

# PAKISTAN FLOODS 2010



**Evaluation of the Relief Phase of the International Federation of Red  
Cross Red Crescent Societies/Pakistan Red Crescent Society  
Monsoon Flash Floods Operation**

Dr. Niaz Murtaza

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	3
Introduction	
Overview of the floods	6
Overview of the IFRC/PRCS Response	7
Overview of the Evaluation	9
Findings	15
Compliance	15
Relevance	20
Effectiveness	22
Efficiency	23
Coverage	24
Connectedness	25
Impact	26
Accountability to beneficiaries	26
Conclusions and Lessons Learnt	27
Recommendations	29
Appendices	
Evaluation TORs	
Evaluation timeline	
Evaluation Tools	
Documents reviewed	
People interviewed	
Places visited	

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Pakistan Flood was one of the largest humanitarian emergencies ever in terms of the number of people affected. UNOCHA estimates indicate that almost 2000 people were killed, over 1.7 million homes were destroyed and almost 18 million people were seriously affected by it. At the worst point, approximately 20% of Pakistan's total area was underwater, an area bigger than England. The country suffered extensive damage to health, educational, transportation and communication infrastructure and crops. The total economic impact is estimated to be as much as 10 billion USD. While camps have largely been dismantled and the overwhelming percentage of people has returned to their villages, huge recovery needs persist in the areas of shelter, water, sanitation, infrastructure and livelihoods in villages.

The IFRC/PRCS joint response, with a total appeal target of over CHF 130,000,000 for a 24 month period, focused on provision of food, NFI, health, water, sanitation, shelter and livelihoods services to nearly 191, 000 families during the relief phase from August 2010 to February 2011 in PK, Punjab and Sindh provinces.

The evaluation was commissioned by the IFRC's Asia Pacific Zonal Office in Kuala Lumpur for the purpose of accountability and learning. Specifically, it aims to assess the relief phase of the joint Pakistan Red Crescent Society/International Federation of Red Cross Red Crescent Societies/ Monsoon Flash Floods Operation using the following criteria: compliance with standards/expectations; relevance and appropriateness; effectiveness; efficiency (including cost effectiveness); coverage; impact; coherence; connectedness; and accountability to beneficiaries. The information for the evaluation was collected through secondary documents, interviews with IFRC and PRCS staff and focus group discussions with 18 communities in the three provinces. The main evaluation constraints included the high turnover among agency staff and beneficiaries, the significant length between the end of the relief phase and the evaluation, the weak documentation and the lack of coordination among IFRC and PRCS about this evaluation.

The IFRC/PRCS response to the Pakistan floods 2010 was a large and complex one. Its strong point include its sheer size as it reached nearly 10% of the flood-affected people in Pakistan, the strong adherence to the RC Code of conduct, the high degree of satisfaction of communities with the quantity and quality of the food aid were among its other strengths and the high multi-faceted impact in improving the socio-economic condition of the targeted communities.

The main findings of the evaluation are as follows (details provided in the main body):

- There is a disjunct between the various assessments conducted and the actual program delivered in the sense that it is not clear how the relative size of the sectors was determined. The assessments themselves did not suggest any overall sizes for the various sectors and this choice seems to have been made largely based on agency capacity and donor allocations. While this is understandable, having a clear idea of level of needs in each sector would have helped the agency somewhat in influencing donor allocations and increasing PRCS capacity in certain sectors, as has happened even now for many sectors.
- Procurement procedures, meant to ensure quality standards and prevent misuse of funds, may have been a cause for delays too and the IFRC is advised to review this issue further since this evaluation did not focus on management issues
- Program operations were also affected by the large number of international deployments of relatively short durations which undermined continuity and program ownership. However, this was unavoidable for the current response due to low PRCS capacity but does highlight a need to enhance PRCS capacity for future
- There was also insufficient coordination and communication among IFRC and PRCS which resulted in wastage of time and sub-optimal decision-making and use of resources, although both agencies did make a serious effort to coordinate well
- PRCS capacity, especially at the district levels, is low due to the high turnover among volunteers and a shortage of people with a strong humanitarian background.
- The focus on the most vulnerable regions and families was mixed with some low vulnerability regions and families selected along with those with high vulnerability. There were significant unmet needs within and beyond communities that RC did not meet
- People's participation and accountability over the agency was low. There was also insufficient information provision and absence of complaint mechanisms with the result that the agency's programs caused conflicts and grievances in 8 of the 18 places visited.
- While people were generally happy with the food and NFI packages, some items in the latter were found inappropriate by staff and/or communities.
- Cash was not utilized as an intervention in the emergency phase even though there was high demand for it within communities due to PRCS reservations based on past negative

experiences. Cash would have allowed the agency to respond faster and cheaper and more in line with people's specific needs in many though obviously not all places.

- Insufficient attention could be paid to developing the capacities of communities during the relief phase due to time constraints and scale of operation.
- There was insufficient focus on livelihoods activities due to PRCS lack of experience
- There is an absence of formal and effective tools for incorporating past lessons and documenting current lessons, except in the case of the WatSan sector.
- Compliance with Sphere has been mixed, partially due to funding shortage and capacity but also due to the absence of a clear rationale for the relative size of various sectors.
- There is an absence of an integrated contingency planning mechanism which could help to develop a consensus before an emergency and facilitate quick response.

The main recommendations of the evaluator are as follows (details within the report)

- Develop a participatory contingency planning mechanism
- Develop clear rationale for geographical/sectoral focus and targeting the most vulnerable
- Use cash more widely during the emergency phase
- Increase focus on livelihoods activities during emergency phase
- Enhance accountability mechanisms at community levels
- Enhance PRCS capacity significantly, especially at the district level
- Review the role of logistical and financial procedures in not allowing faster response as this evaluation did not focus on management issues
- Develop a stronger MIS system
- Better systems be developed for lessons incorporation and documentation
- Undertake evaluations earlier and with greater consensus
- Review the contents of the NFI package

# **INTRODUCTION**

## **OVERVIEW OF THE FLOOD**

The Pakistan floods crisis 2010 began in July 2010 following heavy monsoon rains in the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Sindh, Punjab and Balochistan provinces. UNOCHA estimates indicate that almost 2000 people were killed, over 1.7 million homes were destroyed and almost 18 million people were seriously affected during this flood, exceeding the combined total of individuals affected by the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami, the 2005 Kashmir earthquake and the 2010 Haiti earthquake. At the worst point, approximately 20% of Pakistan's total area was underwater, an area bigger than England.

The country suffered extensive damage to health, educational, transportation and communication infrastructure and crops. The total economic impact is estimated to be as much as 10 billion USD. Floods submerged 17 million acres (69,000 km<sup>2</sup>) of Pakistan's most fertile crop land, killed 200,000 heads of livestock and washed away massive amounts of grain. Flood waters soon receded from the north enabling livelihoods & reconstruction etc to take place, whereas large areas in Sindh province are still submerged under flood waters, which are likely to take several more weeks to recede fully. Therefore, many farmers were unable to meet the autumn deadline for planting new seeds in 2010, which implies a massive loss of food production in 2011, potential long term food shortages and price increases in staple goods. Sindh province had the highest number of people affected (7.2 million) followed by Punjab with 6 million people and KP with 3.8 million people. Sindh was also the most badly affected area in terms of the percentage of area covered at the sub-district level with 12 of the 17 sub-districts that had more than 50% of their areas affected being in Sindh.

Outbreaks of diseases, such as gastroenteritis, diarrhea, and skin diseases, due to lack of clean drinking water and sanitation soon posed a serious risk to flood victims. The elderly, disabled, women and children were especially made vulnerable due to a lack of aid and the threat of exploitation by traffickers. Relief work was also hampered by the difficult logistical terrain, the destruction of infrastructure and the threat of terrorist attacks against aid agencies. All these factors made this emergency response one of the most difficult ones in recent times. The needs covered almost all immediate relief sectors. All emergency work had to be done in an insecure and challenging operating environment. The Pakistani government was blamed for sluggish and disorganized response to the flood' which led to instances of riots, with attacks and looting of aid convoys by hunger-stricken people. The UN initially appealed for \$460 million to provide immediate help, including food, shelter and clean water and later increased it to \$2 billion for longer-term work. While camps have largely been dismantled and the overwhelming percentage of people has returned to their villages, huge recovery needs persist in the areas of shelter, water, sanitation, infrastructure and livelihoods in villages.

## **OVERVIEW OF IFRC/PRCS RESPONSE**

The IFRC/PRCS Pakistan Monsoon Floods Operation was initiated in July 2010 following the worst floods to hit the Pakistan since 1929. The operation aims to enable the PRCS to assist at least 130,000 families (approximately 910,000 people or approximately 5% of the total 16 million flood affected people) for 24 months, and expects to be completed by early August 2012. Resources for the operation are being raised through the IFRC's Revised Emergency Appeal which seeks CHF 130,673,677 (USD 133,873,000 or EUR 97,968,800) in cash, kind, or services. As of February 2011, the appeal is 61.8% covered in actual cash and kind donations, and 70% covered when including contributions in the pipeline. The relief phase of the operation covered the first six months. Following an intensive assessment and planning process, efforts are now focused on the longer term recovery of the flood-affected areas. The IFRC/PRCS monsoon floods operation has the following specific objectives:

### **Relief distributions (food)**

**Outcome:** The basic food needs of 130,000 flood-affected families in KPJ, Punjab, Sindh and Gilgit-Baltistan over nine months are met.

### **Relief distributions (non-food)**

**Outcome:** The essential household needs of 75,000 flood-affected families in KPK, Punjab, Sindh and Gilgit-Baltistan over nine months are met.

### **Shelter**

**Outcome:** Improved conditions for 75,000 most vulnerable flood-affected families in KPK, Punjab, Sindh and Gilgit Baltistan over 24 months through the provision of emergency shelter and restoration activities.

### **Health and care**

**Outcome:** The vulnerability of 130,000 flood-affected families to public health risks is reduced through the provision of curative and preventative health services over 24 months

### **Water, sanitation, and hygiene promotion**

**Outcome:** The health status of 80,000 families is improved, and the risk of water and sanitation-related diseases is reduced, over 24 months, through access to safe water, appropriate sanitation and hygiene promotion.

### **Livelihoods**

**Outcome:** Economic security of 50,000 flood-affected families restored within 24 months through livelihoods that are sufficiently sustainable and resilient to withstand future disasters.

### **Disaster preparedness and risk reduction**

**Outcome:** Reduce the number of deaths, injuries and socio economic impact from disasters by community based programming to identify and tackle disaster risks and build community resilience.

### **Beneficiary communications**

**Outcome:** To improve the lives of the flood-affected families through the provision of timely, relevant and accurate information and to support an environment of transparency and accountability between the flood affected families and PRCS/IFRC.

### **Organizational development (Capacity development and organizational strengthening)**

**Outcome:** To strengthen the immediate and long term capacities of PRCS staff and volunteers at branch level to complete the emergency and recovery operational needs, as well as build sustainable capacities for the future.

Following six months of concerted relief efforts, the PRCS/IFRC floods operation has reached at least 1,285,984 people (199,799 families) across the five most-affected provinces. This represents close to half of the overall Red Cross Red Crescent Movement's current reach of 2.5 million people.

<b>Sector</b>	<b>Number of families reached</b>	<b>Percentage of target</b>
Relief	199,799	147%
Shelter-Relief	83,074	108%
Shelter-Recovery	5,623	12%
Health	105,900	138
Water and sanitation	31,300	104
Livelihoods	2,000	100%

With the relief phase over, huge needs remain in Sindh KPK, and Punjab, where the government and humanitarian organizations are consolidating longer-term recovery plans to address a wide range of issues including malnutrition, health epidemics, poor sanitation and loss of homes and livelihoods. By the end of January, the PRCS and IFRC concluded a month-long integrated vulnerability and capacity assessment. Findings from the assessments were fed into recovery planning across all sectors, and an integrated recovery plan has been put into place.

During the period to be reviewed, the IFRC secretariat commissioned a Real Time Evaluation (RTE) during October to November 2010 to assess the ongoing IFRC/PRCS response to the floods. Findings from the RTE, which looked specifically at the efficiency and effectiveness of management and coordination, including related internal processes and systems, were used to inform the ongoing flood response. A RDRT evaluation has also been conducted in March, commissioned by the IFRC South Asia Regional Office. The Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) also commissioned an Inter-Agency RTE



of the response to the floods from January to March 2011 to assess the current response to date and provide real time feedback and input into ongoing decision making.

The IFRC response was affected by the following constraints:

- The lack of a status agreement with the Pakistan government which made it more difficult to obtain visas for international staff and clear goods through customs quickly
- The specific organizational structure of the PRCS, where the provincial branches have a high level of autonomy. This affects the cooperation between Provincial Branch and NHQ.
- The significant and continuous movement of the people during the floods, which undermined the ability to conduct rapid and accurate assessments. The massive exodus of the affected population also made it very difficult to “work” with communities as the traditional structures were non-functional. The destruction of infrastructure also made it difficult for IFRC’s initial assessments teams to reach the people and conduct assessments.
- Because of the large scale of the disaster and the large-scale displacement of people, there were huge needs in the area of water, food and health, which were sufficient to stretch the capacity of PRCS, making it difficult to focus on livelihoods and community development.

## **OVERVIEW OF THE EVALUATION AND LIMITATIONS**

The evaluation was commissioned by the IFRC’s Asia Pacific Zonal Office in Kuala Lumpur for the purpose of accountability and learning. Specifically, it aims to assess the relief phase of the joint Pakistan Red Crescent Society/International Federation of Red Cross Red Crescent Societies/ Monsoon Flash Floods Operation using the following criteria: compliance with standards/expectations; relevance and appropriateness; effectiveness; efficiency (including cost effectiveness); coverage; impact; coherence; connectedness; and accountability to beneficiaries..

The evaluation examines only the relief phase of the PRCS/IFRC Pakistan Monsoon Floods Operation during the six months period from August 2010 to February 2011. While the IFRC RTE focused on issues related to the internal systems and the management and coordination of the operation, this focuses more on the actual achievements and impact of the programs, as well as accountability to beneficiaries. The evaluation relied upon agency documents, IFRC/PRCS staff interviews and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) in 18 communities in Sindh, KP and Punjab in which approximately 400 beneficiaries participated. A planned household survey had to be dropped due to insufficient time to plan and implement it. The evaluation instead used the results of an internal survey conducted by the two agencies in April 2010 across the three provinces with a respondent size of 300 people. While the respondents were not selected randomly, the survey did add an element of triangulation to the methods used in this evaluation. The detailed evaluation criteria and questions are provided in the attached TORs and inception report.

### Constraints and limitations

Given the fact that the relief phase had ended six months prior to this evaluation, many of the staff members from the relief phase had left IFRC and PRCS. As such, it was difficult to get relevant perspectives in many cases. Many of the relief communities were also not traceable as they had been helped within camps. Even if they were available, recall was an issue for them as they had received aid several months back.

Due to these problems, the significant distances to be covered and the limited time assigned for the evaluation, it was not possible to select the communities visited for this evaluation randomly. It was also difficult to get hold of a lot of information and documentation requested by the evaluator due to the weak documentation and record-keeping practices of both agencies. For example, tracking record for Sphere for all sectors except water, FACT assessment report, beneficiary lists and items given for the villages visited, logs of grievances received from beneficiaries at the district levels and PRCS Gender and DM strategy were some of the documents requested by the evaluator but never received because they either did not exist or could not be located immediately.

Finally, the various parts of the two agencies were also not on the same page with regard to the importance of the evaluation at this stage. Thus, the survey mentioned earlier was dropped partially due to differences of opinion of its feasibility between the IFRC and PRCS in Pakistan. Furthermore, provincial PRCS staff had not been informed about the evaluation until a day before field visits.

To overcome the staff turnover problem, some of the staff who had moved on from IFRC in Pakistan was interviewed by phone. The lack of randomness of the FGD communities could have theoretically meant that PRCS staff members selected villages where people had a more favorable impression of RC work. However, this problem was minimized because of the high turnover within PRCS, which meant that the new staff members within districts did not in most cases know the communities very well and as such would not have been in a position to take the evaluator to communities more favorable of PRCS work. As such, the communities selected were as good as randomly selected ones.

Thus, overall the external evaluator feels confident that the methodology of this evaluation met minimum standards, was comparable to the several evaluations that he has conducted in Pakistan and elsewhere recently and that the findings of the report are relevant and valid.

The IFRC was keen to undertake an evaluation based both on qualitative and quantitative methods to enhance its reliability and credibility, which is understandable. However, in the experience of the evaluator, it is very difficult to organize quantitative surveys for emergency evaluations. Thus, all of the emergency phase evaluations that the evaluator has conducted over the last one year related to the Pakistan floods were qualitative ones. In fact, this is also true in most emergency cases and most evaluation reports found in the ALNAP database tend to be based on qualitative methods. Thus, while the intent is good, the IFRC is advised to include quantitative surveys for future evaluations only if it can be sure that it will be possible to arrange them properly. It would also be useful to enhance the appreciation of the value of qualitative evaluations within the agency.

## **FINDINGS**

### **COMPLIANCE**

**Were activities conducted in compliance with the Red Cross Red Crescent's Fundamental Principles, Code of Conduct and Sphere standards 2004 and appropriate within the country context?**

#### **The Codes of conduct of RCRC**

The Humanitarian imperative comes first: The IFRC-funded part of PRCS's response was late, except for the portions related to the contingency funds and existing stockpiles. Both the internal survey and the FGDs conducted by the evaluator reveal that very few of the respondents received any aid during the first one month and some received it as late as 4 months after the floods. According to the RTE conducted by the agency, approximately 9% of the total affected population or more than 90% of the people targeted has been reached by mid-November 2010. A small number of people were provided aid in the initial days through the PRCS's own stock piles and from the IFRC's own Disaster Relief Emergency Fund. For example, the KP PRCS's annual report 2010 reveals that the branch undertook its first food aid distribution on 5<sup>th</sup> August 2010 (almost 10 days after the flood in KP) from its own resources with the distribution of 500 food packages in Nowshera. By August 2, the PRCS had overall supported 5000 families and given out 7,954 food packs. The IFRC had provided CHF 300,000 by the end of July 2010.

Part of the reason for the delay was the lack of funds as donor commitments were slow to materialize. However, another major reason could have been the financial requirements of the IFRC for purchases. These issues will not be elaborated here as it is beyond the remit of the report to provide detailed analysis of management issues. However, it would be advisable for the agency to review this issue further. Weak coordination and consensus between IFRC and PRCS (NHQ and PHQs) also affected timeliness and program quality. For example, the initial reluctance by the PRCS to request the deployment of ERUs and RDRT delayed the response. Additionally, the scope of the livelihoods and cash components proposed by the IFRC had to be scaled back because of the reluctance of PRCS to engage in these activities due to lack of experience. For example, a proposed seeds and fertilizer distribution for the summer season had to be transferred to the winter season because of PRCS reservations due to capacity issues. The specific organizational structure of the PRCS, where the provincial branches have a lot of autonomy, also hampered the joint IFRC-PRCS response. Both agencies did make an effort to coordinate well. However, coordination remained elusive due to an absence of a prior emergency preparedness exercise and the high staff turnover. Thus, greater consensus and better communication between the two agencies would be helpful before the inception of emergencies.

Aid is given regardless of the race, creed or nationality of the recipients: The evaluator did not come across any evidence of any sort of bias, and aid seems to have been given across all affected provinces, races and creed without distinction

Aid will not be used to further a particular political or religious standpoint: This principle was generally adhered to, though in 3 communities (all in Punjab), people complained that aid was not distributed transparently and fairly.

We shall endeavor not to act as instruments of government foreign policy: No evidence found of non-compliance.

We shall respect culture and custom: There was a very high degree of appreciation among communities about the polite behavior of PRCS staff and their adherence to local cultures and norms. However, some NFI items were not culturally or contextually appropriate. For example, blankets were found to be too small and thin by almost every community in all three provinces. Knives were deemed dangerous and conflict-provoking by staff in Sindh, especially in camps where different, mutually hostile, tribes were living together. While none of the communities reported a misuse, distributing such items carries risk in the opinion of the evaluator. Tarpaulins were not found very useful in in the three communities in KP as people preferred tents because they provide better shelter and privacy and staff in Sindh and Punjab reported that hygiene kits given to women were often not culturally appropriate.

We shall attempt to build disaster response on local capacities: The evaluator did not find any evidence of the agency undertaking any community-level capacity-building, beyond the hygiene promotion work done for less than 16% of the total beneficiaries. This is perhaps understandable given the scale of the relief operation and the time constraint which made it difficult to engage in community development. Most of the service delivery was done by using local capacities though a local NGHHA (PRCS). However, there was still a huge international capacity deployment required, consisting of over 100 expatriates sent at different times during the relief phase, as PRCS capacity was not adequate to deal with the scale of the emergency. There is some evidence that PRCS capacity-building had occurred even before the floods, especially in the water sector. The PRCS had received several water treatment plants during previous emergencies which helped develop PRCS capacity in this area. Consequently, during this emergency, only one water Emergency Response Unit (ERU) had to be deployed internationally as the PRCS teams were

able to manage several other locally-run water production equipment units donated from previous ERU missions with the help of some technical staff deployed by national societies. However, there is still an enormous need to build the capacity of the PRCS to further reduce the need for short-duration, high turn-over international deployments during future emergencies.

Involve programme beneficiaries in the management of relief aid: In KP province, already existing village committees were used in the beneficiary selection process which reduced conflicts and made the task more manageable. However, in Sindh and Punjab, there were no pre-existing communities in any of the locations as these provinces have not been recipients of previous NGO work, unlike KP. In addition, there was no time for the PRCS to set up such committees during the relief phase. As such, there was little involvement of the communities in the management of relief aid, beyond some involvement in latrine construction and maintenance in some camp and village locations. There is thus a need to enhance beneficiary involvement in future disasters by setting up committees during the early recovery stage and then working through them in future disasters as much as possible.

Relief aid must strive to reduce future vulnerabilities besides meeting basic needs: The hygiene promotion work done and the small number of permanent latrines built in villages and schools will have a longer-term impact. However, these activities were conducted with less than 20% of the total beneficiaries. Additionally, some of the items in the NFI packages, such as mosquito nets, kitchen items, tools and tarpaulins will likely last beyond the relief phase. These were given to almost 50% of the total beneficiaries.

Accountability to beneficiaries: Information provision and complaint mechanisms were generally absent in all the communities visited. This issue will be dealt in more detail in the “Accountability” section.

Recognize disaster victims as dignified humans, not hopeless objects: As mentioned earlier, communities were generally happy with the respectful manner with which IFRC/PRCS staff dealt with communities. This reflected the fact that the agency views disaster victims as dignified humans and not helpless objects. The agency’s communication material also adheres to the same principle.

## **Compliance with Sphere standards**

It proved to be quite difficult to analyze the extent of the compliance with international standards due to two reasons. First, Sphere standards are more relevant and easier to meet and track in camp situations where there is a relatively fixed population almost entirely dependent on agency inputs and where monitoring is easier. However, camp populations were a small percentage of the people targeted and the vast majority of relief recipients were in villages where inflow and outflows of people are higher and more difficult to monitor and people have access to a variety of other inputs. Thus, in villages it becomes more difficult to meet and track Sphere standards. Second, the IFRC and PRCS's weak documentation and record-keeping on Sphere standards makes it difficult to analyze Sphere standard achievement even where they could have been tracked, e.g., in camps. Ideally, both agencies could have maintained tracking sheets for this purpose during the relief operations. Beyond the non-availability of information on quantitative achievements, the main gap on Sphere relates to the fact that the assessment reports done by TPAT did not give indications of the level of needs in each sector, making it difficult to figure out the extent to which actual program levels in various sectors are based on assessment results, as expected by Sphere, or other factors.

### Food security and nutrition

*Food security assessment standard:* The IFRC undertook in-depth assessments through the FACT, TPAT and PRCS volunteers through acceptable methods to identify the needs and the most vulnerable people. Some weaknesses in the assessments process are however detailed later.

*Nutrition assessment, young children feeding and management of acute malnutrition standards:* The IFRC did not undertake any assessments or work in the area of nutrition even though this was a significant need as evidenced by a UNICEF report about the high degree of malnutrition among flood affected children, especially in Sindh.

*Food security and livelihoods standards:* Food aid distribution was the largest component of the agency's programming and it reached almost 7.5% of the flood-affected people with its food aid programme--clearly among the highest coverage by any aid agency during this crisis. However, as mentioned earlier, the food aid was delivered late to most beneficiaries. The items included in the food aid package were generally found to be culturally appropriate and highly adequate by all the communities, especially in comparison with any food aid that they received from other aid agencies. However, it is difficult to evaluate whether the quantity of food aid delivered (130 kgs of food to a family of 7) meets the Sphere daily kilocalories nutritional requirements of 2100 kilocalories per person per day as exact calculations were not available with the IFRC (According to one IFRC staff member, the IFRC package provided around 2200 kilocalories per person per day, though this is not based on clear evidence). Finally, the food supply chain seems

to have been managed well and communities were highly appreciative of the orderly manner in which food aid was delivered. However, some communities complained of the long distance that they had to travel (as high as 20 kilometers in some cases) to get aid. This was due to the fact that their villages were still flooded making it difficult for aid to be delivered there. Staff members also reported 1-2 cases of looting of agency food aid convoys by bandits. Finally, the agency did not consider cash vouchers as a way of delivering food to people, although people in most communities themselves were quite keen to receive cash rather than in-kind food aid. While cash would not have worked as long as and wherever markets were not working due to floods (especially in Sindh), it could have been a possible intervention in later months once the water had receded in many communities from October onwards. In fact, in many places, the water receded very quickly as in KP and to some extent Punjab. The agency conducted a small livelihoods component. However, it only targeted 2000 families, i.e., around only 1% of the people targeted for food aid. Initially, 15,000 families were to be targeted. However, this was scaled down due to the unwillingness of PRCS to engage in more livelihoods work as livelihoods is not within the PRCS's current mandate and an area where they have little experience.

#### Water and sanitation

*WASH needs are met and users are involved in program implementation:* Overall, only around 16% of the food beneficiaries were provided with WASH services although the needs were much more wide-spread in all the communities as clear from the evaluation visits. People in 12 of the 18 communities mentioned that they do not have access to clean water. There was some involvement of people in constructing, safeguarding and maintaining facilities, especially latrines, in camps and schools.

*Hygiene promotion implementation:* Less than 16% of the food beneficiaries were provided with hygiene promotion activities even though there was much greater need within the flood affected people given their low level of knowledge about hygiene activities.

*Identification and use of hygiene items:* Hygiene items were distributed to around 80,906 families. some of the 50% of food beneficiaries provided with NFI kits. Given that hygiene promotion activities were conducted in a much smaller percentage of communities than those given hygiene kits, many women may not have used the items without the hygiene promotion training, as mentioned by PRCS staff.

*Access and water quantity:* Again, a very small percentage (less than 16%) of food beneficiaries were targeted with water provision even though lack of clean water was a major issue as 12 of the villages visited reported that the water from their pre-floods hand pumps had become



contaminated. Within water, the agency only focused on the achievement of the Sphere drinking water standard of 2.5-3 liters per person per day but only managed to provide 1.5 liters per person per day, according to the figures provided by the IFRC Pakistan water team.

*Water quality and facilities:* Water treatments plants were used to clean water and the water was tested for quality. Moreover, jerry cans were provided to 126,463 families.

Excreta disposal, vector control, drainage and waste management: There was some indirect impact of latrines construction and hygiene promotion activities. However, as mentioned earlier, these services were provided to less than 16% of the food beneficiaries. Latrines were conducted according to Sphere standards as shown below:



NFI items: NFI items were provided to only around 50% of food beneficiaries. Moreover, there was significant variation in the exact composition of these kits and it is not immediately clear what percentage received the different sub-categories mentioned under Sphere standards. There were some complaints about the quality of some of these items. For example, there were complaints about expired toothpastes and less useful tarpaulins from KP while the thickness and

size of blankets was criticized in almost all the 18 communities throughout all provinces. According to the IFRC, the expired toothpastes remain fit for human consumption even after expiration except for taste change and were also removed promptly once discovered.

Overall, compared with food, the coverage in other sectors was much lower. This was obviously due to funding shortage and the fact that food was the most important need after the emergency. Sphere also does not expect that all beneficiaries will be provided services in all sectors. However, it does expect that a thorough assessment will be made which will provide information about the number of people requiring services in each sector and then services will be provided according to those assessments as much as possible depending on donor funding availability and agency capacity. However, the assessments conducted by the IFRC TPAT teams do not provide information about the number of beneficiaries for each sector. There is little information available, from assessment reports or in talking with staff verbally, on why and how the agency made the sectoral level choices and whether it would have been better to cover a smaller number of people with all or most of the sectors rather than concentrating so much of the resources in the food sector. Thus, a clearer rationale could be present from its assessment report with the agency in future for the sectoral choices that it makes.

#### **RELEVANCE AND APPROPRIATENESS**

**Did the assessments carried out by PRCS staff and volunteers, the field assessment and coordination team (FACT), and later by the transitional planning assistance team (TPAT), provide an adequate picture of the communities affected by the floods, including their locations and needs? How did this affect the planning for the relief phase of the operation?**

The agency undertook a series of assessments to identify the needs of the flood-affected communities. One set of assessments was conducted by the Field Assessment Coordination Team during August and September 2010, which was supposed to become the basis for the launch of the IFRC appeal. However, unfortunately, no assessment report was available from the work done by the FACT. In talking with staff and reviewing the secondary documents, it is clear that the FACT faced significant management and leadership hurdles that undermined its effectiveness. However, according to staff, even without a report, its informally available information influenced the appeal. The Transitional Planning Assessment Team (TPAT) took over from the FACT during September 2010 and completed the task of producing assessments reports for each sector, which are of a high quality. Both the FACT and the TPAT focused on the macro picture and used secondary information, interviews with government officials and IFRC/PRCS staff and visits to a limited number of villages as their main sources of information.

The assessments by these two teams served the purpose of defining the agency's sectors and the type of interventions in each one of them. However, the TPAT reports did not make any recommendations in terms of the total budget and the number of beneficiaries to be targeted in each sector. As such, there is a gap between the assessments conducted and the actual program size delivered for each sector. It seems that these specific sectoral outcomes, rather than being determined by assessment findings, were determined by what the IFRC was able to obtain from different donors or PRCS capacity. While it is understandable that the agency programming size across different sectors will depend on funding availability and agency capacity, the agency would have been a better position to approach donors with specific sectoral targets in mind or looked into supplementing PRCS capacity had the TPAT assessments provided such targets. Beyond the individual sectoral assessment reports produced by each technical sub-team, there could have been an exercise done by the whole team that prioritized the various sectors and came up with an overall assessment report that gave some sense of the size of each sector and the rationale for the sizes recommended.

The PRCS also undertook detailed assessments within each village where aid was delivered, which mainly focused on identifying the number of beneficiaries and their exact identity in each village. These assessments did not affect the choice of sectors and interventions as these had been identified already by the FACT and TPAT. There were some issues with the quality of these assessments with respect to the targeting of the most vulnerable as discussed in the "Coverage" section.

**To what extent, were the strategies employed to meet the needs and priorities identified by the targeted communities, tailored to the local context? To what extent did the intervention support the targeted communities' own problem-solving and decision-making to address local needs?**

The communities expressed a high degree of satisfaction with the quality and quantity of food items and consistently rated them higher than those given by other agencies. The NFIs were also appreciated although, as already described earlier, there were some issues with the blankets, knife and some expired goods. However, the main negative issue related to the lateness of the aid, as also already mentioned earlier. People were also very keen to receive more cash than in-kind food. Currently, the macro nature of the assessments conducted by the TPAT means that the nature of aid in each village was not really based on actual assessments within it. Undertaking such village-specific assessments and then responding accordingly would not have been feasible given the scale of the operation and the need to respond quickly. However, more reliance on cash, wherever possible depending on whether markets are functioning, would have allowed the

agency to meet both goals---respond more quickly and give people the right chose the exact type of aid they need according to their own situation. This would have made the agency’s aid be more in line with people’s own problem-solving strategies. People in 14 of the visited communities visited mentioned that food was available in the local markets when they got it in-kind from IFRC and that they would have preferred cash. People also generally identified water as their second most important need after food in 12 of the 18 communities. However, the targets for WatSan sectors were set by the IFRC at only around 16% of the food sector.

**Were the operation’s strategies and priorities in line or complement those of the authorities and other international humanitarian actors? If not, why?**

The targeting of communities was almost entirely based on the information provided by the district officials. However, this high degree of coordination with government agencies could ironically have been a negative point as the district officials themselves had not undertaken any detailed assessments, lacking the capacity to do so, and often were responding to political pressures in identifying vulnerable communities for aid agencies. Thus, while the IFRC and PRCS should certainly have coordinated with the government officials, it would have been better to further validate the information given by them through its own independent assessments of geographical priorities.

**EFFECTIVENESS**

**To what extent has the Floods Operation achieved the proposed objectives of the relief phase?**

The following table reflects the degree to which the agency was able to achieve its targets and objectives in different sectors:

<b>Sector</b>	<b>Number of families reached</b>	<b>Percentage of target</b>
Relief	199,799	147%
Shelter-Relief	83,074	108%
Health	105,900	138
Water and sanitation	31,300	104
Livelihoods	2,000	100%

The agency has been able to significantly exceed its objectives in the relief and health sectors, and met its objectives in the shelter-relief, livelihoods and WatSan sectors. However, as discussed briefly earlier, it is not entirely clear why these lopsided objectives and targets were set in different sectors, ranging from 2000 for livelihoods and 199.799 for relief. In looking at the

priorities mentioned by 12 out of 18 communities during the FGDs, their livelihoods and water needs were not met.

**What NS/IFRC mechanisms and tools were used to promote good practice?**

The Federation used a number of mechanism and tools to promote good practice. Despite some of the problems mentioned in the assessment sections, the FACT and TPAT missions helped in undertaking thorough assessments which provided invaluable help in launching the appeal and developing the POA. The ERUs helped in ensuring a high level of productivity and high technical standards. The use of RDRTs helped in enhancing management and technical capacity in later months. The deployment of accountability delegates helped in getting this aspect of the response off the ground although considerable work still needs to be done to firmly institute accountability issues within future programs.

**What were the factors that helped to move the Floods Operation effectively forward, and what factors hindered progress?**

Based on the interviews with staff and field observations, the following is a summary of the factors that facilitated or hindered the flood operations:

<b>Facilitating factors</b>	<b>Hindering factors</b>
The ability of the IFRC and PNSs to mobilize staff, teams, funds and equipment internationally	High volunteer turnover within PRCS and general low capacity within some sectors
The large size of the volunteer base of the PRCS	Lack of consensus and coordination among and between IFRC and PRCS
The enhanced capacity that the PRCS had developed before the floods in responding to other emergencies in certain sectors	IFRC’s stringent procurement requirements
The pre-existing presence of IFRC in Pakistan and experience in responding to previous emergencies	The scale of the operation and the access issues initially faced
The use of ERUs, RDRT and TPAT	Lack of signed agreement for IFRC with government

Recommendations are provided later to deal with the program-related hindering factors

**What changes in capacity, capability, understanding and learning have occurred within the PRCS as a result of the operation so far? Are these appropriate?**

There has been a significant increase in the capacity of the PRCS both before and during the flood. In terms of the pre-flood increase, the most impressive improvement has been in the area of water which was not traditionally seen by the PRCS as an area of operation. However, due to the experience that it gained during previous emergencies, it was able to manage several water ERUS on its own, with at most some technical inputs provided by people deployed from

different national societies. This reduced the need for full-scale ERU international deployments. PRCS staff at the district level also felt that they learnt a lot about the management of large-scale relief distributions by working alongside internationally deployed relief staff during this emergency. The PRCS also obtained equipment, vehicles and office space as a result of the resources left behind by deployed staff during this operation.

However, it is also true, as generally acknowledged by PRCS itself, that significant international deployment will still be needed in the future too for any large-scale emergency. The most crucial capacity gap is at the district level, which is also the main program implementing level within the PRCS. The PRCS relies on a combination of at most 2-3 paid staff and a large number of volunteers at the district level. However, the paid staff are generally fairly junior-level and inexperienced people who do not have the technical and managerial capacities to supervise large-scale emergency operations while the volunteer base suffers from a high degree of turnover. Thus, the PRCS has to enhance its capacities at the district level significantly. There is also some degree of capacity gap at the provincial and even the national level as there is an abundance within the PRCS of people with commercial, military and government backgrounds who do not have a strong background in the humanitarian sector. Thus, there is a need to increase humanitarian capacity at the highest levels of the PRCS.

**To what extent were relevant recommendations from the Review of the Pakistan Earthquake Operation: 2005 -2008 implemented, and how did this impact the operation?**

Not even one staff interviewed within Pakistan expressed familiarity with the recommendations of the Earthquake 2005 evaluation report. Thus, overall, there has been no explicit attempt to keep those recommendations in mind during the relief phase. Many of the lessons included in that report also pertained to the early recovery phase. According to IFRC staff, they have been incorporated in the early recovery framework. According to IFRC staff, the FACT and TPAT teams did keep these lessons in mind while undertaking their assessments even though there is no official record of that. The report was also provided to deployed staff and referenced by AP staff in the development of overall strategy.

**EFFICIENCY**

**Could the operation have adopted more cost effective alternative strategies or approaches to achieve the same results? Did the use of global tools - RDRT, FACT, ERUS etc contribute to a more efficient operation?**

According to the figures provided by the agency, relief services constituted 76% of its total budget while administrative costs were 24% of the total budget. This compares favorably with

the average (79%) of this ratio for the 13 DEC agencies that the evaluator had recently evaluated. Since the agency did not provide detailed budgets, an analysis of efficiency in various sectors or provinces could not be undertaken. This ratio was relatively lower as many of the expatriates (e.g., FACT members), vehicles and equipment were donated as in-kind to IFRC and did not come off its budget. On the PRCS side, PRCS staff in all three provincial offices mentioned that the reliance on volunteers rather than paid staff reduced their administrative costs, though precise figures were not readily available. Bulk centralized purchases of food aid helped in reducing purchasing costs, according to IFRC Islamabad and KL logistics staff. The use of ERUs and FACT reduced costs for the country program since these costs are borne by national societies and not charged to the country program appeal. RDRT is charged to the national budget and hence reduced cost-efficiency. However, this was unavoidable due to low PRCS capacity. Future increases in cost-efficiency will thus largely depend on enhancing the capacity of PRCS, as discussed elsewhere in the report.

## **COVERAGE**

### **Could the IFRC have expanded its appeal to cover more of the affected communities?**

Coverage can be viewed from the point of view of whether the people targeted by the agency were the most vulnerable or not. The PRCS generally focused on the regions and villages identified by the district government officials. As such, there was considerable variation in the vulnerability of the various locations targeted by the PRCS. The locations included large towns on the main road where vulnerability was low and resilience high and highly isolated and marginalized villages where vulnerability was high and resilience low. To begin with at the district level, the NDMA had early during the emergency provided a list of all districts affected by floods and divided them into severely and medium affected ones list attached in appendix). The IFRC/PRCS covered districts of both types. Focusing mainly on the severely affected districts would have given greater geographical focus and reduced logistical and financial burden. Within villages, there were wide variations found in almost every village in the type of families provided aid, with some beneficiaries having large concrete houses and others living in straw huts or tents, as shown below in the photos. The evaluator found significant complaints among people about targeting in around half the villages. Thus, there is a need to improve targeting within villages. This could have been done by focusing on a smaller number of villages (e.g., the most isolated ones in terms of the distance from main towns and those with the highest percentage of houses destroyed) and increasing the number of people covered in each village. Currently, the 18 communities visited included around 6 which were main towns or villages close to the main towns. This also needed clearer and more consistent criteria across different

places and communicating them to all PRCS field staff engaged in distributions. Currently, the evaluator could not find any consistent criteria being used across all villages even in the same province. The staff accompanying the evaluator mentioned at least half a dozen different criteria (including number of family members, disadvantaged status in terms of being widow, disabled etc. and damage incurred) with no clear idea of their order of priority. However, in almost all villages, the evaluator did not find these criteria being uniformly applied. While there was no time to develop a proper record of such inconsistencies, they were far too numerous to be accidental.



There was also a disproportion in coverage across provinces in terms of the percentage of people covered by the IFRC/PRCS: KP-10%, Punjab-6% and Sindh-7.8%. Thus, the coverage in Sindh and Punjab was lower even though these were the two most badly affected and poorest regions.

Coverage can also be reviewed from the point of view of whether there were unmet needs that the RC did not meet. Clearly, there were huge unmet needs even in the villages that the evaluator visited. The agency only gave food that lasted for 1-1.5 months while people in around 15 villages mentioned that they faced food shortages for 4-5 months. As revealed by the transect walks that the evaluator undertook, many people within the villages visited were not targeted with food or NFI even though they were as vulnerable as those helped by the agency in the opinion of the evaluator based on their condition of housing, number of family members or assets lost in floods. Permanent shelter, water and health needs were also rampant in more than half the villages but have not been addressed by any agency. Finally, while there was little time to visit non-targeted villages formally, in looking for targeted villages, the evaluation team did stop at several villages that had not received any sort of help from any agency. While it was not possible to collect detailed statistical information about these unmet needs due to time constraint, the unmet needs were of a high magnitude even based on the quick and informal transect walks undertaken. Obviously, funding and capacities limit the ability of the agency to meet all these



needs. However, if additional funding is made available, it would be advisable for IFRC and PRCS to conduct detailed surveys on water and shelter for the early recovery phase.

## **IMPACT**

**How did the support provided to the targeted communities impact on their well-being? What were the positive and negative consequences/changes in the communities as a result of the support provided?**

Most of the agency's interventions had a highly positive impact on beneficiaries as narrated by communities. The analysis here is limited to the food, NFI and hygiene promotion activities as the communities visited had only benefited from these activities.

### **Food aid**

- The number of meals that people were having per day increased from 1 to 3 after the distribution of RC food according to people in every community given food
- This increased food intake adequate sustenance to women, children and men and increased their ability to engage in repair and income activities
- The need to take loans for food purchases decreased after the food aid distribution
- The need to sell animals to purchase food reduced after the food aid distribution

### **NFIs**

- According to community testimonies, the mosquito nets helped reduce malaria and fever, especially among children, though in one community people reported that they were not properly informed that the nets are medicated and they developed some skin problems due to improper handling of the nets. Government figures for malaria and fever were not available for the villages covered specifically by the Federation.
- The tools given as part of the NFIs helped people greatly in repairs and livelihoods activities
- The NFIs reduced the need for taking loans and selling animals to replace the household items lost

### **Hygiene promotion**

- Hygiene promotion activities helped reduce the incidence of disease and increased people's knowledge about hygiene issue, according to community testimonies. KAP studies were not available for further verification.

However, the impact could have been higher had cash distributions been used during the relief phase, had targeting been better and had RC responded earlier.

### **CONNECTEDNESS**

**To what extent did activities planned and carried out during the relief phase take into account the longer term recovery aspects? Cite examples where this was done.**

With respect to the long-term impact of the relief phase, some of the activities did create some long-term impact. For example, the hygiene promotion activities have improved hygiene practices in the long-run. Some of the NFI items, such as tools, mosquito nets, kitchen items, tents and tarpaulins, will last for 2-3 years. While their paper life expectancy is around 6 months according to IFRC, people in poor communities are generally able to stretch this life through careful use and repair considerably. Some of the latrines built in schools and villages will also last several years. There has also been some long-term improvement in PRCS capacity, as discussed earlier.

With respect to the connectedness between the relief and early recovery phase, some linkages do exist. The early recovery phase is targeting some of the same areas where the relief activities were conducted. As such, the agency will benefit from its prior knowledge about those communities even though the high turnover within the PRCS will reduce some of this connectedness. The agency is focusing on providing cash for shelter construction and agricultural inputs during the early recovery phase. Both the shelter construction and agricultural activities during the early recovery phase will benefit from the tools given during the relief phase. The food aid given during the relief phase has also given people more physical strength and economic resources (by reducing the need to take loans or sell animals) to engage in shelter construction and agricultural work.

### **ACCOUNTABILITY**

**Is there a beneficiary feedback mechanism, and how effective is it?**

Accountability mechanisms were generally absent in all the communities visited during the evaluation. People were not informed in writing or even verbally about the exact items they will receive when tokens were given, unlike some other agencies who had printed the items list on

the back of the token. People were not consulted about their needs at the village level and received the same general package given across all provinces. In Punjab and Sindh, people were generally not involved in the process of selecting the specific beneficiaries within the village. The agency has recently started a national beneficiary communication program involving radio and TV programs and SMSs. However, none of the communities visited had exposure to any of these mechanisms. IFRC staff maintain that community-level complain mechanisms have been instituted. However, no formal compliant mechanisms were found in any of the communities visited, according to the information obtained in all FGDs. Nor did any of the PRCS field staff exhibit any knowledge about complaint and accountability mechanisms.

## **CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNT**

The IFRC/PRCS response to the Pakistan floods 2010 was a large and complex one, encompassing three provinces, six sectors and a huge budget. The strongest point of the response is its sheer size as it reached nearly 10% of the flood-affected people in Pakistan. The strong adherence to most of the principles in the RC Code of conduct and the high degree of satisfaction of communities with the quantity and quality of the food aid were among its other strengths. The program has clearly had a multi-faceted impact in improving the socio-economic condition of the targeted communities. However, several areas of improvement can also be identified as follows:

- There is a disjunct between the various assessments conducted and the actual program delivered in the sense that it is not clear how the relative size of the sectors was determined. The assessments themselves did not suggest any overall sizes for the various sectors and this choice seems to have been made largely based on agency capacity and donor allocations. While this is understandable, having a clear idea of level of needs in each sector would have helped the agency somewhat in influencing donor allocations and increasing PRCS capacity in certain sectors, as has happened even now for many sectors.
- The response was quite late in reaching people due to a combination of slow donor allocations, overly-stringent IFRC procurement allocations and the reluctance of the PRCS to initially request various forms of international deployments.
- Program operations were also affected by the large number of international deployments of relatively short durations which undermined continuity and program ownership. This was unavoidable for the current response due to low PRCS capacity but does highlight a need to enhance PRCS capacity for future

- There was also insufficient coordination and communication among IFRC and PRCS which resulted in wastage of time and sub-optimal decision-making and use of resources
- PRCS capacity, especially at the district levels, is low due to the high turnover among volunteers and a shortage of people with a strong humanitarian background.
- The focus on the most vulnerable regions and families was mixed with some low vulnerability regions and families selected along with those with high vulnerability. There were significant unmet needs within and beyond communities that RC did not meet
- People's participation and accountability over the agency was low. There was also insufficient information provision and a general absence of complaint mechanisms with the result that the agency's programs caused conflicts and grievances in around 8 of the 18 places visited.
- While people were generally happy with the contents of the food packages and most of the items within the NFI packages, some items in the latter were inappropriate.
- Cash was not utilized as an intervention in the emergency phase even though there was high demand for it within communities due to PRCS reservations based on past negative experiences. Cash would have allowed the agency to respond faster and cheaper and more in line with people's specific needs in many though obviously not all places.
- Insufficient attention could be paid to developing the capacities of communities during the relief phase due to time constraints and scale of operation. There was insufficient focus on livelihoods activities during the emergency phase, partly due to PRCS reservations given that it had little prior experience in this sector.
- There is an absence of formal and effective tools for incorporating past lessons and documenting current lessons, except in the case of the WatSan sector.
- Compliance with Sphere has been mixed, partially due to funding shortage but also due to the absence of a clear rationale for the relative size of various sectors.
- There is an absence of an integrated contingency planning mechanism which could help to develop a consensus before an emergency and facilitate quick response.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### 1) Develop a participatory contingency plan for joint IFRC/PRCS emergency response

Given the significant lack of consensus that emerged within the operations, it is recommended that the IFRC and the PRCS develop a comprehensive contingency plan for future emergencies which includes a hazard profile, possible responses in different types of emergencies, clear guidelines for levels and types of international deployments needed for different emergency responses and other key components of the response.

### 2) Develop clearer rationale for geographical and sectoral focus and targeting of the most vulnerable

The assessments that the IFRC (FACT and TPAT) and PRCS undertake could provide a clearer rationale for the relative weight of different sectors so that fund-raising can be done accordingly as well as clear guidelines for targeting the most vulnerable regions and families. The PRCS is advised to aim to focus on the 10% most vulnerable of the emergency affected people rather than any 10% of them. While it can continue to coordinate strongly with the district officials, it would be good to develop mechanisms for verifying the information given by them to target the most vulnerable people in the district.

### 3) Use cash more widely during the emergency phase

The use of cash can enhance the speed, cost-efficiency, relevance and appropriateness of the agency's relief-phase response. While certain sectors cannot be replaced by cash, for example health, water and sanitation, cash could be an effective substitute for significant portions of the food aid and NFI response. The mechanisms being developed for cash distributions for the early recovery phase could be adapted before the next emergency for the relief phase. While it is understood that PRCS is reluctant to engage in cash (and livelihoods) activities, the results of this evaluation clearly reveal the preferences of the communities. Thus, the PRCS is advised to review its position in light of these preferences.

### 4) Increase focus on livelihoods activities during emergency phase

The agency is advised to also focus more on livelihoods activities during the emergency phase as this helps in making communities self-reliant and leveraging the value for money from programs. There can be a special emphasis on focusing on women in such programs, for example by supporting livestock, poultry, handicraft and home gardening activities within communities.

5) Enhance accountability mechanisms at community levels

Accountability to communities could be enhanced significantly. This will require a more concerted effort at the global level, including developing a humanitarian framework for the agency as well as earlier deployment of accountability delegates during the relief phase. Accountability mechanisms can focus on providing greater information to communities about the mandate of the agency, the exact goods and services to be distributed (e.g., by printing them on the back side of the tokens) and the exit strategy. These mechanisms can also focus on enhancing the involvement of communities in relevant decisions (e.g., the sectoral choices, the people to be selected for aid in a community) through participatory assessments as well as implementation (e.g., by using village committees to more actively manage the distribution). Finally, complaint mechanisms can be instituted by giving the contact information for senior staff in writing as well as verbally (e.g., by putting posters with contact information and complain procedures outside mosques).

6) Enhance PRCS capacity significantly, especially at the district level

At the national and provincial levels within the PRCS, a greater emphasis to recruit people with strong humanitarian backgrounds rather than commercial or military backgrounds would be advisable. At the district levels, there could be a focus on hiring more experienced persons as DMOs rather than immediately appointing volunteers to these positions. To reduce turnover within the volunteer base, PRCS could focus not only on young males, who are very mobile vocationally, but also other age groups and females, who may be less mobile. PRCS could also look into training its non-DM staff working in regular paid positions in disaster management work so that they can be deployed for emergency work during disasters. There could also be an attempt within the IFRC to place more Pakistanis into FACT, TPAT and RDRT so that the pool of qualified Pakistanis available to work with the IFRC and PRCS during emergencies increases. There is also a need for improved volunteer management, finance management, relationship management with IFRC and PNSs as part of a contingency planning process.

7) Relax logistical and financial procedures to allow faster response

Most large-scale relief agencies have adopted fast-track procurement procedures for the first 2-3 months. The increased risk introduced by these procedures can be minimized by maintaining a roster of reliable suppliers as part of the contingency planning exercise. A detailed analysis of

such issues and their solution is beyond the remit of this report. However, the report still adds value by showing the links between these issues and impact on field level program quality.

8) Develop a stronger MIS system

IFRC and PRCS are advised to also develop better MIS and documentation systems. The purpose would be to have the evaluation criteria for any emergency clear right from the start so that information along those criteria can be constantly collected. This will help make key documents and information more easily available for evaluators at the end of the project. More importantly, it will also help the senior management of the IFRC and PRCS track progress towards those criteria right throughout the emergency and take remedial action in case progress is weak along some criteria.

9) Better systems for lessons incorporation and documentation

The IFRC and PRCS are advised to develop stronger mechanisms to incorporate previous lessons into current emergencies. This can be done by having one-page bullet format summaries of previous lessons available for all staff, holding quick, one-hour lessons incorporation meetings during the early part of the emergency at various levels and sending periodic reminders from the management to all staff to keep the lessons in mind.

10) Undertake evaluations earlier and with greater consensus

It would be advisable to have a clear plan, shared by all levels of the IFRC and PRCS, to conduct an evaluation in a timely manner close to the end of the emergency phase. The planning of the evaluation should ideally start much earlier given the complex and multi-layered nature of the agencies involved. The agency may also look to recruit a team consisting of at least one male and one female so that both types of beneficiaries can be approached during the evaluation.

11) Review the contents of the NFI package

As mentioned in the report, some of the NFI items, such as knives, blankets, tarpaulins etc., were not found appropriate by field level staff or beneficiaries. It would be advisable for IFRC and PRCS to review their appropriateness.

## APPENDIX

### Evaluation TORs

Attached

#### Evaluation Timeline

June 9-12	Desk review and preparation
June 13-15	Travel to Kuala Lumpur
June 16	Meetings with relevant IFRC Asia staff
June 17	Travel to Pakistan
June 18-19	Meetings with relevant IFRC/PRCS staff in Islamabad and the evaluation team
June 20-21	Meetings with KPK field staff Field work in Nowshera KPK Travel back to Islamabad and Karachi
June 22	Meetings with IFRC and PRCS, Sindh staff Travel to rural Sindh
June 23-25	Meetings with PRCS field staff Field work in Larkana, Shikarpur and Khairpur Travel to Islamabad
June 27-29	Travel to Lahore Meetings with PRCS Punjab staff Travel to Multan (8 am-23 <sup>rd</sup> June) Meetings with IFRC and PRCS field staff Field work in Muzaffargarh, and Layyah Fly back to Islamabad
July 1	9-11---Presentation of initial findings 11-5pm --Meetings in Islamabad
July 2-3	Travel back to the US
July 5-17	Preparation of first draft
July 18-24	Review and feedback by RC
July 24-July 31	Preparation of final draft

#### Communities Visited

##### KP

- Akora Khattak, Nowshera
- Nowshera Qalan, Nowshera
- Mishik, Nowshera

##### Sindh



- Hatri Ghulam Shah, Larkana
- Mehel Khan Jatoi, Larkana
- Hakra, Larkana
- Murad Ali Jatoi, Khairpur
- Mohammed Jatoi, Khairpur
- Hussain Bux Jatoi, Khairpur
- Yusuf Bhatti, Shikarpur
- K.B. Allah Bux Soomro, Shikarpur
- Bhudo Burro, Shikarpur

### **Punjab**

- Moza Baut Wasawa Karluwala, Liyyah
- Paharpur Nasher, Liyyah
- Basti Piranwala, Liyyah
- Basti Nutqani, Muzzafargarh
- Basti Nutqani Hanjara, Muzzafargarh
- Chak Bajewala, Muzzafargarh

### **People Interviewed**

#### **Kuala Lumpur**

- Al Panico, Acting Head of Operations
- Alka Kapoor / Jeremy Francis , Regional Procurement/ Logistics Coordinator
- Sharil Dewa, Senior Planning and Reporting Officer
- Drew Strobel, Ops coordinator
- Jim Catampongan, Emergency Health Coordinator
- John Gwynn, Organisational Development Coordinator
- Nigel Ede, Recovery Delegate

#### **Islamabad**

- Ateeb Siddiqui, Director of Operations , PRCS
- Azmat Ulla, Former HoD, Pak; current HoRD South Asia, IFRC (by phone)
- Bilal Shah, Relief Officer, IFRC
- Caroline Austin, Beneficiary Comms, IFRC
- Daniel Wood, DM&E Delegate, IFRC
- Dr. Munis Sajid, Deputy Director, Gender (Beneficiary Comms), PRCS
- John Punter, Logistic Coordinator, IFRC
- Katheryn Clarkson, WatSan, IFRC Zone
- Minajul Haq, Larkana Delegate, IFRC
- Mohammed Ubaid Ullah Khan, DD DM, PRCS
- Raj Zafar, Cooperation Officer, IFRC

- Steen Frederiksen, Acting HOD, Pakistan, IFRC
- Ted Itani, Team Leader, FACT, Ex-IFRC (by phone)
- Thu Rein Maung Maung, WatSan Delegate, IFRC

#### **KP**

- Syed Ali Hassan, Provincial Secretary, KP PRCS

#### **Punjab**

- Mohammed Akram, Provincial Coordinator, PRCS
- Sune Bulow, Multan Delegate, IFRC

#### **Sindh**

- Abdul Zahoor, Volunteer Team Leader, PRCS Larkana
- Kamran Abbas, DMO, Shikarpur, PRCS
- Kanwar Waseem, Secretary, PRCS Sindh
- Mohammed Sajid, WatSan Officer, PRCS Larkana
- Rajab Ali, Health Motivator, PRCS Larkana
- Shahid Hussain, DMO, PRCS, Khairpur
- Sikder Ahmed, Field Delegate, Sindh, IFRC

#### **Documents Reviewed**

- End of Mission Report, WatSan ERU
- IFRC Earthquake 2005 Pakistan Evaluation Report
- KP PRCS Annual Report 2010
- Operational Updates, Pakistan Monsoon floods, August 2010 to June 2011
- Pakistan Red Crescent Society/IFRC Monitoring and Evaluation pilot Draft Report
- PRCS Water and Sanitation 2010 Flood Response Lessons Learnt Workshop, May, 2011
- Real time evaluation of IFRC response to 2010 Pakistan floods
- Real time evaluation of RDRT deployment to Pakistan Floods operation, 2010-2011
- TPAT Assessments Reports, WatSan, Livelihoods, Shelter and Health
- WatSan Lessons Learnt Report, June 2011
- WatSan Report, IFRC Pakistan
- Mega Disasters Meeting Report

#### **Evaluations Instruments**

**Questionnaire for RC Staff  
Pakistan Flood Response evaluation  
June 2011**

### **Compliance**

- 1) What systems and processes did RC have in place to ensure compliance with COC and Sphere standards?
- 2) Does the agency have any data that shows the extent to which Sphere standards were met in the relief phase in each sectoral area?
- 3) What is your own subjective assessment of compliance with COC and Sphere standards during the relief phase?
- 4) What factors inhibited and facilitated the above compliance?
- 5) What measures do you think are needed for increasing compliance in future?

### **Relevance and appropriateness**

- 1) Did the assessments carried out by PRCS staff and volunteers, the field assessment and coordination team (FACT), and later by the transitional planning assistance team (TPAT), provide an adequate picture of the communities affected by the floods, including their locations and needs? How did this affect the planning for the relief phase of the operation?
- 2) To what extent, were the strategies employed to meet the needs and priorities identified by the targeted communities, tailored to the local context? How well did the intervention take into account the economic, social, political and environmental context?
- 3) Were the operation's strategies and priorities in line or complement those of the authorities and other international humanitarian actors? If not, why?
- 4) To what extent did the intervention support the targeted communities' own problem-solving and decision-making to address local needs?
- 5) What steps are needed to enhance the relevance and appropriateness of the agency's relief programs in future?

### **Effectiveness**

- 1) To what extent has the Floods Operation achieved the proposed objectives of the relief phase? Is there any data or reports that show the overall objectives in various sectors and regions and the extent to which they were met?
- 2) What NS/IFRC mechanisms and tools were used to promote good practice (e.g. Sphere, BPI, emergency assessment tools, Plan of Action template, VCA etc)? How effective were they?
- 3) What were the factors that helped to move the Floods Operation effectively forward, and what factors hindered progress?
- 4) What changes in capacity, capability, understanding and learning have occurred within the PRCS as a result of the operation so far? Are these appropriate? What else is still needed?

- 5) To what extent were relevant recommendations from the **Review of the Pakistan Earthquake Operation: 2005 -2008** implemented, and how did this impact the operation? Please identify the three recommendations out of the 28 that you think were implemented the most and the three that have been implemented the least? What needs to be done to better implement these recommendations? (Annex: list of 28 recommendations)

#### **Efficiency**

- 1) What major steps did the agency adopt to enhance cost-effectiveness in the relief phase? How successful were these steps?
- 2) Could the operation have adopted more cost effective alternative strategies or approaches to achieve the same results?
- 3) Did the use of global tools - RDRT, FACT, ERUS etc contribute to a more efficient operation in the relief phase? Please describe these tools and share any documentation?
- 4) Is there any data or report that shows the overall administrative expenditure percentage within the overall budget at the national and provincial level? Is there any data that compares the agency's cost-effectiveness with past emergencies or with other agencies?
- 5) What can be done to enhance cost-effectiveness in the future?

#### **Coverage**

- 1) Did the agency's relief programs target the most badly affected districts and sub-regions identified by the NDMA?
- 2) What criteria did the agency use to identify geographical areas? How effective do you think the approach was?
- 3) Could the IFRC have expanded its appeal to cover more of the affected communities?
- 4) How can the agency improve its coverage and targeting for the future?

#### **Connectedness**

- 1) To what extent did activities planned and carried out during the relief phase take into account the longer term recovery aspects? Cite examples where this was done.
- 2) What factors inhibited and facilitated connectedness during the relief phase?
- 3) How can the agency improve its connectedness for the future?

#### **Impact**

- 1) How did the support provided to the targeted communities impact on their well-being?

- 2) What were the positive and negative consequences/changes in the communities as a result of the support provided?
- 3) What factors inhibited and facilitated impact?
- 4) Are there any reports that document the nature of impact?
- 5) How can the agency enhance its impact in the future?

**Accountability to beneficiaries**

- 1) What systems and processes does the agency have to enhance accountability to communities?
- 2) Is there a beneficiary feedback mechanism, and how effective is it?
- 3) What mechanisms exist to incorporate community perspectives into program planning, design, implementation and review? Please share any relevant documentation
- 4) How can accountability be improved in the future?

**Questionnaire for Community Focus Group Discussions  
Pakistan Flood Response evaluation  
June 2011**

**Guidelines for FGDs**

- Introduce yourselves (name and agency)
- Inform the community that you are here to get their feedback about their satisfaction with the relief services that they received from the RC during August 2010 and February 2011 so that the agency can improve its services in the future
- Thank people for giving their time during a busy time of the year
- Encourage people to speak freely and honestly and assure them that any negative feedback that they give will not hurt their chances of getting help from RC in the future and that the evaluators will not share the name of people who make critical remarks with the RC local staff
- Speak politely and sensitively with people even if some of them make provocative remarks
- Please do not make any culturally or politically insensitive remarks
- Please do not make any promises of help to the people and make it clear that you are not here to identify people for future aid
- Encourage all sections of the group to speak rather than just the leaders
- Probe appropriately in case people are giving unclear or general or vague answers

- Thank people again in the end and tell them that their views will help the agency improve its services in the future

### **Relevance/appropriateness**

- 1) What were the five most important needs that people in this community have immediately after the floods?
- 2) What services did RC provide?
- 3) Which priority needs did the agency not cover during its relief programs?
- 4) Were the exact packages in each sector relevant to your local area culture and requirements (ask about each sector one by one)?
- 5) If not, what can the agency do to make the services in the identified sectors more relevant for your needs?
- 6) What was the community doing on its own to address the priority needs? Did the agency's work help or hinder those efforts? Please give examples
- 7) What help did the community get from other agencies and did RC help duplicate or compliment that help?

### **Effectiveness** (ask about each sector one by one) for each question?

- 1) How soon after the floods did the agency provide services in different sectors?
- 2) Was the help provided by the agency sufficient for the community in different sectors?
- 3) How can the agency enhance the effectiveness of its services in the future?

### **Impact**

- 1) What impact has the services in each sector had on people's lives?
- 2) Which sector has had the most impact and why?
- 3) Which sector had the least impact and why?
- 4) What can the agency do to enhance impact in the future?

### **Connectedness/coherence**

- 1) The services provided by the agency were designed to help people immediately. Burt did the program in any sector help the community in a way that will benefit the community for a long time? Please describe which service and how?
- 2) What can the agency do to enhance the long-term duration of the impact of its services?

### **Accountability**

- 1) Did the agency consult the people about their requirements before starting its programs?
- 2) If so, was the help that it gave in line with what the people had asked for each of the main needs?
- 3) Did the agency involve the people during the implementation and if so how?
- 4) Did the people have any way of making complaints and if so were any complaints made? What type and what was the reaction of the agency?
- 5) How can the agency increase people's participation in its programs in the future?

