



**Afghanistan
Shelter and NFI Cluster
(North)**

**Review of the 2014
Flood Response**

Lessons Learned



Emergency Shelter and NFI Cluster (North)


Review of the 2014 Flood Response

Lessons Learned

Introduction

Between 24 April and 6 June 2014, the worst seasonal flooding for 100 years impacted 8 provinces in the North and North East of Afghanistan. Over 112,000 people were affected, 221 deaths were reported and some 8,000 homes were completely destroyed.

A relief effort by members of Shelter Cluster (North), coordinated with local authorities and other national and international organizations, assisted some 14,000 families. A Shelter Recovery Plan (SRP) was implemented and targeted 3,657 of the most vulnerable Category A families, those with fully destroyed houses. Winter assistance, a combination of NFIs and Cash/Voucher for fuel, targeted 3,800 families prioritizing those who had been forced to relocate their homes completely and those that had not received shelter assistance.



Fifty three districts affected by floods and landslides April- June 2104

A review of all phases of the response was conducted in February and March 2015. It comprised a survey of organizations implementing shelter recovery projects, joint observation missions to 8 recovery sites and a concluding meeting on 18 March. Much of the benefit of the review was derived through the exchange of ideas both during mutual site visits and in discussion at the final plenary. The findings are summarized in the following 6 sections:

- Relief Phase

- Recovery Planning
- Recovery Project Implementation
- Winter Assistance
- Gender Issues
- The Future

Relief Phase

Preparation. Humanitarian agencies and NGOs/INGOs can collectively improve their preparedness by strengthening partnerships at provincial and district level.¹ This should include preemptive. Routine liaison with authorities should aim to cement trusting and transparent relationships and ensure that, for example that PDMCs have a clear idea of the humanitarian actors' policies and procedures for joint assessments and of their capacities for response.

Coordination before Assistance. Organizations should not to rush to distribute assistance without consultation with wider coordination bodies from both the Provincial authorities and UN humanitarian agencies, specifically OHCA. This is to ensure that the greatest and most critical needs, rather than the easiest to access, are being addressed.



OCHA, IOM and UNHCR relief coordination with Khwaja du Koh District Authorities, Jawzjan 29 April
(Photo: Opolot UNHCR)

Emergency Shelter. Over 2,263 tents were distributed. Spontaneous camps were formed in 3 locations with major sustainability issues. If humanitarian actors are asked to provide emergency shelter great care should be taken before considering distribution of tents. Creation of camps is to be avoided. Tents can be distributed where they promote and support hosting arrangements which should be the primary emergency shelter strategy. **Tents distributed during the relief phase were well utilized during Recovery as victims undertook rebuilding of their homes.**

¹ This conclusion is central to UNICEF's after action review of its substantial contribution to the Relief Phase. COAR 2014 Lessons Learned After Action Review 21/22 October 2014



Spontaneous camps Takhur Province May 2014 (Photo: Concern Worldwide)

Assessment Information. Provincial and District authorities as well as individual communities are the initial source of disaster information. However, this was frequently inaccurate and misleading. In the case of Abi Berek in Badakshan Province, the initial announcement of 2,700 lives lost perpetuated and resulted in a massive excess of aid from within and outside Afghanistan.² It is widely understood that the death toll was in fact 53. Accuracy of assessment information is crucial. Over-estimation of needs whether deliberate or not can be damaging beyond simple resource implications. Risks can be minimized by:

- Joint participation of humanitarian organizations and local authorities in early assessments. The premise for this joint participation should be established preemptively.
- Cross referencing assessments and information between agencies and organizations.
- Comparison of population numbers with NSP data.
- Clarity of differentiation between families, households and houses /shelters

Rapid Assessment Form (RAF) A variety of formats was initially used to collate assessed information and, despite the guidance given in the SRP the use of different forms continued. Significant benefit would be derived by standardized use of the IOM Rapid Assessment Form (RAF) to collect and record community level information. This would ensure a comprehensive and consistent picture relevant to all Clusters. Completed and updated information should be shared as soon as possible with IOM and OCHA. It is acknowledged that a different format is required for house to house information from which beneficiary lists are derived.

Focal Points. In both Relief and Recovery Phases NGOs and Agencies were distracted by dealing with a multiplicity of government departments. PDMCs should be asked to nominate a primary focal point / line department with which the humanitarian community should deal to avoid duplication and confusion.

² Concern Worldwide/IOM Report Winterisation Assessment and Recommendations Takhar and Badakshan IDP Campsites 14/08 15 covers the consequences explicitly.

Operational Coordination Team (OCT) OCTs pre-established in all Provinces were effective in all phases of the response. OCT meetings were facilitated by OCHA and were attended by government entities, ARCS, and humanitarian organizations. The reasons for being effective include participation of key provincial humanitarian partners, information sharing, planning, prioritization, reporting, and follow-up. Improvements could include ensuring ANDMA functions as the linkage between the Provincial Disaster Management Committee (PDMC) process and humanitarian OCT coordination. It is notable that OCT structures do vary between provinces. Whilst individual provincial solutions may be preferable, in Baghlan concerted efforts should be made to engage the relevant line departments in the OCT.

Coordination of the North East Region. All the regular relief and recovery coordination meetings were held in Mazar I Sharif. Whilst information was gathered from dispersed OCHA and IOM offices communication and coordination was strained as distance increased. Coordination failed active NGOs such as Concern Worldwide operating in Takhar and Badakshan. Measures were taken to strengthen coordination through the conduct of two UNCHR missions and one OCHA mission. Efforts should be made to link main actors in the North East in key planning meetings by video or teleconference links.

Recovery Planning

Shelter Recovery Plan (SRP) The SRP concept was agreed by the shelter Cluster on 12 May and included:

- A focus on Cat A fully destroyed houses



Category A (Fully Destroyed) Khwaja du Koh, Jawzjan. (Photo: People in Need)

- The aim to replace Cat A with a 2 room permanent shelter based on the Shelter Cluster Guidelines
- **Inclusion of 1 metre high stone foundation (Build Back Better concept)**
- Recognition of the need for flexibility in the method of achieving the output
- Minimal variation of shelter solutions within districts and between neighboring areas
- To base planning initially on available PDMC data but to verify using RAF format
- Beneficiary selection criteria giving priority to the most vulnerable
- Shelter cluster Kabul's role to liaise with the central government

The SRP dated 26 June is at Annex A.

Shelter Standard and Design. THE SRP acknowledged the need for flexibility in the method of reaching the agreed standard design. However, in the course of its implementation there were major deviations from the standard, brought about by donor requirements and financial constraints. Three organizations implemented one room solutions. The Technical Working Group of the national Emergency Shelter and NFI Cluster has addressed this phenomenon and has developed a catalogue of standards. It has been proposed that, given cultural norms, boundary walls should be included in the catalogue. It is noted that NRC has a special package for female headed households in this respect.

Shelter Development Potential. Whilst designs varied, the overwhelming feedback drawn from the Field review was of beneficiary satisfaction with the shelter provided. Some beneficiaries had already begun extending the original provision. Most intended to do so when they had sufficient funds. Only in one project where a more transitional design was implemented, was there less intention to use the shelter as a basis for future development.

Latrines The inclusion of a latrine with each shelter was considered a significant protection and health component. However, beneficiaries did not accord the facilities the same level of importance. It is estimated only 60% of latrines were completed and are being used as intended. For some families a latrine was a new phenomenon. Approximately 20 % of latrines were unfinished with materials diverted to other structures. In other cases where the latrine was completed it remained either unused or utilized for a different purpose, such as storage or a livestock shelter. To at least ensure completion of latrines in future one approach could be to program the building of the latrine first and as a condition of support to construction of the shelter itself.

Inter Cluster Coordination Exploiting multi sector information comprehensively using RAF, the coherence of a humanitarian response in future would be greatly enhanced with improved communication and coordination between clusters, both in the Relief phase then in planning and implementing the Recovery.

Project Approval Process SRP (N) was shared with the central government. MRRD proposed a much larger shelter as a standard. It was not until 09 June 2014, that a decision was made to allocate ERF funds. A call for proposals was launched on 18 June 2014 and decisions on allocations on 22 June 2015. In the case of one national NGO funds were not received until October 2014 when winter conditions were already impacting mountainous areas. All stages could and should have been quicker. If central funding decisions require such a length of time, this should be taken into account when planning the approval process.

Factoring Vulnerable Families in Project Costs Project cost planning is based on the majority of beneficiary families being complete and male headed households without specific vulnerability. However, selection criteria rightly prioritize the most vulnerable families. In the case of the Flood Recovery project 1,423 (40%) of the shelters fell into this category. Whilst it is assumed that the community supports such families, this is frequently not the case. It is proposed that project planning should make provision for the additional resources required.

Factoring Terrain in Project Costs BoQs are calculated on a shelter being built on flat terrain and in ideal soil conditions. Consideration should be given to the additional resources both in quantities and time when it is known that the shelters are being implemented in mountainous areas, where both the gradient and rocky terrain impact severely. Some 30% of implementing organizations reported gradient and rocky terrain to have impacted implementation significantly.

- Preparation of foundations takes up to 3 times longer to prepare
- Up to 70% more foundation material is needed when construction is on a slope
- Additional time and costs are incurred in transporting construction materials to each shelter site
- The time taken for a site supervisor or engineer to move from one shelter to another is significantly greater, and diminishes their impact if a contingency is not factored in.



Mountainside shelter in Pul I Khumri, Baghlan Province (Photo: SHA)

Project Implementation Factors

All implementing organizations were asked to comment on the factors which impacted project implementation.

Weather The SRP targeted 31 October shelter recovery completion. With the exception of those organizations that had pre-existing funding and were able to begin implementation quickly, the delays in funding decisions pushed the implementation period into winter. All reported that the weather caused some delay. In 2 cases work was suspended in December with a view to restart in the Spring. One organization reported the weather being the critical factor in bringing about the redesign of the composition of its brickwork.



Construction delayed by winter in Abi Barek, Badakshan Province (Photo: Concern Worldwide)

Road Network Half the implementing organizations reported a significant impact of the road network. They commented on:

- Pre-existing paucity of road networks and access to sites
- Damage caused to existing networks caused by the floods and worsening winter conditions
- The strategic impact of the closure (by flood damage) of the Tangi Tashgurghan gap which effectively cut off four provinces of the Northern region from the rest of the country for 3 weeks
- Landslide and flood damage to the approaches to Gurzagahi Nur which denied access of significant relief convoys also for 3 weeks



Arterial route at Tangi Tashgurghan, Samangan (Photo: OCHA)

Availability of Construction Material The majority of implementing organizations reported that most construction materials were available local markets. However, inconsistent supply of roofing materials, in one case halted construction for two weeks. In Khwaja du Koh, Jawzjan Province where 469 shelters were built by PIN and WHH, foundation material became in very short supply. Given the shortage of

time one organization obtained a waiver to formal tendering process and one organization found the most cost effective arrangement was procurement of all construction materials from Kabul.

Availability of Water. The supply of water for construction purposes was a challenge at all but a few sites. In many cases the flooding itself destroyed or damaged water sources, networks and storage facilities. Importation of water either by tanker or pack animal was necessary at 80% of sites. At Abi Berek part of the project was to connect a new water source to 150 relocated shelters. An inter community dispute over the source caused one month's delay.

Availability of Labour

A general shortage of labour was experienced and the excess of demand over supply resulted in a 20% increase in unskilled and skilled labour costs to 300 AF and 800 AF per day respectively. In at least 3 sites the shortage of skilled labour was overcome by training programs which resulted in an additional unplanned, long term benefit to the affected community.

Land Ownership The prerequisite that beneficiaries have ownership of their land often results in the exclusion of the most vulnerable. NRC has established a method of securing temporary land ownership for the landless IDPs and impoverished host communities through signing an agreement between the target family, land owner and one of the community elders. It comprises the ownership of the user for a short period of one to three years and longer period of 3- 5 years, the most usual conditions are:

- Donation of a piece of land from relatives/ friends to the target family for the agreed period of time without any charge.
- Providing land against an agreed amount of cash or kind /year
- Leaving the built unit on the land to the owner after the agreed period of time.

Beneficiary Selection Most organizations reported that beneficiary selection was, as expected, the most challenging phase of their project. Inaccurate data gathered early in the crisis had to be updated and delayed many projects. It was particularly problematic where needs exceeded the resources available and prioritization left some Cat A victims unassisted. The SRP specified that Cat A only were to be targeted but most NGOs agreed in hindsight that there should be some margin of flexibility to include the most vulnerable Cat B victims. Of 3,657 beneficiaries, 1,423 were selected on basis of vulnerability as follows:

- Female headed household 178
- Elderly 460
- Disabled 59
- Very Large Family 373
- Other 353

Funding Flow There were 3 cases in which delays in funding impacted. One national NGO received its funds 6 weeks after international NGOs received theirs from the same donor. In one case the decision to

fund the project came only in November. In a third case (as at March 2015) one organization has received only 60% of the agreed project funding and is having to survive on institutional core funding.

Security An estimated 981 Cat A families were in areas considered inaccessible due to insecurity. Whilst these were not included in shelter assistance projects they were included in the Winter Assistance Cash/Voucher for Fuel scheme. Even in accessible areas where shelter projects were implemented, 80% of organizations reported that security incidents had impacted their projects. It is a sign of NGO commitment and professionalism that generally mitigation measures were found to minimize the risks and projects were able to continue. However, in Shirintigab, Faryab Province the security situation changed so radically as to have seriously disrupted NGO staff access to the site. Progress has been significantly delayed.

Design and Neighbouring Project Variations. The SRP determined that shelter solutions within districts and between neighbouring project areas should be uniform in order to avoid conflict and dispute. In the early stages this principle was maintained. However, as the initial simple division of areas became more complicated and more than one organization worked in a single district, deviations began to occur. In one case, whilst the design was consistent the methodology varied. The juxtaposition of cash for shelter by one organization and a combination of cash and material assistance by another did cause some tension. Furthermore, when a very welcome second phase of funding became available to address significant gaps it became conditional on the donor's specification of a one room shelter. Great care was taken by the implementing organizations to preempt potential difficulties with timely, sensitive and transparent explanation of the reasons for the variations.

Winter Assistance

Planning With initial assessment data gathered in April and May becoming rapidly out of date Shelter Cluster (North) conducted a reassessment of the needs in August. The aims of the reassessment were not only to better inform recovery planning and to add weight to advocacy with donors to address remaining gaps but also to prepare plans for winter assistance. A concept for the Winter Assistance was agreed on 22 August.

- **Winter Assistance would be provided to Cat A families who had received no shelter assistance**
 - Priority would also be given to the 'relocation groups'; those 4 groups comprising 436 families who due to the severity of the impact on their place of origin had had to reestablish their communities in new areas
- **Assistance would be in the form of cash or voucher for fuel**
 - Altitude of the affected communities would be factored into the amount of assistance given
 - Cash/vouchers would be complemented with an NFI component comprising UNICEF children's clothes and blankets packages.³
 - UNHCR would share the burden equally with UNICEF of transporting the NFIs to a single place of distribution in each targeted district.

³ UNICEF contributed 2,500 packages

The plan was funded by CHF and implemented by ACTED and Afghanaid.

- ACTED assisted 2,527 families in 30 districts of 6 provinces including those previously considered inaccessible to shelter implementers. Their voucher for fuel scheme required establishing 30 suppliers as well as locations at which fuel efficiency training could be conducted. The altitude weighting system resulted in beneficiaries receiving the following quantities.
 - Low A 0-1000m: 2 months of fuel supplies distributed in 15 districts.
 - Medium 1000-2000m: 3 months of fuel supplies distributed in 6 districts.
- Afghanaid assisted 296 families or 1,776 individuals in Samangan and Badakshan with cash for fuel which reflects the same provision.



Voucher for Fuel, Saripul Province (Photo: ACTED)

Care was taken to de-conflict with areas, principally in Balkh, Baghlan and Jawzjan, where DRC distributed a 1,000 NFI and Fuel packages to a combination of Cat A and Cat B flood victim families.

Gender Issues

Involvement of Female Members of the Community. Tragically due to social habit and confinement of women to their compounds, a greater proportion of the death toll from the initial impact of the flood was of women. This was most notable in Gurzagahi Noor. Regarding female members of the community involvement in the projects, a total of 159 female headed families were beneficiaries. Many females took an active part in helping their husbands in some cases with “less physical tasks such as plastering and mixing small amounts of cement”. However, with just one exception females had no role in beneficiary selection process or NGO / shura negotiations. In one community women were reported to be the key decision makers for selection of latrine sites. **Solidarites International’s Female FGD as part of a multi sectoral survey revealed women’s disenfranchisement from household and life decision making and a primacy of safe drinking water amongst their needs. ACTED reported that in the fuel efficiency training aspect of the voucher for fuel scheme, the sessions specifically scheduled for women were very poorly attended for socio-cultural reasons.**



Female involvement in Shelter Recovery, Khwaja du Koh, Jawzjan (Photo: People in Need)

Involvement of Females amongst Project Staff. There was significant involvement of female NGO staff at all sites fulfilling mobilizer, assessor and trainer functions. However, only one organization reflected women amongst project management staff.



A widow helps with the plastering of her shelter. Soozma Qala, Saripul (Photo: ZOA)

SGBV. No reports of SGBV linked to any part of the response came to light except for the general malaise of early marriage with consequences for both girls and boys. The early marriage of daughters was in some cases thought to be a mechanism for coping with poverty and raising funds for land purchase.



Two sisters, whose father is sick, help out in Khwaja du Koh (Photo: People in Need)

The Future

Future Mitigation Measures. For 4 communities comprising 436 families the land on which they had lived was swept away and they were forced to reestablished themselves in completely new locations areas where they are no longer in danger of flooding or landslides. However, in 15 other sites affected by flooding it was reported that less than 10% of shelters had been built in a new location out of the path of a potentially recurring flood. This was thought to be due to lack of financial resources to enable moving. However all beneficiaries interviewed reflected the opinion that the build back better principle of 1 metre high stone foundation⁴ would afford them much more protection and resilience in the future. IOM implemented 1.5 km of barrier projects protecting 20 villages and an estimated 8,800 families and has plans in 2015 for a further 700 m projects protecting 8 villages and 1,422 families in Balkh, Badakshan and Baghlan. No other communities reported government mitigation measures either physical or procedural.

Remaining Gaps Excluding some 981 Cat A shelters in in- accessible areas there remain 822 Cat A⁵ in accessible areas and of viable project size. The Shelter Cluster encourages proposals for the following sites.

- Faryab Shirintigab 221
- Jawzjan (Faizabad) 281
- PIK 30
- Baghlan Fring 132
- Khwaja du Koh 150

⁴ Build Back Better concept

⁵ Excludes 250 in Abi Berek which are damaged and in a high risk land slide area

- Abi Barek 250 (currently under discussion with group of NGOs)

Acknowledgement

Shelter Cluster North would like to acknowledge:

- The donors who funded the humanitarian response which includes: Japan, Australia, Germany, as well as OFDA, ECHO and the ERF and CHF.
- Entities which contributed to the assessment and relief effort: ANDMA, Government line departments, ARCS, national and international NGOs, UN agencies, ICRC, IFRC, and donors.
- The NGOs which implemented the Shelter Recovery Plan: ACTED, Afghanaid, Concern Worldwide, NAC, NRC, INTERSOS, WHH, PIN, ZOA, SHA, and Solidarites International .
- The NGOs which implemented Winter Assistance: ACTED, Afghanaid, and DRC.

NATIONAL SHELTER RESPONSE PLAN (26 June 2014)

AIM

The aim of this Shelter Response Plan is to provide 8128⁶ shelters for families displaced from completely destroyed, (Category A) homes in 26 provinces all over Afghanistan due to floods and Landslides by 31 December 2014.

BACKGROUND

Heavier than normal seasonal rains in the northern provinces of Afghanistan began on 24 April and continued until 20 May⁷, resulting in flash flooding, landslides and an estimated 175(excluding Ab-Barik Landslide casualties) deaths, 8,128⁸ homes destroyed and severe damage to infrastructure, crops and livestock. Assessments were conducted jointly by provincial and district authorities and the humanitarian community. Multi-sectoral emergency relief was provided to 17,608 families⁹. Access both for assessment and assistance was affected by ongoing flooding and damage to roads and infrastructure. Furthermore some areas remain inaccessible due to security concerns.

NEEDS AND PRIORITIES

Initial planning was based on Provincial Disaster Management Committee (PDMC) endorsed figures which are continuously updated. However, as anticipated, IOM's consolidation of multi sector assessment information using RAF format at village level is underway and will provide the most comprehensive source to support the National Shelter Recovery Plan (NSRP). Planning for areas not covered by IOM RAF assessment will be based on PDMC and independent assessment.

Set in the context of a multi-sectoral response, the NSRP aims to provide 8,128 shelters for families displaced from completely destroyed, (Category A) homes by 31 October.¹⁰ Assistance to families affected by partially damaged homes (Category B) will be implemented through cash for work programmes managed through Food Security Cluster.

RESPONSE STRATEGY

Shelter Guidelines: The Shelter Guidelines (Annex A) provide the basis for planning and establish a common shelter outcome. Methods of achieving the outcome may vary and follow 'assistance in kind', Cash for Shelter (CfS) or a combination models. This allows the most appropriate method to be used as circumstance and conditions differ between provinces and districts. The Shelter Guidelines aim to facilitate the work of Cluster Members in a harmonised manner during shelter implementation. The

⁶ Excludes areas which are inaccessible due to security reasons (Jawzjan, Dashti Leyli, Darzab and Qush Teppa)

⁷ Excludes flooding reported on 30 May 2014.

⁸ Total of IOM consolidated figures as at 30 May where RAF used and PDMC figures where RAF or other data not available.

⁹ OCHA Country Emergency Report No.9 dated 1 June 2014.

¹⁰ This date is driven by the onset of winter when construction is no longer viable. In some areas at altitude this may be mid-October.

Guidelines provide a high degree of flexibility, provided that each Cluster Member follows the Guiding Principles and adheres to national quality standards and reporting procedures. The Guidelines also discuss the methodology to implement, Design of Shelter, Size of the Shelter and all the DRR measures to be taken to construct sustainable shelters in flood prone areas as floods are being recurrent in Afghanistan every year. The Shelter & NFI cluster aimed at introducing sustainable Shelter reconstruction methods to achieve build back better communities and to create resilience in the communities to face natural disasters like floods, earthquakes and Landslides.

Emergency Response vs Sustainable Durable shelter solutions: Even though these proposed shelters adhere to immediate Humanitarian & protection needs of the affected displaced populations due to floods, Technical working group(TWG) of Shelter & NFI cluster argued that the Shelters to be built with all the necessary DRR measures and to the required minimum Sphere and Global construction standards. This would increase the minimum cost of the shelter as such measures like stone masonry in the foundation and up to 1m high above ground level, corner bracings, lintels above doors and windows and strong roof either with timber planks or iron I beams construction. TWG has estimated the cost of the shelter ranging between \$1500 to \$2500 excluding operational cost of implementing agency and beneficiary contribution through Unskilled/Skilled Labour and some local material procurement. A Standardised two room shelter of 32.1 Sq.mt area and a separate latrine has been proposed for a family size of 6 to 9 members. If the family size is less than six members a one room shelter can be built. Detailed Design, drawings and BOQs of two different models are attached as annexes to the shelter Guidelines.

Beneficiary Selection criteria with focus on Vulnerability: Beneficiary selection is based on the belief that vulnerable families would not be able to establish shelters without external assistance, Vulnerability must be prioritised at all times, and in particular when resources are scarce. Notwithstanding the latter assumptions, the Shelter Cluster recognises that vulnerability is a relative phenomenon and differs from location to location. Selection and implementation processes are required to ensure that vulnerable categories of people, including female headed or Child-headed households, the chronically ill, mentally or physically disabled or elderly heads of households without external support and large families with insufficient income and other vulnerable persons are not overlooked or rejected for assistance.

Relocation and HLP issues: Government has to quickly acquire the land required for relocation of affected displaced families living in tents mostly in case of Landslides. Delay in this process would trigger emergency response needs like winterisation support and families having to face severe winter conditions. Relocation should be consistent with international and national human rights standards and humanitarian practice and should be conducted in a safe and orderly manner. Beneficiary selection process should also be led by the Government along with the implementing partners and coordinating agencies. A separate winterisation plan has to be prepared to respond to those families who will continue to live under tents in the coming winter season.

Funding Mechanisms: It is assumed that an estimated cost of \$ 24 million (an average cost of \$3000 per Shelter) is required to rebuild the required 8,128 shelters (proposed as of now and which may increase with recent floods & expected floods) including Ab- Barak Landslide in ARGO district of Badakshan

province. A national appeal for funding with major Donors will be undertaken by the Afghanistan Government based on the approved National Shelter Response plan to fill the gap of around \$ 20 million to respond to the Humanitarian needs of affected populations due to floods and Landslides.

Implementation: The NSRP Implementation Matrix reflects planned implementation in areas coordinated on the basis of:

- Implementation capacity¹¹
- Existing presence and familiarity with the district /community
- Access
- Economies of scale
- Availability of funding

The Implementation Matrix is a live document and will be updated weekly in order to record and find gaps in number of Shelters to be built. Allocation of areas and targets are expected to change as Cluster Members' conduct detailed project assessments and as funding levels are clarified.

Province	District	Total No of fully destroyed Homes	Cluster Member	Planned	Method	Donor	Priority (1)	Tranche -2	Comment
Faryab	Pashtunkot	500	NRC/IFRC	250	CfS	ECHO	1	F	12 Cat A in 11 villages 136 Cat A in 62 villages inaccessible – IFRC
	Gurziwan	74	NRC		CfS		1	1	
Jawzjan	Khwaja Du Koh	569	PIN	300	CfS		1	1	
			WHH	275	CfS		1	1	
Saripul	Sayyad	256	ZOA	400	IK	OFDA	1	2	
	Sozma Qala	143	ZOA		IK	OFDA	1	2	
	Gosfandi	60	ZOA		IK	OFDA	1	2	
	Balkhab	12	ZOA		IK	OFDA	1	2	
	Kohistanat		ZOA		IK	OFDA	1	2	

¹¹ Grading of implementation capacity: Good: NRC, PIN, ZOA, ACTED, Solidarites, INTERSOS, CARE, WHH, GIZ, Concern Worldwide, Afghan Aid. Average: ADEO ADGO ACT Acceptable SRP AWEN NRDOAW, WRDOAW

Baghlan	Puli Kumri	471	ACTED	118	IK	OFDA	1	2	ADEO proposed to fill any remaining gap ACTED/OFDA cannot
Badakshan	Faizabad	150	NRC	120			1	2	OCHA to clarify if GE govt to fund all Badakshan Cat A
	Keshem	74	ACTED	298	IK	OFDA	1	2	
Samanagan	Khurmum Wa Sabagh	257	Solidarites	363	IK		1	3	Solidarites/Afghanaid coordination under discussion
			Afghanaid	150	IK		1	3	
	Ruyi Du Ab	113	Solidarites	204	IK		1	3	
	Dara I Sufi Payin	26	SRP/ACF	26	IK		1	3	SRP proposal with ACF material
Takhur	Taluqan	211	NRC	120			1	3	Recent ACTED update indicates only 5 Cat A
Faryab	Khwasabzp	96			CfS		2	3	Recent NRC update indicates only 3 Cat A
	Shirintagab	483	Intersos	200	CfS		2	3	
Jawzjan	Faryzabad		CARE	200	IK		2	3	
Balkh	Kulm	499	NRC	120	CFS		2	3	
	Sholgora	29	IOM	277	OFDA		2	4	
	Chimtal	198			OFDA		2	4	
	Keshendeh	20			OFDA		2	4	
	Charbolak	42			OFDA		2	4	
	Charkent	8			OFDA		2	4	
Baghlan	Khost Wa Fereng	49	ACT	44	IK		2	4	Included with 150 from Gurigahi Nur

	Tala Wa Barfak	65	AWEN	65	IK		2	4	115 update from OCHA Kunduz – 16 June
	Dushi	75	AWEN	75	IK		2	4	
Badakshan	Yaftal-e-Sufla	14					2	4	GE govt funding TBC by OCHA for all Badakshan
	Shahr-e-Buzorg						2	4	
	Nosai	23					2	4	
	Shignan						2	4	
	Yamgan	18	IFRC				2	4	IFRC
	Warduj	20	IFRC				2	4	IFRC
	Darayim	30					2	4	
Faryab	Qaysar	80	IFRC				3	5	IFRC
	Almar	86	IFRC				3	5	IFRC
	Dawlatabad	306	NRDOAW	142	IK		3	5	
	Maymana	119	NRC	8	CfS		3	5	
	Qurghan	92					3	5	
Jawzjan	Shiberghan	82	ADEO (CWS?)	82	IK		3	5	CWS to confirm funding position and submit proposal accordingly
	Aqcha	40	ADEO (CWS?)	40	IK		3	5	CWS to confirm funding position and submit proposal accordingly
	Khwaja Du Koh DDL*	106	IFRC				3	5	IFRC
	Qush Tepa*	445	IFRC				3	5	IFRC
	Darzab	110	IFRC				3	5	IFRC
Samangan	Aybak	42	AGDO	37	IK		3	5	
	Hazrat-e-Sultan	17	AGDO	17	IK		3	5	
Baghlan	Khwajahejran	9					3	5	
	Dehsalah	4					3	5	

	Andarab (Bano)	22					3	5	
	Baghlan-e-Jadid	7					3	5	
	Khinjan	19	AWEN	17	IK		3	5	TBC
Takhar	Yangi Qala						3	5	
	Kalafgan	15					3	5	
	Fakhar	11					3	5	
	Chal	19					3	5	
Sari Pul	Saripul	223	NRC	190	CfS	SIDA-RRM	1	F	190 subject to discussions
Balkh	Zari	8	PIN	17	CfS	ECHO	2	F	

Below Table showing the Areas where Land allocation or Relocation of Affected population. These areas should be treated as very high priority but can only achieve reconstruction after Government land allocation to the affected population.

Province	District	Total No of fully destroyed Homes	Cluster Member	Planned	Method	Donor	Priority (1)	Tranche 1-5	Comment
Baghlan	Guzargah-e-Nur	597	ACT	66	IK		VH	NA	
Takhar	Rostaq	118 (landslide)	Concern				VH	NA	
	Ishkamish	152	NRDOAW				VH	NA	
Concern							NA		
Badakshan	Argo	700 (landslide)	WRDOAW				VH	NA	
Faryab	Pashtoonkot	78 (landslide)	IFRC				VH	NA	IFRC
Samangan	Dara I Suf Bala	21					VH	NA	Recent UNHCR update indicates only 5 Cat A

Coordination: Coordination is based on a concept agreed by the Shelter & NFIs cluster as follows:

- National level – Coordination by the National Shelter & NFI Cluster at the national level will link with ministries and support regional cluster by articulating and packaging regional plans accordingly.
- Regional level – Regional Shelter & NFI Clusters will cover the areas under their regions and coordinate with the cluster partners within the region. Coordination with WASH, Protection and Food Security Clusters is effected through the OCHA led Humanitarian Regional Team.
- Provincial level - Strengthened cluster coordination with the establishment of a cluster lead in each affected Province with following roles:
 - Represent the cluster with the PDMCs and weekly meetings of provincial OCTs.
 - Liaise with and inform those organizations involved in shelter response which do not have representation in Mazar-i-Sharif.

Coordination with Provincial/District Authorities and Communities: Interventions will be planned in close coordination with Provincial/District authorities and their appropriate planning departments as well as with Community Development Committees (CDCs) in formulating solutions and identifying beneficiaries.

CHALLENGES

Access: Security and the flood damage to infrastructure impact access.

- **Security.** NSRP recognizes that some areas affected by security concerns remain inaccessible to the majority of the humanitarian community. In such case the Regional ESN Cluster will advocate with Provincial and District authorities for government supported or specific group (i.e. Afghan Red Crescent Society) intervention. In other areas even where access is routinely possible threats to NGO staff, coercion by Anti Government Elements, tribal and criminal disputes, security incidents impact the smooth running of shelter operations.
- **Flood damaged Infrastructure.** Flash floods washed away many roads which have yet to be reestablished. This impacts access for detailed assessment, beneficiary selection and transportation of shelter materials.

NGO Local Capacity: Given the scale and shelter needs, Cluster Members will have to recruit significant numbers of staff implement shelter programs in the limited time available. In many areas outsiders will find it difficult to operate. The appropriate skills and qualifications may be difficult to source within local populations.

Time: Due to the onset of winter during which weather conditions make construction impractical shelter programs (construction part) must be completed by the end of October. In higher altitude areas

completion will be necessary by early / mid-October. Time available will be further impacted by The Holy Month of Ramadan and possible disruption arising from the second round of Presidential elections.

Water: Access to sufficient quantities of water for construction is critical. Availability will be impacted by the weather in high summer and damaged to wells and irrigation channels.

Markets: Localized increased demand for shelter materials will impact market prices. Emergency Market Mapping Analysis (EMMA) is planned to be carried out in at least 4 provinces by NRC.

CROSS CUTTING ISSUES

Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR). Whilst the rain and resulting damage in the North has been exceptional in 2014, this seasonal event will continue to threaten communities each year in the future. To maximize the sustainability of solutions, interventions will be linked to DRR measures.

- **GIS and Satellite Imagery.** Satellite imagery and records will be used to identify flash flood prone high risk areas and inform possible relocation options.
- **Municipal and District Development Plans.** Shelter interventions will take account of existing medium and long term district and municipal DRR and development plans.
- **New DRR Measure.** IOM successfully implemented DRR retaining walls in 2014 and plans to continue the program in 2014. Cluster Members will work in close coordination with IOM to jointly optimize similar DRR opportunities.
- **DRR Shelter Designs.** Cluster Members will explore DRR measures incorporated in shelter designs to increase resilience and sustainability.
- **Awareness and Early Warning.** Cluster Members will seek to enhance awareness and link interventions with strengthened early warning measures.

Direct Participation by Women. The Shelter Cluster endeavours to support the efforts by the Afghan government to strengthen the role that women play in socio-economic life. As such, the Shelter Cluster has a strong commitment to ensure the full participation of women in the decision making and implementation of shelter programmes. Recognising the challenges of facilitating female participation in a conservative society, the Shelter Cluster seeks to involve women in the selection, implementation, monitoring and management of its shelter programme to the greatest extent possible within regionally and culturally appropriate contexts

Gender Considerations: The participation of female staff from Shelter Cluster members and local authorities in the beneficiary selection process should be particularly encouraged wherever possible. Additionally, female participation from the community in general and from the Community Development Committees in particular should always be encouraged. This will allow Beneficiary Selection Committees (BSCs) to engage directly with female beneficiaries, which would in turn facilitate the identification of vulnerable families who may otherwise be overlooked if only men were involved.

This will also give BSCs the opportunity to survey and capture living conditions within vulnerable families. The Shelter Cluster recognises that in Afghanistan males are typically the public actors. Usually a male family representative will be the direct recipient of material coupons, goods, and cash grants on behalf of the family. The Cluster also recognises that there will be female-headed households (FHH) who are justified to receive shelter support. Responsibility for identifying and protecting their interests lies with the village shura and the Partner via their female staff and the BSC it facilitates. For this, the procedures are detailed in the Shelter Guidelines.

Environmental Concerns: Afghanistan's forestry is one of the sectors that has sustained a significant amount of damage over the last few decades. With the environmental impact of this damage in mind and in order to mitigate the risk of further damage, Shelter Cluster members are encouraged, as far as possible, to use alternative sources of materials in lieu of wood. Even where the use of wood is unavoidable, members should seek to ensure that wood products are either imported or are from sustainable local sources. The transitional shelter guidelines reflect the need to be environmentally friendly, and therefore advise, where possible, in the use of iron roof beams or dome roofs made of bricks. Additionally, recognizing the link between the environment and hygiene, each shelter package is suggested to include one latrine per family.

Monitoring and Evaluation: Shelter Cluster members are responsible to monitor and verify shelter implementation. Performance Monitoring must be completed through the Cluster member either directly or indirectly, as a tool to check physical progress as well as the structural integrity of the shelter.

- The use of remote monitoring mechanisms may be adopted by the Shelter Cluster in areas of inaccessibility due to insecurity.
- For final verification, Shelter Cluster members should work jointly with members of the BSC, and should include female staff to the extent possible.
- Progress and consolidated reports will be shared with Shelter Cluster members to ensure a wide dissemination of information and further analysis.
- Post-monitoring of shelters should be conducted by the Shelter Cluster members. This could be done through visits to shelters selected on a random sample basis in each village/district, six months post completion.
- If a CfS approach is used, it will be especially important to underline to beneficiary heads of household, and to the community as a whole, that the use of children for hard labour during construction is strictly prohibited. Appropriate safeguards may need to be established.

Reporting: In an effort to streamline monitoring and evaluation, the Shelter Cluster aims to develop baselines, standard indicators and a minimum threshold, to facilitate cluster needs assessment, reporting and shared analysis.

Shelter Status 14 April 2015

Province	Location	Shelter funding allocated	Shelters Completed (Note1.)	Donor	Partner
Permanent shelter of comparable category					
Sar-i-Pul	Sar-i-Pul City	160	160	SIDA	NRC
	Sozma Qala, Sayad, Gosfandi, Kohistanat, Balkhab	452	452	OFDA	ZOA
Samangan	Khuram Wa Sarbagh	166	138	ERF	Afghanaid
	Ruy-i-Doab	176	176	ERF	Solidarites
	Aybak	23	23		WHH
Jawzjan	Khoja Du Koh	30	66%	German Foreign Office	WHH
	Khoja Du Koh	35	35	German Foreign Office	PIN
	Khoja Du Koh	138	138	ERF	WHH
Takhar	Khoja Du Koh	32	32	ERF	PIN
Taloqan	Taloqan	60	60	ERF	NRC
	Pul-e-Khumri	150	80	ERF	SHA
Baghlan	Pul-e-Khumri	118	89%	OFDA	ACTED
	Kishem	101	73%	OFDA	ACTED
Badakhshan	Ab-e-Barik	150	95%	GoIRA	Concern/ Afghanaid/NAC
	Faisabad	120	56%	OFDA	ACTED
Faryab	Mayna Dashte	77	41%	OFDA	ACTED
	Shirintagab	91	91	ERF	InterSoS
ECHO Cash for Shelter					
Faryab	Maimana	12	12	ECHO-ERM	NRC
Balkh	Khulm	201	185	ECHO-ERM	NRC
Jawzjan	Aqcha	39	39	ECHO-ERM	PIN
	Khoja Dukoh	24	24	ECHO-ERM	
Balkh	Zari	17	12	ECHO-ERM	
ECHO Transitional					
Takhar	Eshkamesh	170	165	ECHO	Concern
Takhar	Rustaq	127	127	ECHO	
Baghlan	Guzgahi Noor	652	652	ECHO	NRC
Samangan	Khuram Wa Sarbagh	90	90	ECHO	NRC
Sar e Pul	Sozma Qala	26	26	ECHO	NRC
Jawzjan	Khoja Dukoh	220	220	ECHO	PIN
Total		3,657	2,937		

Note: 1. Percentage project progress is indicated where no shelters have been fully completed