

www.ifrc.org
Saving lives,
changing minds.

DREF operation final report

Myanmar: Magway Floods

 International Federation
of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

DREF operation n° MDRMM005
GLIDE n° FL-2011-000167-MMR
25 May 2012

The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent's (IFRC) Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF) is a source of un-earmarked money created by IFRC 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 IFRC's disaster response system and increases the ability of National Societies to respond to disasters.

Summary: CHF 165,669 was allocated from the IFRC's Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF) on 3 November 2011 to support the Myanmar Red Cross Society (MRCS) in delivering assistance to some 5,750 of the most vulnerable people affected by floods in Magway Region. These beneficiaries were provided with relief items, namely family kits and emergency shelter materials. Additionally, among this group of beneficiaries, 3,419 people were provided with safe drinking water. Among the 3,419 people, 200 households received latrine construction assistance.

DREF funding was used to replenish the national society's disaster preparedness stock of family kits and emergency shelter materials used for these beneficiaries, as well as to support the water and sanitation assistance provided.

The initial water and sanitation needs identified at the start of the four-month operation, were later discovered to include both emergency and non-emergency needs. Accordingly, MRCS revised its plan of action and budget to exclude the non-emergency water and sanitation needs. This also meant that the total DREF allocation of CHF 165,669 could not be spent, leaving a balance of CHF 41,827 to be returned.

The entire operation's activities on the ground were conducted by Red Cross volunteers. MRCS's distribution of relief materials began on 21 October 2011, and DREF funding was granted in early November. The emergency operation was completed by 4 March 2012. In line with Federation reporting requirements, this final report marks the close of this operation.

Replenishment to the DREF specific to this operation was made by Canadian Red Cross/Canadian government and Netherlands Red Cross/Netherlands government. On behalf of the Myanmar Red Cross Society, IFRC would like to thank all donors for their invaluable support of the DREF.

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



Community members on their way home after having received MRCS family kits and emergency shelter kits. Photo: MRCS

The situation

Tropical Storm Two made landfall on the Myanmar-Bangladesh border on 19 October 2011, bringing heavy rains during the days that followed, to the Magway, Mandalay and Sagaing regions in central Myanmar. Flash floods occurred in several areas and four townships in Magway Region were the hardest hit. They were the Pakokku, Myaing, Pauk and Seikphyu townships where MRCS conducted its relief operation. These townships were hardly accessible in the aftermath, with roads and bridges destroyed, and agricultural land damaged.

According to figures released by the Ministry of Social Welfare, Relief and Resettlement, about 151 people were killed. The people affected totalled about 35,734, while approximately 2,128 houses were totally destroyed.



Red Cross volunteers relied on various means of transportation to transport relief materials to remote areas or areas inaccessible to motor vehicles.
Photo: MRCS

Four hardest-hit townships

Township	People affected	Families affected	Houses destroyed
Pakokku	2,252	820	384
Myaing	1,730	354	89
Pauk	12,381	2,775	380
Seikphyu	19,371	3,659	1,275
Total	35,734	7,608	2,128

Breakdown of affected population

Township	Men	Women	Children	Total
Pakokku	1,019	1,233	544	2,252
Myaing	783	947	417	1,730
Pauk	5,601	6,780	2,991	12,381
Seikphyu	8,765	10,606	4,680	19,371
Total	16,168	19,566	8,632	35,734

Immediate response activities were conducted by the local authorities, MRCS, aid organizations, local and international non-governmental organizations, and the private sector. These activities included the establishment of a number of evacuation centres and camps for people who had been made homeless. The President and Vice-President of the Government of the Union of Myanmar visited the affected areas on 26 October and 23 October respectively. Aid organizations were requested by local authorities to provide water purification tablets and water purification units to avoid the outbreak of diarrhoeal and other water-borne diseases. These activities included organizations such as Action Aid, Oxfam International, Save The Children, UNICEF, World Food Programme, and World Vision.

MRCS assistance to affected communities, was led by Red Cross volunteers throughout the response activities – the initial assistance provided by volunteers comprised assisting local authorities in issuing early warnings, evacuating villagers in the four affected townships, and distributing pre-positioned family kits and emergency shelter kits to affected people including those at temporary camps. Relief distributions began on 21 October in areas more accessible than others. The volunteers consisted mainly of brigade members from each of the affected townships – the volunteers from two of the townships, Pakokku and Seikphyu, were trained in disaster response thanks to the society's community-based disaster risk management programme implemented in recent years. To support the volunteers on the ground, MRCS headquarters deployed the programme coordinator of its disaster management division to the affected area. As the scale of the disaster

did not require the activation of the society's contingency plan, its standard operating procedure was applied instead.

The local government provided food distributions as well as cash assistance (MMK¹ 500,000 / about USD 625 per household) to some of the affected families for the reconstruction of their homes. Aid organizations also provided food assistance.

Coordination and partnerships

MRCS with the support of IFRC, engaged in close coordination with local authorities, UN OCHA² and other aid organizations as well as local and international NGOs, in the affected townships and at Yangon level. This engagement included the first coordination meeting organized at Yangon-level by UN OCHA on 27 October.

There was no special sectoral/cluster meeting organized at Yangon level because the displaced population size was less than 50,000³. The 27 October meeting was attended by representatives of approximately 20 organizations comprising UN agencies, aid organizations including MRCS, IFRC and DG-ECHO⁴, as well as local and international non-governmental organizations (NGOs). This coordination was also useful in preventing duplication of assistance provided by the various organizations. The organizations operating in the area included *Action Aid, Adventist Development & Relief Agency, BAJ, Lutheran World Federation Myanmar, Oxfam International, Save The Children, UNICEF, Welthungerhilfe, World Food Programme, and World Vision.*

Joint assessments by aid organizations were organized at township level in coordination with local authorities, using standard assessment forms in line with the existing inter-agency contingency plan of the Humanitarian Country Team. Local NGOs which have their own contingency plan also followed this standard questionnaire which is available in the Myanmar language. The main needs identified by the assessments were food, emergency shelter and drinking water. In-country donors were informed of the coordinated efforts of organizations and were alerted to the possible need for funding.

Coordination meetings conducted by local authorities were attended by Red Cross volunteers. This representation of MRCS was crucial, as it was used as a means to keep abreast of some uncoordinated requests for assistance from the authorities at local, regional and central levels which were made to aid organizations and NGOs.

In reference to Red Cross Red Crescent Movement coordination, IFRC and MRCS held a joint meeting on 28 October and all in-country partner national societies (French Red Cross, Danish Red Cross and Australian Red Cross) were informed about ongoing MRCS activities and the plan for the DREF operation.

Red Cross and Red Crescent action

Achievements against outcomes

Relief distributions (food and basic non-food items)

Outcome: 1,150 families (5,750 people) comprising most affected households (who have lost their homes and belongings completely) and displaced families in camps are supplied with standard non-food items/family kits.

Outputs (expected results) and activities planned:

- Conduct rapid emergency needs and capacity assessments.
- Set clear beneficiary selection criteria and define distribution protocols.
- Distribute relief supplies and control supply movements from point of dispatch to end-users/communities.
- Engage Red Cross volunteers and beneficiaries in relief assistance activities.
- Monitor and evaluate relief activities and provide reporting on relief distributions.
- Develop a plan for follow-up action.

¹ Local currency – Myanmar Kyat.

² UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UN OCHA).

³ The Contingency Plan applied by international aid organizations is only activated when the number of affected people exceeds 50,000.

⁴ The European Commission's Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection directorate-general.

Impact:

The target of 1,150 families was exceeded, with a total of 1,177 households reached by MRCS. Each household was provided with a family kit. The distributions were conducted between October and November. Family kits pre-positioned in warehouses in the Magway and Yangon regions were distributed to affected families. These items have since been replenished with DREF funding - *for the purposes of this operation however, funding has been used to replenish only 1,150 family kits. The contents of a family kit are described in the table below.*

Selection of beneficiaries

Beneficiaries were selected based on selection criteria which are in line with the national society's standard operating procedure, which in turn is guided by SPHERE (Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Disaster Response). As such, due consideration was given to age, gender, disabilities and minority groups through the following categorization of priority groups targeted for assistance:

- Families headed by single women
- Families headed by single men
- Families headed by children
- Families headed by disabled persons
- Families headed by elderly persons
- Families which have not been beneficiaries or recipients of any substantial assistance from the government and other organizations.
- Families with person(s) with disabilities and other socially excluded groups.

For beneficiary feedback on the usefulness of assistance provided, please see Pg 7 below.

Distribution of family kits

Township	Distribution of family kits/ Approximate number of families reached	Contents per family kit
Seikphyu	600	Kitchen set, 2 blankets, mosquito net, clothes for children and adults, and soap
Pakokku	327	
Pauk	200	
Myaing	50	
TOTAL	1,177	

Challenges:

Distributions in the initial aftermath of the flooding were hampered due to destroyed roads and bridges.

Water, sanitation and hygiene promotion

Outcome: A minimum of 1,150 families are provided with clean drinking water, water storage containers, and families living in camps are provided with emergency sanitation facilities and hygiene promotion activities to reduce the risk of waterborne and water-related diseases.

Outputs (expected results) and activities planned:

- Assess the existing water and sanitation situation in the camp sites to ensure availability of an adequate water supply.
- Provide safe water to 1,150 families through the installation of mobile water purification units.
- Distribute water storage containers and control supply movements from point of dispatch to end-user/communities.
- Provide emergency sanitation facilities and hygiene promotion to people living in camps and evacuation centres.
- Conduct training/information programmes for Red Cross volunteers and beneficiaries, in particular hygiene promotion and the safe use of water treatment products (e.g. chlorination tablets).

Impact:

A total of 814 households (3,419 people) were reached with emergency water and sanitation assistance, in contrast with the target of 1,150 households (5,750 people). This was due to the fact that initial water and sanitation assessments undertaken by the society included longer-term or non-emergency water and sanitation needs which could not be covered by the DREF operation.

As such, only safe drinking water was distributed and latrine construction assistance provided to communities. The non-emergency water and sanitation needs were covered by local authorities and the Department of Health.

The 814 households across nine villages were provided with safe drinking water between 10 and 30 November. Water purification tablets were also provided to the villagers. The water was produced by an emergency response unit previously used in the Cyclone Nargis operation⁵.

Latrine construction assistance was also provided to 200 households (who were part of the 814 households mentioned above) – each of them received pan and pipes. The structure was constructed of timber and tarpaulin sheets – the timber was provided by other aid organizations, while the tarpaulins were donated by MRCS.

The team operating the emergency response unit consisted of two water and sanitation staff members from headquarters, and nine volunteers mobilized from the relevant township Red Cross brigade. The volunteers were previously trained in the installation, operation and maintenance of emergency response equipment (ERE⁶). The training was part of MRCS's initiative to sustain and expand the water and sanitation capacity which the society had gained as a result of the extensive Cyclone Nargis operation. In total, equipment from 14 emergency response units received during the Cyclone Nargis operation has been rehabilitated. With this in place, the society now has the capacity to respond to water and sanitation needs for small and medium-scale disasters. It should be noted that staff and volunteers trained during the Cyclone Nargis operation also applied their knowledge during the response to Cyclone Giri in October 2010.

Challenges:

There is a need to strengthen the MRCS water and sanitation unit's understanding of the emergency ambit of a DREF operation.

Emergency shelter
<p>Outcome: 1,150 families (5,750 people) comprising most affected households (who have lost their homes and belongings completely) and displaced families in camp sites are supplied with standard emergency shelter materials, including community shelter kits.</p>
<p>Outputs (expected results) and activities planned:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct rapid emergency needs and capacity assessments. • Set clear beneficiary selection criteria and define distribution protocols. • Distribute relief supplies and control supply movements from point of dispatch to end-user/communities. • Engage Red Cross volunteers and beneficiaries in relief assistance activities. • Monitor and evaluate relief activities and provide reporting on relief distributions.

Impact:

The target of 1,150 families was met for this intervention. The families were each provided with emergency shelter kits, while one community shelter kit (containing construction tools) was shared by five families. The distributions were conducted and completed from early to mid-November. *(For a description of contents, please see the table below)*

Emergency shelter kit	Community shelter kit (one kit for 5 families)
2 tarpaulins, rope (1 unit), hammer (1 unit)	5 machetes, 5 machete sharpeners, 1 hand saw, 3 claw hammers, nails, rope, 1 crow bar, chisel (2 sets)

⁵ The extensive Cyclone Nargis relief and recovery operation was conducted from 2008 to 2011.

⁶ ERE is the term used by MRCS to refer to components of emergency response units rehabilitated upon the conclusion of the Cyclone Nargis operation.

These kits were pre-positioned in warehouses in the Magway and Yangon regions as part of MRCS's disaster preparedness efforts. *These materials have since been replenished with DREF funding.*

The same procedures employed for beneficiary selections for the distribution of family kits, as described earlier, were applied to this intervention.

Challenges:

The same challenge faced during the distribution of family kits were faced with this intervention.

Lessons learnt

Several lessons have been learnt from the response to the Magway floods. They include the following:

- The disaster response and preparedness training previously provided to volunteers and vulnerable communities as part of the society's long-standing annual programming initiatives, proved to be useful and effective in saving lives and mitigating the impact of the disaster. This was witnessed in the form of a high number of Red Cross volunteers as well as villagers (also known as community volunteers) from the townships of Pakokku and Seikphyu, who participated in initial activities such as early warnings, evacuations, distributions and assessments. They had previously been trained through the society's community-based disaster risk management programme. In addition, the highest-ranked volunteer in Magway Region (formally known as a Grade 1 staff officer) as well as another senior Red Cross volunteer from the region, had earlier participated in the society's national disaster response team training in September. This training provided them with skills which enabled them to provide a certain level of leadership to brigade volunteers during the flood relief operation.
- In spite of the positive developments described above, there was a lack of clear instruction provided to township volunteers on the role of the Red Cross in a relief operation. Additionally, there were gaps in the flow of information from volunteers in the field to the regional-level Red Cross supervisory committee and eventually, headquarters. The gaps were at times due to the inaccessibility of official data or the inability of volunteers to report on official data, owing to the local context. These challenges point to the need for follow-up training for volunteers previously trained in disaster response and preparedness. There is also a need to strengthen the reporting system from field to headquarters, and to provide training to volunteers in emergency reporting.
- Coordination at local level with local authorities was not as smooth as that experienced during the society's response to the earthquake in Eastern Shan State, in March 2011. This was also seen in some uncoordinated requests for assistance being conveyed by the authorities at local, regional and central levels to aid organizations and NGOs. As a measure to address this, coordination meetings organized by local authorities were attended by Red Cross volunteers, and this participation helped the society keep abreast of developments. It should also be noted that the coordination undertaken by local authorities was limited to camps housing people who had been displaced by the floods. The learning gained from this experience is the need for MRCS to further engage with local authorities during normal times, with the aim of securing a stronger level of coordination for future disasters or emergencies. There is also a need to conduct advocacy sessions with newly installed local authorities and state or regional governments, so that there is an improved understanding of Red Cross work – to this end, it should be noted that MRCS has conducted advocacy meetings with several state or regional governments including the Magway Region government, since January 2012.
- The successful assessment undertaken by MRCS in the aftermath of the Eastern Shan State earthquake in March 2011 (where the society led the inter-agency assessment) was not entirely replicated in the response to the Magway Floods, in view of the fact that initial water and sanitation assessments of the needs of affected communities, and the recommendations that followed, were not in line with the emergency ambit of a DREF operation. As such, the society needs to strengthen its understanding in this regard.
- The learning gained upon the conclusion of the Cyclone Giri DREF Operation in January 2011, that the composition of the society's emergency shelter kit needed to be redesigned to include a hammer and rope, to be in line with the standard package recommended by the inter-agency emergency shelter cluster, was applied well. As a result, the society was able to distribute redesigned emergency shelter kits to affected communities, in response to the Magway floods.

Beneficiary Feedback



U Than Htwe
67 years old
Administrator
Seike Kham village
Seikphyu township

“We received family kits within the first week of the flood. We also received shelter materials. These helped relieve our situation. We are thankful that lives were saved through early warning and evacuations carried out by villagers who were trained in disaster risk management in 2011.”

(Photo: MRCS)

Contact information

For further information specifically related to this operation please contact:

- **Myanmar Red Cross Society:** Prof Dr Tha Hla Shwe, president;
phone: +95 1 383 681, +95 067 419 014; email: president@myanmarredcross.org.mm
- **IFRC Myanmar country office:** Bernd Schell, head of country office;
phone: +95 1 383 686; email: ifrcmm01@redcross.org.mm
- **IFRC Southeast Asia regional office, Bangkok:** Anne Leclerc, head of regional office;
phone: +662 661 8201; fax: +662 661 9322; email: anne.leclerc@ifrc.org
- **IFRC Asia Pacific zone office, Kuala Lumpur:**
 - Al Panico, head of operations, phone: +603 9207 5700; email: al.panico@ifrc.org
 - Heikki Väättämoinen, operations coordinator,
phone: +6012 230 7895, email: heikki.vaatamoinen@ifrc.org
 - Alan Bradbury, head of resource mobilization and PMER,
phone: +603 9207 5775, email: alan.bradbury@ifrc.orgPlease send all pledges of funding to zonerm.asiapacific@ifrc.org

DREF history:

- This DREF was initially allocated on [3 November 2011](#) for CHF 165,669 for 4 months to assist 10,000 beneficiaries.
- No DREF operation updates were issued.



Click here

1. **Final financial report** [below](#)
2. **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 \(NGOs\) in Disaster Relief](#) and the [Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Disaster Response \(Sphere\)](#) in delivering assistance to the most vulnerable.

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



IFRC's work is guided by [Strategy 2020](#) which puts forward three strategic aims:

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



MDRMM005 - Myanmar - Magway Flash Floods

Appeal Launch Date: 03 nov 11

Appeal Timeframe: 03 nov 11 to 03 mar 12

Final Report

Selected Parameters	
Reporting Timeframe	2011/11-2012/4
Budget Timeframe	2011/11-2012/3
Appeal	MDRMM005
Budget	APPROVED

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

I. Funding

	Disaster Management	Health and Social Services	National Society Development	Principles and Values	Coordination	TOTAL	Deferred Income
A. Budget	165,670					165,670	
B. Opening Balance	0					0	
Income							
<u>Other Income</u>							
<i>DREF Allocations</i>	165,669					165,669	
C4. Other Income	165,669					165,669	
C. Total Income = SUM(C1..C4)	165,669					165,669	
D. Total Funding = B +C	165,669					165,669	
Coverage = D/A	100%					100%	

II. Movement of Funds

	Disaster Management	Health and Social Services	National Society Development	Principles and Values	Coordination	TOTAL	Deferred Income
B. Opening Balance	0					0	
C. Income	165,669					165,669	
E. Expenditure	-123,842					-123,842	
F. Closing Balance = (B + C + E)	41,827					41,827	

MDRMM005 - Myanmar - Magway Flash Floods

Appeal Launch Date: 03 nov 11

Appeal Timeframe: 03 nov 11 to 03 mar 12

Final Report

Selected Parameters	
Reporting Timeframe	2011/11-2012/4
Budget Timeframe	2011/11-2012/3
Appeal	MDRMM005
Budget	APPROVED

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

III. Expenditure

Account Groups	Budget	Expenditure					TOTAL	Variance
		Disaster Management	Health and Social Services	National Society Development	Principles and Values	Coordination		
A							B	A - B
BUDGET (C)		165,670					165,670	
Relief items, Construction, Supplies								
Shelter - Relief	50,510	54,820				54,820	-4,310	
Clothing & Textiles	31,625	29,048				29,048	2,577	
Water, Sanitation & Hygiene	25,807	985				985	24,822	
Utensils & Tools	9,200	12,126				12,126	-2,926	
Total Relief items, Construction, Supplies	117,142	96,980				96,980	20,162	
Logistics, Transport & Storage								
Storage	3,576	2,421				2,421	1,155	
Distribution & Monitoring	7,500	3,992				3,992	3,509	
Transport & Vehicles Costs	750	324				324	426	
Logistics Services		3,846				3,846	-3,846	
Total Logistics, Transport & Storage	11,826	10,582				10,582	1,244	
Personnel								
International Staff		103				103	-103	
National Staff		119				119	-119	
National Society Staff	19,129	501				501	18,628	
Volunteers		737				737	-737	
Total Personnel	19,129	1,460				1,460	17,669	
General Expenditure								
Travel	1,250	758				758	492	
Office Costs	500	115				115	385	
Communications	1,000	960				960	40	
Financial Charges	2,000	5,428				5,428	-3,428	
Total General Expenditure	4,750	7,261				7,261	-2,511	
Indirect Costs								
Programme & Services Support Recov	10,111	7,558				7,558	2,553	
Total Indirect Costs	10,111	7,558				7,558	2,553	
Operational Forecasting								
Operational forecasting	2,711						2,711	
Total Operational Forecasting	2,711						2,711	
TOTAL EXPENDITURE (D)	165,670	123,842				123,842	41,828	
VARIANCE (C - D)		41,828				41,828		