral)                       |
| American /German/Spanish RC                            | Vehicles to NS   |   |
| ICRC   |  | Tracing Delegate  |

## Appeal 02/99

The Transitional Appeal was launched on 23 December 1998 to address the needs of 240,000 people for six months. This period was extended in June to the end of 1999.

**Objectives and Plan of Action** The Appeal reflected assessments by the Federation, PNS and other agencies pointing to the need for transitional assistance prior to longer term rehabilitation (much of which would depend on infrastructure recovery by the government and major donors). These assessments took into account the slow recovery profile, the likely loss of the immediate harvest and the possibility of a second harvest being compromised. The Federation Plan of Action, based on the compilation of these assessments, was detailed in its Framework for Rehabilitation, presented to PNS and NS in Guatemala City in December. (Full details of the Plan are to be found in that document.)

In summary, the Appeal objectives were:

- To provide ongoing relief assistance in the form of agricultural support (seeds and tools), food and hygiene parcels, shelter and health services to 44,060 identified families, particularly in remote or un-serviced communities
- To ensure safe water, vector control against dengue and malaria, treatment for basic illnesses, and trauma counselling
- To identify the possibility of food-for-work, to reduce dependency
- To construct temporary shelters, pending the provision of land for long term resettlement; to repair houses and give other shelter assistance
- To provide short term assistance to the NS to help them recover from losses in property, equipment and income and to help restore operational capacity.

### **Beneficiary Numbers /country**

| <b>Country</b>     | <b><i>Honduras</i></b> | <b><i>Nicaragua</i></b> | <b><i>Guatemala</i></b> | <b><i>El Salvador</i></b> |
|--------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Families</b>    | 13,500                 | 21,230                  | 3,930                   | 5,400                     |
| <b>Individuals</b> | 81,000                 | 127,380                 | 23,580                  | 32,400                    |

### **The Federation Delegation**

Central America is covered by the Federation's Regional Delegation in Guatemala City. Hurricane Mitch monopolised all the resources of the delegation -- delegates, local staff and volunteers -- for over six months. Reinforcements were provided in the form of an Emergency Assessment and Response Team of delegates from other global operations, regional NS staff and Geneva officers. After the first phase, country delegations were created in the two most seriously hit countries, Honduras and Nicaragua. Operations in El Salvador and Guatemala continued to be co-ordinated by the Regional Delegation. While carrying out direct assistance the Delegations also provided a co-ordination service to the NS/Bilateral PNS operating in each country. Altogether, more than 170 delegates and 85 volunteers from the Federation, PNSs and National Societies of the region worked in the field. (For full details, see the Global Report.)

### **Operating National Societies**

The National Societies of the affected countries mobilised more than 8,000 volunteers as well as all their staff for the relief effort. In the initial stages, as noted above, the NS were the focal point for search and rescue and emergency services. As their capacity became overloaded and their resources were used up, or damaged or lost in the flooding, their role was supplemented by human and material resources from the Federation and Bilateral PNS. The NS then became the primary counterparts in carrying out distributions of Federation /PNS aid, co-ordinating transport, supplying administrative and support staff and operational co-ordination and liaison. Direct working advances to the NS from the Federation allowed the NS to continue to be directly involved and to play a role in leading Red Cross support.

## ***External relations - Government/UN/NGOs/Media***

Each National Society co-ordinated its relief efforts with its government. In Honduras, a Mitch Emergency Task Force was set up, chaired by the President of the country. Its members include representatives of the Armed Forces, municipalities, NGOs, and the Red Cross. In health matters, the Red Cross co-ordinated with the Ministry of Health, PAHO/WHO, OPS, MSF, and other NGOs, and on other issues with WFP, UNDP, UNICEF and the main NGOs. The Federation participated in Interagency meetings hosted by OCHA, both in the field and in Geneva, and was present at the IADB meetings on Reconstruction and Transformation in Central America in Washington and Stockholm.

In the early stages of the operation the Red Cross had a close and positive relationship with government agencies, although later it became clear that the NS influence and governmental acknowledgement of their role was much weaker than expected.

The Federation also developed operational contracts and programmes with USAID/OFDA; WFP; and ECHO.

## ***Analysis***

### **Needs Assessments •**

Early warning systems were not handled well, either by the individual countries or regionally, although international hurricane watch agencies had been tracking Mitch for some time and its destructive potential was known. Much needs to be improved in this area.

The NS of the impacted countries, some with support from the Regional Delegation, carried out initial assessments within the first few days. These relied primarily on governmental sources for figures and needs which were, for understandable reasons, erratic and not particularly accurate. Communications were badly disrupted, creating a domino effect that affected the information flow within the region and subsequently to Geneva and the donor community.

A second assessment was done by the Regional Delegation working in conjunction with the NS. Though handicapped by limited resources the delegation was able to identify additional human resources from within the region to reinforce the response.

The Federation Secretariat in Geneva set up a Task Force three days after the initial impact to co-ordinate management support to the operation. One of its first concerns was to incorporate lessons learned from earlier, similar sized operations. It identified the need to strengthen NS capacities to meet the challenges and opportunities of such a large disaster (for which huge assets and funds were available). In addition it stressed the importance of establishing longer-term strategies for the rehabilitation phase that would take into account the individual capacity of the NS, and the goals and aspirations of the PNS and of other agencies and institutions that would be involved.

To reinforce co-ordination and assess operational needs, as well as to start the process of developing a rehabilitation strategy, an assessment team was sent from Geneva in early December, consisting of Secretariat, delegation, and PNS members. Its Terms of Reference covered both immediate support to the Regional Delegation, particularly in the areas of systems management, logistics and control, and the preparation of a long-term strategy (in consultation with the NS, Federation Delegation and PNS). In retrospect, combining these two distinct objectives may have been premature and a future evaluation of the operation will investigate this further. Nevertheless, the mission produced a comprehensive Framework for Rehabilitation which became the blueprint for an integrated approach to long term recovery and reconstruction and, in particular, for co-ordinated support to build up the capacities of the four NS for a long and complex rehabilitation phase.

The Framework Report issued in January identified DPP and Institutional Development as the two core areas on which the Federation Secretariat should concentrate in order to enhance capacity within the NS and promote the development of community based activities and objectives.

The Framework was adopted by the NS and PNS as the baseline document for the development of individual NS Country Rehabilitation Plans. These in turn formed the basis for a Tripartite Memorandum defining the ongoing roles and relationships between the Federation, PNS and NS in each country. However, despite agreement by all participants to pursue this process at the PNS/NS/Federation meeting in Guatemala City in February 1999, progress has been slow.

Additional assessments were made by the British Red Cross in February prior to launching an Agricultural Support Programme, one of the projects presented in the Framework.

### **Achievement of Objectives •**

#### **Appeal 33/98**

The objectives of this Appeal, to reach 150,000 beneficiaries, were met (see Table below ), though not without difficulties and challenges, particularly in the areas of co-ordination, monitoring and especially reporting.

#### **Families Reached by Federation Relief Operations per month**

| <b>Families</b> | <b>Nicaragua</b> | <b>Honduras</b> | <b>Guatemala</b> | <b>El Salvador</b> | <b>Total Families</b> | <b>Beneficiaries</b> |
|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Oct / Nov 98    | 4'922            | 5'900           | 2'763            | 8'504              | 16'189                | 103'031              |
| Dec 98          | 8'487            | 5'466           | 3'277            | 8'504              | 25'734                | 154'401              |

#### **Appeal 02/99**

The objectives of this appeal have been largely met, despite adjustments to changed circumstances. By early April WFP assessments as well as Federation/PNS reports indicated that most of the food needs were being met and a decision was taken in conjunction with WFP, the NS and the PNS to stop free food distributions earlier, due to improved conditions and local over supply.

| <b>Families</b> | <b>Nicaragua</b> | <b>Honduras</b> | <b>Guatemala</b> | <b>El Salvador</b> | <b>Total Families</b> | <b>Beneficiaries</b> |
|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| January 99      | 16'711           | 7'643           | 3'246            | 3'949              | 31'549                | 189'292              |
| February 99     | 16'391           | 8'291           | 3'246            | 3'387              | 28'315                | 169'888              |
| March 99        | 17'256           | 7'898           | 3'246            | 0                  | 28'400                | 170'398              |
| April 99        | 17'830           | 8'275           | 3'246            | 0                  | 29'351                | 176'106              |
| May 99          | 15'849           | 8'884           | 2'500            | 0                  | 27'233                | 163'398              |

The overall objectives proved appropriate. The NS were generally able to carry out identification of beneficiaries and the most vulnerable communities, although logistics were difficult in the early stages, giving a clear advantage to those areas most easily reached. Only later was an effort made to access the more remote communities, which may account in part for the lower numbers reached in November and December. (See Table Y)

The 1998 Appeal identified food basket items that corresponded to Sphere standards and met the population's needs and were appropriately balanced. Working Advances were made to the NS which purchased the items specified in their plans of action. Where there was a Federation Delegate available, these processes were monitored and in addition Bilateral PNS also monitored distributions in their areas. However, with hindsight, there were weaknesses in the exchange of data from these assessments that needs to be addressed in future operations.

Three water Emergency Response Units (ERU) were deployed in Nicaragua and Honduras. The Federation's ERU officer carried out an assessment of their performance and concluded that they had made a valuable contribution in the areas where they were located. The Federation made a significant contribution to solving temporary accommodation and shelter needs by supporting the Honduras RC management of "macroalberguas" and in Nicaragua by constructing over 2,000 temporary shelter units under a USAID/OFDA funded project.

With the ending of the relief period as noted above, in May 1999, the Federation's focus moved to the longer term aspects of the appeal. Water & Sanitation projects funded by ECHO to improve well capacity and rehabilitate community water supplies were completed in Nicaragua. Rehabilitation and repair to NS structures took place at HQ and Branch levels, as did staff training and support to core costs.

Relief and DPP Training workshops to develop the response capacity of the NS in the region to internal disasters and to increase delegate support to Federation co-ordinated operations bore fruit: many delegates from the region were deployed during 1999 in operations in Mexico, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Colombia and, most significantly, Venezuela.

The British Red Cross funded Agricultural Support Programme, after some early challenges, was successfully completed, with over 30,400 families in four countries receiving seeds, tools, fertiliser and, in some cases, cash incentives. The complex process of identifying and registering beneficiaries, finding suitable seed and fertiliser stock and managing the logistics and administration resulted in a sound, well targeted and relevant programme. Its objective was to assist in the provision of essential tools, fertiliser and seeds to farmers who had lost their capacity to cope with the planting season for the next harvest. It acted as a mitigation measure, assisting many households and communities to rebuild their livelihood and reducing food aid dependency. A detailed Final Report is available and a number of follow up workshops and training seminars were carried out as part of the project.

### **Operational Constraints and Difficulties •**

**Beneficiary selection:** The NS were responsible for identifying beneficiaries, distributions and reporting on all stages of the relief process. The Global Report indicates that, although the Appeal's beneficiary target was reached, the categories of people, their location and the numbers per country varied considerably from the original targets in the Plans of Action. There are a number of possible explanations for this. Original target areas were those most quickly and easily reached and it was only later that more inaccessible communities were reached. As increasing numbers of NGOs began to work, changes were made to avoid duplication.

**Distributions:** Generally, distributions were well organised by hard working and dedicated volunteers. However, logistics and inventory control weaknesses meant that Federation, NS and PNS supplies were often mixed together without any record of origins, donors and amounts. An important condition of almost all donations in this operation (and indeed most emergency relief operations) is the increasingly demanding requirement for detailed and timely reports to donors. The complexity of the situation meant that the consolidation and reconciliation of logistics and relief data was a difficult and time consuming activity that a more co-ordinated approach to systems application would relieve, resulting in more accurate and timely reporting to both Federation and PNS donors.

**In-country purchasing:** The control, management and overall accountability of in country purchasing was very complex. Federation standards were not universally adopted and at times totally different

authorisation, documentation and financial reporting systems and protocols were required to be completed by the NS. Independently, these systems were generally appropriate; however, to meet the various reporting requirements the NS became heavily overloaded in reconciling working advances. This, combined with a bewildering range of relief and logistics management formats and methods of operation, contributed to the earlier problems of achieving timely, accurate and standardised reporting to donors.

***In-kind donations from abroad:*** As large operations before and after Mitch have demonstrated, the management and co-ordination of this element of a sudden emergency is not yet satisfactory. An analysis of logistics information highlights the lack of communication and lack of commitment to co-ordination within the early response mechanisms of the Federation (Secretariat/PNS/ONS). A significant percentage of goods were not requested in the Appeal, arrived unannounced and unaccompanied, and were not reported on, and not documented when the delivery system became overloaded. Understandably, the capacity of the Federation/PNS and particularly of the NS to report and track goods failed in several cases. In the case of the British and Canadian Red Cross airlifts the goods were closely monitored and documented right up to delivery to the NS warehouses, but reporting on their subsequent distribution became complicated.

Conditions arbitrarily attached to some donated resources limited or eliminated their usefulness. Weak warehousing management protocols and widely diverse inventory control systems made tracking and reporting difficult. Detailed reports from the Federation Logistics Delegates have identified a number of areas for improvement which have successfully been implemented in subsequent operations in the region. The SUMA logistics tracking system, strongly promoted within the region, and acknowledged as a promising start to management systems, was widely regarded by those trying to use it as too complicated and requiring almost constant technical monitoring by SUMA officials. Finally, the increased inventory of equipment, vehicles and other capital items clearly poses management, financial and security dilemmas for the NS.

***The Red Cross partners:*** The Red Cross response, while rapid and major in scope, revealed insufficient co-ordination of the respective plans of action of the Secretariat, the NS and the PNS. There was an early recognition and agreement that the Federation would be the lead agency; but there was not always full clarity or acceptance of this by the NS and the PNS, and on occasion this extended to the respective roles of the PNS and the NS within each country. One significant consequence of this was a lack of compatible monitoring, recording and reporting structures. Financial and material management transfer systems and accountability were also weakened. *One lesson to be learned here is the need in the earliest stages of emergency response to balance individual identity and visibility requirements with those of operational effectiveness.*

***Relations with local and national authorities:*** These were generally good, though at times the pressures placed on the NS and the Federation to undertake additional activities often not truly representative of Red Cross work were difficult to resolve. In terms of co-ordinating and implementing the Framework into NS Country Rehabilitation Plans (CRP) of Action and an MoU with bilateral partners, the results have been mixed. The efforts to produce co-ordinated, integrated CRPs in time to have a strong Red Cross consolidated document fell short of what could have been done. Until very recently there was limited commitment to a truly tripartite MoU, although significant progress is now being made to complete this process. Finally, an analysis of all "plans" shows only partial co-ordination and integration of Bilateral PNS country plans into the individual NS CRP. This has resulted in overlaps, duplication and fragmentation. These plans need to be more fully reviewed in order to ensure maximum effectiveness, economy and, above all, respect for the capacity of each NS to handle these resources.

***Financial resources:*** In the early days some donors were slow to convert pledges into cash. However, in some cases where funds were rapidly delivered the Federation financial processing and transfer systems failed to forward them promptly. This caused resentment among donors of substantial and usually un-earmarked contributions -- the most valuable kind for any operation -- who felt that the value of their donation was being overshadowed by the scramble for high profile recognition of bilateral aid.

The Federation appeals performed quite well but early reporting failures cast a shadow and this must be considered a major area for improvement if donor confidence is to be maintained.

**Staffing:** The Federation Delegation started the operation badly under staffed; and the assignment of all its resources to the relief operation had a detrimental, longer term effect on ongoing Regional programmes. Thanks to support from Societies in the region as well as traditional donors, the staffing issue was resolved. More recently, the biggest problem has been to identify development and DPP Delegates to manage the longer term components of the Appeal.

**Communications /Warehousing /Transport.** Apart from the difficulties noted in inventory management and reporting, the availability and reliability of these services was satisfactory.

## ***Contributions/Financial analysis***

CHF 3.9 was transferred from appeal 33/98. The final balance of CHF 142.000 is recently being transferred to appeals 01.18/2000, 01.19/2000 and 01.20/2000. The 02/99 balance of CHF 2.2 is also being transferred to the 2000 appeals. Details showing these final reallocations are available upon request.

See Annex 1 for details.

## ***Conclusions***

The initial response to the disaster was clearly not the co-ordinated, well-managed and effective operation that should be the hallmark of the Federation. The principal weaknesses were in efficient and effective resource deployment and management, co-ordination and co-operation. The whole issue of melding all Red Cross partners into a united, effective, smooth running operation needs to be resolved by building commitment to co-operation mechanisms in advance of disasters -- and not during them. This will be enhanced by further developing and reinforcing lessons learned in meeting the ongoing and inevitable challenges that will continue to demand our attention and response.

Today Red Cross programmes are contributing to rebuilding these damaged countries by assisting displaced, homeless and unemployed victims, many of whom still have no homes to return to or have stepped back into the dangerous cycle of risk exposure by returning to the only place they know -- the treacherous slopes, valleys and ridges where they will again be in serious danger when the next hurricane or flood strikes.

Many initiatives triggered during and after Mitch have borne fruit. Federation disaster relief training workshops have produced a reliable data base of highly competent regional delegates who have responded quickly and professionally to the many disasters in the region during 1999. Closer relationships and more coherent lateral relationships are emerging among NS and PNS. Noting the unanimous agreement among the international community that disaster preparedness and mitigation must be given due recognition in the rebuilding of Central America, the Federation has dedicated much effort to

planning and implementing programmes with the NS and those PNS who are continuing assistance. Long term community based programmes will help the National Societies to strengthen and expand their capacity to be a critical and indispensable force in the disaster response mechanisms of their countries.

To achieve these goals increased efforts are being made to ensure a more consultative and truly co-ordinated approach to disaster response, with a strong emphasis on preparedness, monitoring and effective early warning mechanisms. Projects aimed at strengthening the Central American region's Telecom, communications, health and water and sanitation networks are under way by both the Federation and bilateral Societies.

Peter Rees-Gildea  
Director  
Operations Funding and  
Reporting Department

Santiago Gil  
Director  
Americas Department

**This and other reports on Federation operations are available on the Federation's website: <http://www.ifrc.org>**

**INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF RED CROSS AND RED CRESCENT SOCIETIES**

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
| Interim report |   |
| Annual report  |   |
| Final report   | X |

**Appeal No & title: 02/1999 Hurricane Mitch**

Period: year 1999, 2000, 2001 up to February 2002

Project(s): SV506, GT000, GT505, GT506, HN000, HN505, HN506, NI000, NI004, NI005, NI160, NI505, 43506

Currency: CHF

**I - CONSOLIDATED RESPONSE TO APPEAL**

| FUNDING                                     | CASH              |               | KIND & SERVICES  |                | TOTAL INCOME      |
|---|-------------------|---------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|
|   | Contributions     | Reallocations | Goods/Services   | Personnel      |                   |
| Appeal budget                               | 31,965,000        |               |                  |                |                   |
| less  |                   |               |                  |                |                   |
| Cash brought forward                        |                   |               |                  |                |                   |
| <b>TOTAL ASSISTANCE SOUGHT</b>              | <b>31,965,000</b> |               |                  |                |                   |
| <i>Contributions from Donors</i>            |                   |               |                  |                |                   |
| American Government (DGUS)                  | 131,915           |               |                  |                | 131,915           |
| American Red Cross (DNU5)                   | 34,138            |               |                  |                | 34,138            |
| Andorran Red Cross (DNAD)                   | 85,195            |               |                  |                | 85,195            |
| Australia RC Private Donors (DPNAU)         | 129,150           |               |                  |                | 129,150           |
| Australian Government (DGAU)                | 216,387           |               |                  |                | 216,387           |
| Australian Red Cross (DNAU)                 | 327,419           |               |                  |                | 327,419           |
| Austrian Red Cross (DNAT)                   | 14,000            |               |                  |                | 14,000            |
| Bahamas Red Cross (DNBS)                    | 5,196             |               |                  |                | 5,196             |
| British Red Cross (DNGB)                    | 3,320,573         |               |                  |                | 3,320,573         |
| Canadian Red Cross (DNCA)                   | 798,309           |               |                  |                | 798,309           |
| Cayman Islands Red Cross (DNKY)             | 70,966            |               |                  |                | 70,966            |
| Cruz Roja Boliviana (DNBO)                  | 1,430             |               |                  |                | 1,430             |
| Czech Red Cross (DNCZ)                      | 26,368            |               |                  |                | 26,368            |
| Danish Govt.via Danish Red Cross (DGNDK)    | 433,266           |               |                  |                | 433,266           |
| Danish Red Cross Private donors (DPNDK)     | 20,827            |               |                  |                | 20,827            |
| Danish Red Cross (DNDK)                     | 133,265           |               |                  |                | 133,265           |
| DFID - British Government (DFID)            | 822               |               |                  |                | 822               |
| Donor - Disaster Relief Emergency Fu (DREF) | 565               |               |                  |                | 565               |
| Donor - Unidentified (D000)                 | 137,975           |               |                  |                | 137,975           |
| Ecuador Red Cross (DNEC)                    | 41,342            |               |                  |                | 41,342            |
| Finnish Govt.via Finnish Red Cross (DGNFI)  | 536,000           |               |                  |                | 536,000           |
| German Red Cross (DNDE)                     | 1,261             |               |                  |                | 1,261             |
| Hellenic Red Cross (DNGR)                   | 13,493            |               |                  |                | 13,493            |
| Hong Kong Red Cross (DNHK)                  | 37,211            |               |                  |                | 37,211            |
| Icelandic Red Cross (DNIS)                  | 238,587           |               |                  |                | 238,587           |
| ICRC (DM04)                                 | 126               |               |                  |                | 126               |
| Irish Government (DGIE)                     | 242,465           |               |                  |                | 242,465           |
| Irish Red Cross (DNIE)                      | 436,025           |               |                  |                | 436,025           |
| Jamaican Red Cross (DNJM)                   | 5,568             |               |                  |                | 5,568             |
| Japanese Red Cross (DNJP)                   | 795,055           |               |                  |                | 795,055           |
| Kuwait Red Crescent (DNKW)                  | 272,400           |               |                  |                | 272,400           |
| Lichtenstein - Private donors (DPLI)        | 290,813           |               |                  |                | 290,813           |
| Liechtenstein Red Cross (DNLI)              | 419,458           |               |                  |                | 419,458           |
| Luxemburg Red Cross (DNLU)                  | 30,000            |               |                  |                | 30,000            |
| Monaco RC - Private Donors (DPNMC)          | 844               |               |                  |                | 844               |
| Netherlands Govt.via Netherlands RC (DGNNL) | 7,192             |               |                  |                | 7,192             |
| Netherlands Red Cross (DNNL)                | 3,879             |               |                  |                | 3,879             |
| New Zealand Red Cross (DNNZ)                | 229,151           |               |                  |                | 229,151           |
| Norwegian Govt.via Norwegian Red Cro (DGNM) | 176,780           |               |                  |                | 176,780           |
| Norwegian Red Cross (DNNO)                  | 294,188           |               |                  |                | 294,188           |
| OPEC Fund For International Developm (DM16) | 677,025           |               |                  |                | 677,025           |
| Paraguay Red Cross (DNPY)                   | 4,230             |               |                  |                | 4,230             |
| Private Donors-online donations (DPOLD)     | 954               |               |                  |                | 954               |
| Private Foundation -LI (DPS004)             | 203,221           |               |                  |                | 203,221           |
| Republic of Korea Red Cross (DNKR)          | 40,000            |               |                  |                | 40,000            |
| Singapore Red Cross (DNSG)                  | 9,230             |               |                  |                | 9,230             |
| Spanish Govt.via Spanish Red Cross (DGNE5)  | 60,978            |               |                  |                | 60,978            |
| Spanish Red Cross (DNES)                    | 1,760,259         |               |                  |                | 1,760,259         |
| Suriname Red Cross (DNSR)                   | 28,524            |               |                  |                | 28,524            |
| Swedish Govt.via Swedish Red Cross (DGNS)   | 177,191           |               |                  |                | 177,191           |
| Swedish Red Cross (DNSE)                    | 356,282           |               |                  |                | 356,282           |
| Swiss Red Cross (DNCH)                      | 50,000            |               |                  |                | 50,000            |
| Switzerland - Private Donors (DPCH)         | 66,802            |               |                  |                | 66,802            |
| United States - Private Donors (DPUS)       | 1,553             |               |                  |                | 1,553             |
| Venezuelan Red Cross (DNVE)                 | 27,953            |               |                  |                | 27,953            |
| World Food Programme (DH05)                 | 27,994            |               |                  |                | 27,994            |
| WFP   |                   |               | 5,347,578        |                | 5,347,578         |
| Canada                                      |                   |               |                  | 23,655         | 23,655            |
| Denmark                                     |                   |               |                  | 19,877         | 19,877            |
| Finland                                     |                   |               |                  | 45,503         | 45,503            |
| France                                      |                   |               |                  | 15,770         | 15,770            |
| Iceland                                     |                   |               |                  | 30,226         | 30,226            |
| Italy                                       |                   |               |                  | 41,232         | 41,232            |
| Norway                                      |                   |               |                  | 28,747         | 28,747            |
| Great Britain                               |                   |               |                  | 46,653         | 46,653            |
| USA   |                   |               |                  | 43,532         | 43,532            |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                | <b>13,451,796</b> |               | <b>5,347,578</b> | <b>295,195</b> | <b>19,094,569</b> |

**II - Balance of funds**

|                     |                |
|---------------------|----------------|
| Opening balance     |                |
| CASH INCOME Rcv'd   | 13,451,796     |
| CASH EXPENDITURE    | -12,946,113    |
| <b>CASH BALANCE</b> | <b>505,683</b> |

## Appeal No & title: 02/1999 Hurricane Mitch

Period: year 1999, 2000, 2001 up to February 2002

Project(s): SV506, GT000, GT505, GT506, HN000, HN505, HN506, NI000, NI004, NI005, NI160, NI505, 43506

Currency: CHF

### III - Budget analysis / Breakdown of expenditures

| Description                         | Appeal Budget     | CASH Expenditures | KIND & SERVICES  |                | TOTAL Expenditures | Variance          |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------------|
|                                     |                   |                   | Goods/services   | Personnel      |                    |                   |
| <u>SUPPLIES</u>                     |                   |                   |                  |                |                    |                   |
| Shelter & Construction              | 3,466,000         | 63,357            |                  |                | 63,357             | 3,402,643         |
| Clothing & Textiles                 | 566,000           | 9,255             |                  |                | 9,255              | 556,745           |
| Food/Seeds                          | 13,281,000        | 3,186,522         | 5,347,578        |                | 8,534,100          | 4,746,900         |
| Water                               | 69,000            | 12,450            |                  |                | 12,450             | 56,550            |
| Medical & First Aid                 | 1,245,000         | 26,037            |                  |                | 26,037             | 1,218,963         |
| Teaching materials                  | 43,000            | 15,836            |                  |                | 15,836             | 27,164            |
| Utensils & Tools                    | 2,353,000         | 656,208           |                  |                | 656,208            | 1,696,792         |
| Other relief supplies               | 1,594,000         | 199,363           |                  |                | 199,363            | 1,394,637         |
| <b>Sub-Total</b>                    | <b>22,617,000</b> | <b>4,169,030</b>  | <b>5,347,578</b> |                | <b>9,516,608</b>   | <b>13,100,392</b> |
| <u>CAPITAL EXPENSES</u>             |                   |                   |                  |                |                    |                   |
| Land & Buildings                    | 1,730,000         | 218,495           |                  |                | 218,495            | 1,511,505         |
| Vehicles                            | 1,120,000         | 608,659           |                  |                | 608,659            | 511,341           |
| Computers & Telecom equip.          | 325,000           | 260,151           |                  |                | 260,151            | 64,849            |
| Medical equipment                   | 222,000           | 3,852             |                  |                | 3,852              | 218,148           |
| Other capital expenditures          |                   | 202,616           |                  |                | 202,616            | -202,616          |
| <b>Sub-Total</b>                    | <b>3,397,000</b>  | <b>1,293,772</b>  |                  |                | <b>1,293,772</b>   | <b>2,103,228</b>  |
| <u>TRANSPORT &amp; STORAGE</u>      |                   |                   |                  |                |                    |                   |
|                                     | 2,749,000         | 739,393           |                  |                | 739,393            | 2,009,607         |
| <b>Sub-Total</b>                    | <b>2,749,000</b>  | <b>739,393</b>    |                  |                | <b>739,393</b>     | <b>2,009,607</b>  |
| <u>PERSONNEL</u>                    |                   |                   |                  |                |                    |                   |
| Personnel (delegates)               | 1,353,000         | 2,594,594         |                  | 295,195        | 2,889,789          | -1,536,789        |
| Personnel (local staff)             | 585,000           | 2,023,557         |                  |                | 2,023,557          | -1,438,557        |
| Training                            |                   |                   |                  |                |                    |                   |
| <b>Sub-Total</b>                    | <b>1,938,000</b>  | <b>4,618,151</b>  |                  | <b>295,195</b> | <b>4,913,346</b>   | <b>-2,975,346</b> |
| <u>GENERAL &amp; ADMINISTRATION</u> |                   |                   |                  |                |                    |                   |
| Assessment/Monitoring/experts       |                   | 350,334           |                  |                | 350,334            | -350,334          |
| Travel & related expenses           | 180,000           | 335,126           |                  |                | 335,126            | -155,126          |
| Information expenses                | 96,000            | 202,082           |                  |                | 202,082            | -106,082          |
| Administrative expenses             | 119,000           | 594,551           |                  |                | 594,551            | -475,551          |
| External workshops & Seminars       |                   | 27,600            |                  |                | 27,600             | -27,600           |
| <b>Sub-Total</b>                    | <b>395,000</b>    | <b>1,509,692</b>  |                  |                | <b>1,509,692</b>   | <b>-1,114,692</b> |
| <u>PROGRAMME SUPPORT</u>            |                   |                   |                  |                |                    |                   |
| Programme management                | 869,000           | 304,578           |                  |                | 304,578            | 564,422           |
| Technical services                  |                   | 91,191            |                  |                | 91,191             | -91,191           |
| Professional services               |                   | 101,160           |                  |                | 101,160            | -101,160          |
| <b>Sub-Total</b>                    | <b>869,000</b>    | <b>496,929</b>    |                  |                | <b>496,929</b>     | <b>372,071</b>    |
| Operational provisions              |                   | 37,988            |                  |                | 37,988             | -37,988           |
| Transfers to National Societies     |                   | 81,159            |                  |                | 81,159             | -81,159           |
| <b>TOTAL BUDGET</b>                 | <b>31,965,000</b> | <b>12,946,113</b> | <b>5,347,578</b> | <b>295,195</b> | <b>18,588,886</b>  | <b>13,376,114</b> |

**Consumption rate:** Expenditures versus income 97%  
Expenditures versus budget 58%