



Georgia Red Cross Society (GRCS) volunteers distributing relief items, September 2022. Photo credit: GRCS

Appeal: <b>MDRGE016</b>	DREF Allocated: <b>CHF 357,773</b>	Crisis Category: <b>Yellow</b>	Hazard: <b>Flood</b>
Glide Number: <b>FL-2022-0002261-GEO</b>	People Affected: <b>5,200 people</b>	People reached: <b>3,570 people</b>	Publishing date: <b>08/06/2023</b>
Event Onset:  <b>Sudden</b>	Operation Start Date:  <b>08/07/2022</b>	Operation end Date:  <b>31/10/2022</b>	Operation Timeframe:  <b>4 months</b>
Country: <b>Georgia</b>	Targeted Areas:	<b>Ambrolauri, Dusheti, Senaki, Tkibuli, Zugdidi, Tianeti</b>	

## DESCRIPTION OF THE EVENT

### What happened, where and when?

From 21 – 26 June 2022, heavy rains and strong wind have seriously affected ten (10) municipalities in Georgia (Kazbegi, Tianeti, Dusheti, Tkibuli, Kutaisi, Ambrolauri, Senaki, Khobi, Poti, and Zugdidi). The scope of the disaster covers eastern and western Georgia, rural and urban settlements located in flatlands and high mountainous regions. Subsequently to heavy rainfall, central and adjacent streets of the settlements were flooded, roads were destroyed by the sudden mudflows and landslides or blocked by the massive trees, many villages were flooded, and other state infrastructure, such as bridges and inland roads, houses, and power transmission towers, were damaged. Heavy rain also caused landslides and mudflows in some parts of the affected municipalities.



GRCS volunteers supporting affected households in Senaki after the floods.  
Photo credit: GRCS

The evacuation and move of people to a safe place was necessary; the Government allocated shelter for the evacuated persons immediately. Around 100 families in Mtshkheta municipality were evacuated. One (1) person was reported dead as a consequence of the mudflow. Some families are still staying in flood-affected areas and required [relocation](#) and other forms of support. In Dusheti municipality, central roads were destroyed by the disaster, that left several mountainous villages in complete isolation from the rest of the country, including families with older people, children and tourists visiting the area. The effects of the disaster were particularly severe due to the pre-existing difficult socio-economic situation in the area – 23% of the local population receives subsistence benefits and 55% of the municipality population depend on social benefits<sup>1</sup>. In Ambrolauri municipality, strong winds blew the roofs off several houses. In Poti and Senaki municipalities and Kutaisi city, the flood reached into residential houses and destroyed household items and family belongings. A special commission established by the Government of Georgia has been tasked with calculating the damage caused by the heavy rain in the municipalities of Georgia.

<sup>1</sup> [Social Service Agency](#).

From 22 – 27 June, local authorities of the affected municipalities officially requested Georgia Red Cross Society's (GRCS) support to the affected population. GRCS mobilized 70 volunteers in six (6) branches in affected regions for assessing the situation on the ground. Rapid assessment conducted by the GRCS volunteers also revealed that the main immediate need of the affected population is food and non-food items. Based on the information received from the GRCS branches and volunteers involved in the response activities, as well as from the local authorities of the affected municipalities, the heavy rain and wind caused severe damage to roofs, entrances, and ground/first floors (where home electronics, stock food, and hygiene items for long-term use are generally kept), resulting in loss of personal assets. Agricultural lands and livestock were also damaged. As agriculture is a primary source of income of the households in these regions of Georgia, the damage caused by the disaster is foreseen to bring a heavy impact on the livelihood of the people affected.

The Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure of Georgia, regional and local municipalities, and Emergency Management Service (EMS) under the Ministry of Interior in Georgia were actively involved in repair and restoration works of the flood- and landslide-affected municipalities. Repair and restoration works included cleaning and restoring the essential parts of the damaged areas, properties, and infrastructures in the immediate aftermath of the emergency.

## NATIONAL SOCIETY ACTION

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	National Society Readiness
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Assessments
<input type="checkbox"/>	Coordination
<input type="checkbox"/>	Resource Mobilization
<input type="checkbox"/>	Activation of contingency plans
<input type="checkbox"/>	EOC
<input type="checkbox"/>	Shelter and Basic Household Needs
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Livelihoods and Basic Needs
<input type="checkbox"/>	Health
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Water Sanitation and Hygiene
<input type="checkbox"/>	Protection, Gender and Inclusion
<input type="checkbox"/>	Education
<input type="checkbox"/>	Migration
<input type="checkbox"/>	Risk Reduction, Climate Adaptation and Recovery
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Community Engagement and Accountability
<input type="checkbox"/>	Environment Sustainability
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other

## MOVEMENT PARTNERS ACTIONS




IFRC	<i>Technical support to the NS during DREF operation planning, implementation and monitoring. Particular focus devoted to PMER, CEA, and Information Management.</i>
ICRC	N/A
Partner National Societies	N/A



## OTHER ACTORS

<i>The Government has requested international assistance</i>	N/A
<i>National Authorities</i>	<i>Local authorities were the main responders in temporary relocation of the affected to the shelters and alleviating the disaster effect on the road and other state infrastructure.</i>
<i>UN and other actors</i>	N/A
<i>List of major coordination mechanisms in place</i>	N/A

## NEEDS (GAPS) IDENTIFIED

	<b>Livelihoods</b>	In rural areas, agricultural lands and fruit trees were also destroyed. Based on the assessment findings, the affected population lost their food stocks during the disaster and required support in food and non-food items. While the dominant concern expressed by the respondents revolved around repairing houses and livelihood sources of income, 95% of the interviewed people identified food and household items as their most urgent and prioritized needs for the next three months after the disaster.
	<b>Health &amp; Care</b> (Mental Health and psychosocial support (MHPSS) / Community Health / Medical Services)	Emphasis was placed on responding to the psychosocial needs of the affected population. During the needs assessment, affected persons were asked if a member of their household would require psychosocial support, and 43% of the respondents answered positively. Therefore, the operation adopted an integrated approach for Mental Health & Psychosocial Support (MHPSS), with the GRCS volunteers concentrating on providing Psychological First Aid (PFA) during distributions and monitoring, and referring to qualified GRCS psychologists to follow up on the cases with the need of more focused mental and psychosocial support.
	<b>Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH)</b>	Hygiene items were identified through the assessment as the second most prioritized need to afford the households with basic measures to protect their health and well-being for the next four (4) months. Therefore, the operation included a focus on the provision of hygiene items and promotion.

## TARGETING STRATEGY

The targeting strategy was based on the assessment in coordination with the local authorities. Special focus was placed on the degree to which the households were damaged in combination with the degree of vulnerability of the affected households, with a particular consideration to people with disabilities, pregnant and lactating women, large families, people with children, and older adults. Based on this, the GRCS targeted a total of 3,570 people (1020 households) who were most affected in the six (6) municipalities (Ambrolauri, Dusheti, Senaki, Tkibuli, Zugdidi, Tianeti) where the local authorities had requested support from the GRCS. The other four (4) municipalities (Poti, Kutaisi, Mtskheta and Kazbegi) that were affected by the disaster were not targeted within this DREF operation as the local authorities and the affected population did not request support from the GRCS. GRCS utilized community feedback,

as well as protection, gender and inclusion (PGI) related aspects during planning and implementation of the operation.

## TARGETED POPULATION

TARGETED POPULATION	Women	47%	Men	38%
	Children	70 (2%)		
	Total	3,570		
ESTIMATES	Percentage People with Disability (%)	3%	Urban/Rural ration (%)	100% rural

## OVERALL OBJECTIVE OF THE OPERATION

The overall objective of the operation was to provide timely relief assistance to 1,020 households (3,570 people) affected by flooding, severe winds, mudflows, and/or landslides, across six affected regions through the distribution of basic food and household items for a period of four months.

## RESPONSE STRATEGY SUMMARY

The GRCS implemented the DREF operation through the following strategy:

- Needs assessment and finalization of lists of targeted people was done to specify further the extent and scope of damages jointly with the local authorities. The assessment served to determine the final combination of relief items to diversify food and hygiene kits focused on women, older adults and people living with disabilities.
- Procurement and distribution of essential household items for a period of 4 months with integrated health and hygiene promotion (risk communication and community engagement on COVID-19).
- Procurement and Distribution of food parcels to 1,020 households (3,570 people) in compliance with the SPHERE standards<sup>2</sup>.
- Provision of Psychosocial Support to affected persons via in-person consultations and dissemination of targeted messages.
- Monitoring of the operation was undertaken by the GRCS headquarters (HQ) with remote support from IFRC. A Lessons Learned Workshop was planned initially, but the plan was interrupted by other crises which exhausted the capacity and will take place at a later stage outside the timeframe of the operation. There is a need to provide a tailored support to GRCS on DREF capacity strengthening. For this purpose, a capacity strengthening workshop will be organized in May/June 2023, which will capture lessons learned from recent DREF operations.
- The strategy was implemented with a particular focus on localization; each of the targeted areas were covered by the local branches in coordination with the GRCS HQ.

---

<sup>2</sup> [SPHERE Standards](#)

## ABOUT SUPPORT SERVICES



At the onset of the crisis, GRCS mobilized 70 volunteers as part of the immediate response to the disaster. Once beyond the immediate response phase, 15 HQ and branch staff and 27 volunteers were involved in the administering the relief distribution.

All procurements were handled by the logistics department of the GRCS in compliance with the IFRC procurement protocols. The National Society regularly trains volunteers and staff on safety and security measures, and coordinated with local authorities to ensure the safe distribution of relief, and timely response provision in last-mile and/or remote areas. GRCS also made sure that the pandemic context was accounted for by staff and volunteers throughout the whole operation.

The GRCS is in the process of transitioning their Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting (PMER) capacity from a dedicated PMER person to operation specific PMER responsibility assignment. Within the DREF operation, the responsible person for primary data collection and monitoring was the GRCS Operations Manager, with the IFRC Country Cluster Delegation overseeing the overall PMER framework and ensuring quality control over PMER deliverables. GRCS has implemented monitoring visits in all affected regions during distribution and post-distribution processes.

External communication was coordinated by the GRCS Communication Manager, who worked closely with the local branches to coordinate media coverage and visibility of the operation. Communication measures were minimal due to sensitivity and protection of the affected population; a focus was placed on communication towards the affected population about available support and assistance, as well as feedback and/or complaint mechanisms within the Red Cross.

## PLANNED INTERVENTION

	 <b>Livelihoods</b>	<b>People reached: 3,570</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>1,733</b>
			<b>Female</b>	<b>1,837</b>
Indicators			Target	Actual
% of people who report during the satisfaction survey that the food items received where sufficient for the intended time period			<b>70%</b>	<b>100%</b>
Number of households provided with Emergency food parcels			<b>1,020</b>	<b>1,070</b>
Number of people provided with Emergency food parcels			<b>3,570</b>	<b>3,570</b>
Number of households provided with vouchers for essential household items			<b>1,020</b>	<b>1,070</b>
Number of people provided with vouchers for household essential items			<b>3,570</b>	<b>3,570</b>
Narrative description of achievements				
GRCS staff and volunteers at the local level were actively engaged in communication with the affected people and local municipalities from the onset of the disaster. GRCS branch staff worked together with municipality representatives to assess the needs of the affected people and, with consideration of the support provided by the authorities. This allowed the GRCS to identify the gap between the state-provided assistance and affected people’s needs, primarily tied to food and basic livelihood items, as flooding destroyed livelihoods, stocks of the affected households, and their agricultural fields. The local				

**Table 1– Content of food parcels (household)<sup>[1]</sup>**

Content of food parcel	Quantity
Pasta 500 gr	15 pkg.
Tea	5 pkg.
Rice (800 gr)	14 units
Salt (1 kg)	2 pkg.
Oil (1litre)	2 units
Buckwheat (800 gr)	2 pkg.
Sugar (800 gr)	2 packages
Sweets	22 units
Lentils (800 g)	2 pkg.
Flour (2 kg)	1 pkg.

Following GRCS-conducted needs assessment and consultations with the local municipalities, GRCS was provided a list of affected people from the authorities. The authorities and community representatives were also consulted during the targeting stage to prioritize the households with the vulnerabilities as primary recipients of assistance. Local branch staff and volunteers further verified the lists and contact information in consultation with the affected communities.

Parcels containing food items (*see table 1*), hygiene kits (*see table 4*) and essential household (HH) items (*see table 3*) were identified as the most suitable modality for assistance of the affected people.

The content of the essential household items packages was defined based on an individual needs assessment of the affected households, conducted by GRCS volunteers. The HHs were individually provided with the vouchers specifying the type of the essential household item package. At the time of distribution, those who had received the vouchers were able to exchange them for the designated parcel.

**Table 2 – Essential Household Items**

Parcel	Content
Parcel 1	1 Mattress and 2 sets of bed linen
Parcel 2	1 blanket and 2 sets of bed linen
Parcel 3	1 mattress and 4 towels
Parcel 4	1 blanket and 4 towels

Prior to the distribution, GRCS HQ organized an online meeting for the branch staff volunteers to refresh their understanding of the procedures and guidelines.

GRCS procured food items and essential household items through a public tender. Municipalities cooperated in arranging the tenders for shipment and warehouse services. Once the parcels were delivered to the target municipalities, the GRCS branch and volunteer staff distributed the relief items door-to-door with the local municipalities. All beneficiaries signed the delivery acts, that were prepared by GRCS and the municipalities. A total of 1,070 HHs (3,570 people) were reached.

Apart from the monitoring during the distributions, a post-distribution monitoring (PDM) exercise was further conducted by GRCS in all targeted municipalities during which a team from GRCS conducted household visits and phone interviews as part of the exercise in all targeted municipalities. Of those who received assistance, 20% (749 HHs) were randomly selected to participate. The respondents confirmed their satisfaction with the quantity and quality of the received assistance. 89% of the interviewed HHs confirmed that they were very satisfied with the type of assistance provided, and 11% said that they were

municipalities took charge in assisting the affected communities with infrastructural recoveries (mostly state infrastructure, such as roads, power systems, etc.), while livelihood needs persisted.

In total, 35% of the affected population was interviewed by the GRCS volunteers in person. Based on the accumulated information, it was clearly underlined that the affected population lost their food stocks during the disaster and that support was needed in the form of food and non-food items at this stage. While the dominant concern expressed by the respondents revolved around repairing houses and livelihood sources of income, 95% of the interviewed people identified food and household items as the most urgent and prioritized needs for four months after the flooding.



Family in Ambrolauri receiving relief items for their household. Photo credit: GRCS.

satisfied with the support. No complaints were recorder during the interviews, and the targeted households appeared overall thankful for the support from the GRCS and IFRC.



Table 3: TOTAL NUMBER OF PEOPLE REACHED PER LOCATION AND RELIEF ITEM				
	Food Parcels		Essential Household Items	
Region	Male	Female	Male	Female
Ambrolauri	214	299	214	299
Dusheti	265	405	265	405
Senaki	621	701	621	701
Tkibuli	175	161	175	161
Zugdidi	238	159	238	159
Tianeti	220	112	220	12
Total	1,733	1,837	1,733	1,837
	1,070		1,070	
Total Households	3,570		3,570	

### Challenges:

The budget was initially calculated as per the currency exchange rate of CHF 1 = GEL 2.94; however, during the procurement process, the currency rate suffered drastic changes and resulted in the rate of CHF 1 = GEL 2.82 at the time of the procurement, which amounted to a difference of CHF 14,000. Bearing in mind that CHF 14,000 represents 3.5% of the total budget, an internal budget revision was undertaken to protect the number of targeted people. This caused a slight delay in the procurement process; however, no complaints were received from the targeted people regarding late distributions.

### Lessons Learned:

Financial measures need to be taken to mitigate the impact of fluctuating currency exchange rate to ensure that the actual cost corresponds with the budget plan.

	 <b>Health &amp; Care</b>	<b>People reached:</b> <b>357</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>175</b>
			<b>Female</b>	<b>182<sup>3</sup></b>
<b>Indicators</b>			<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
# of HHs receiving psychosocial support (PSS) as part of the immediate response			<b>357</b>	<b>357</b>
<b>Narrative description of achievements</b>				
When asked if someone in the household would require psychosocial support, 43% of the respondents answered the question positively. GRCS volunteers provided on-site psychosocial support to the affected families as part of the immediate response to the disaster, focused on Psychological First Aid (PFA) to the affected population, especially to the older people within the affected population. At least 357 HHs were provided with PSS support during the first days of the disaster. PSS support was provided by the team of 70 volunteers, all of whom have undergone relevant trainings as part of their recruitment and continuous capacity strengthening exercises that is regularly organized by GRCS. The volunteers referred 10 affected people requiring further follow-up to qualified GRCS psychologists.				

<sup>3</sup> The actuals have been calculated based on the average household membership and gender distribution data in Georgia: <https://www.geostat.ge/>.




**Challenges:**

Volunteers reported facing challenges with referring people to advanced psychological services due to lack of available services at local level. This requires attention on advocacy for increased capacities on mental health and psychosocial support of the local authorities. The support provided by the GRCS is limited to psychosocial support, and people in need for further advanced support and follow-up from professional psychologists have limited services to seek at local level. 10 people were provided follow-up professional psychological support from the GRCS HQ.

**Lessons Learned:**

Advocacy measures are needed towards the Ministry of Health for increased resources and support at local level in the field of mental health and psychosocial support.

	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Water, Sanitation and Hygiene</b>	<b>People reached: 3,570</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>48%</b>	
			<b>Female</b>	<b>52%</b>	
<b>Indicators</b>			<b>Target</b>		<b>Actual</b>
<i>Number of households provided with hygiene sets</i>			<b>1,020</b>		<b>1,070</b>
<i>Number of people provided with hygiene sets</i>			<b>3,570</b>		<b>3,570</b>

**Narrative description of achievements**

<b>Table 4: Content of hygiene kits (household) (NS standard kit) and livelihood items</b>	
<b>Items</b>	<b>Quantity</b>
Face mask	1 pack
Toothpaste	2 pcs
Toothbrush	4 pcs
Toilet paper	8 rolls
Liquid Soap	1 piece
Dishwashing liquid	4 pc
Shampoo	1 pack
Baby Soap	2 Pc
Wet towels	1

Hygiene items were identified as the second most prioritized need to afford the households with basic measures to protect their health and well-being for the next four months.

The hygiene parcels were assembled based on the needs identified during the rapid needs assessment.

GRCS made sure that the hygiene items responded to diverse needs of men, women, older people, children, and people with disabilities. 1,070 HHs (3,570 people) were provided with hygiene kits. GRCS validated the relevance of the kits during the post-distribution monitoring exercise in the targeted municipalities.



<b>Table 5: TOTAL NUMBER OF PEOPLE REACHED PER LOCATION AND RELIEF ITEM</b>		
<b>Region</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>
Ambrolauri	214	299
Dusheti	265	405
Senaki	621	701
Tkibuli	175	161
Zugdidi	238	159
Tianeti	220	112
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,733</b>	<b>1,837</b>
	<b>3,570</b>	
<b>Total Households</b>	<b>1,070</b>	

**Challenges:**

As stated in the section under the “Challenges” within the “Livelihoods” section, the budget was initially calculated as per the currency exchange rate of CHF 1 CHF = GEL 2.94; however, during the procurement process, the currency rate suffered drastic changes and resulted in the rate of CHF 1 = GEL 2.82 at the time of the procurement, which amounted to a difference of CHF 14,000. Bearing in mind that CHF 14,000 represents 3.5% of the total budget, an internal budget revision was undertaken to protect the number of targeted people. This caused a slight delay in the procurement process; however, no complaints were received from the targeted people regarding late distributions.

**Lessons Learned:**

As earlier indicated, financial measures need to be taken to mitigate the impact of fluctuating currency exchange rate to ensure that the actual cost corresponds with the budget plan.

	 <b>National Society Strengthening</b>	<b>Persons reached: 71 volunteers</b>	Male	41
			Female	30
<b>Indicators</b>			<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
% of local volunteers who are mobilized and involved in the response activities			80%	71 volunteers
% of volunteers properly trained for the implemented field activities			100%	100%
Operational review conducted			Yes	No
Post-distribution monitoring/ satisfaction survey is conducted			1	1
Number of IFRC monitoring visits			2	1
<b>Narrative description of achievements</b>				
<p>The DREF Operation did not accommodate specific actions on National Society Strengthening; however, close cooperation was maintained between IFRC CCD for South Caucasus and the Georgia Red Cross Society with a focus on monitoring and reporting of the operation.</p> <p>The DREF operation benefited from digital tools obtained from previous operations for assessment purposes; however, Information Management for monitoring and reporting purposes requires further capacity building efforts at branch level.</p> <p>The GRCS has effectively integrated standard operating procedures for preparedness and response at local level. This has afforded the GRCS the capacities to plan, design and implement operations in full compliance with international humanitarian standards. Cash and Voucher Assistance remains a field to be unpacked and institutionalized within GRCS for future response operations.</p>				
<b>Challenges:</b>				
<p>No major challenges were identified during the DREF operation; however, limited capacity of the Georgia Red Cross in the field of monitoring and reporting caused challenges with timely provision of narrative reports and the confirmation of the proportion of volunteers involved in the operation. As for the indicator on % of volunteers mobilized and involved in the response, a total of 71 volunteers were involved (M41/F30); however, this made it impossible to calculate the per cent of volunteers involved against the total number. IFRC identifies</p>				

PMER as one of the prioritized areas for National Society Strengthening and plans to support the Georgia Red Cross in building this capacity in a sustainable manner in 2023.

The operational review was decided to be conducted outside of the operation's timeframe. There is a need to organize a broader capacity strengthening workshop with the GRCS, which includes self-assessment, orientation on revised DREF protocols and procedures, PMER tools and practices, and to capture lessons learned from recent DREF operations in Georgia, based on which an action plan should be developed and implemented. Considering this, the review was planned to be part of this workshop to be scheduled for May/June 2023 as the scope of this DREF operation did not accommodate the time and scope needed for the workshop.

Digitalization and Information Management capacities in GRCS at branch level requires particular attention and capacity building to ensure a smooth flow of data from local to central level for assessment, monitoring and reporting purposes.

#### **Lessons Learned:**

GRCS needs to be oriented on the latest DREF protocols and procedures, including the Simplified Early Action Protocols. It is further advised that coordination and communication at all stages are planned in advance to be followed throughout the DREF operation. This pertains both to coordination and communication between GRCS and IFRC as well as within IFRC between country and regional teams

## **Financial Report**

The budget for the DREF operation was CHF **357,773**, of which CHF **356,640** was spent. The remaining balance of CHF **1,133** is returned to the DREF account as per standard IFRC regulations.

For details, please refer to the final financial report annexed to this document.

*The major donors and partners of the Disaster Response Emergency Fund (DREF) include the Red Cross Societies and governments of Belgium, Britain, Canada, Denmark, German, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Norway, Republic of Korea, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland, as well as DG ECHO and Blizzard Entertainment, Mondelez International Foundation, and Fortive Corporation and other corporate and private donors. The Government of Canada has replenished the DREF in the occasion of this operation. The IFRC, on behalf of the National Society, would like to extend thanks to all for their generous contributions.*

## **Contact Information**

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

- **Georgia Red Cross Society:** Nino Osepaishvili, Secretary General, [nosepaishvili@redcross.ge](mailto:nosepaishvili@redcross.ge)
- **IFRC Appeal Manager:** Ivar Schram, Programme Coordinator, South Caucasus Country Cluster Delegation, Tbilisi, [ivar.schram@ifrc.org](mailto:ivar.schram@ifrc.org)

#### **Reference**

Click here for:

- [Previous Plans and Updates](#)

## How we work

All IFRC assistance seeks to adhere to the **Code of Conduct** for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO's) in Disaster Relief and the **Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Humanitarian 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.



# DREF Operation

## FINAL FINANCIAL REPORT

### MDRGE016 - Georgia - Floods

Operating Timeframe: 08 Jul 2022 to 31 Oct 2022

Selected Parameters			
Reporting Timeframe	2022/7-2022/10	Operation	MDRGE016
Budget Timeframe	2022/7-2022/10	Budget	APPROVED

Prepared on 06/Apr/2023  
All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

## I. Summary

Opening Balance	0
<b>Funds &amp; Other Income</b>	<b>357,773</b>
DREF Response Pillar	357,773
<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>-356,640</b>
Closing Balance	1,133

## II. Expenditure by area of focus / strategies for implementation

Description	Budget	Expenditure	Variance
AOF1 - Disaster risk reduction			0
AOF2 - Shelter			0
AOF3 - Livelihoods and basic needs	132,963	356,640	-223,676
AOF4 - Health			0
AOF5 - Water, sanitation and hygiene	155,124		155,124
AOF6 - Protection, Gender & Inclusion	127		127
AOF7 - Migration			0
<b>Area of focus Total</b>	<b>288,213</b>	<b>356,640</b>	<b>-68,426</b>
SFI1 - Strengthen National Societies	23,392		23,392
SFI2 - Effective international disaster management	46,168		46,168
SFI3 - Influence others as leading strategic partners			0
SFI4 - Ensure a strong IFRC			0
<b>Strategy for implementation Total</b>	<b>69,559</b>		<b>69,559</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>357,773</b>	<b>356,640</b>	<b>1,133</b>

# DREF Operation

## FINAL FINANCIAL REPORT

### MDRGE016 - Georgia - Floods

Operating Timeframe: 08 Jul 2022 to 31 Oct 2022

Selected Parameters			
Reporting Timeframe	2022/7-2022/10	Operation	MDRGE016
Budget Timeframe	2022/7-2022/10	Budget	APPROVED

Prepared on 06/Apr/2023

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

### III. Expenditure by budget category & group

Description	Budget	Expenditure	Variance
<b>Personnel</b>	<b>1,309</b>		<b>1,309</b>
National Staff	1,309		1,309
<b>General Expenditure</b>		<b>245</b>	<b>-245</b>
Financial Charges		245	-245
<b>Contributions &amp; Transfers</b>	<b>334,628</b>	<b>334,628</b>	<b>0</b>
Cash Transfers National Societies	334,628	334,628	0
<b>Indirect Costs</b>	<b>21,836</b>	<b>21,767</b>	<b>69</b>
Programme & Services Support Recover	21,836	21,767	69
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>357,773</b>	<b>356,640</b>	<b>1,133</b>