

## NFI and Emergency Shelter DISTRIBUTION REPORT

Report Date: 2014 July 17      Distribution Date(s): 2014 June 20, 21, 22, 24, 26

### Distribution Location Information

State	Unity
County	Leer
Payam(s)	Leer town
Boma(s) (exact locations- landmarks)	
GPS Coordinates	N08 18 30 16, E030 08 15 05

### Distribution Team Details

Name	Agency	Title	Contact (email, mobile, sat-phone)
Taka Nakahara	INTERSSOS	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:Nfis.south.sudan@intersos.org">Nfis.south.sudan@intersos.org</a>
Sebastian Daridan	NRC	NRC ERT	<a href="mailto:Sebastian.daridan@nrc.no">Sebastian.daridan@nrc.no</a>
Zoran Filipovic	NRC	NRC ERT	<a href="mailto:Zoran.Filipovic@nrc.no">Zoran.Filipovic@nrc.no</a>
Taban Ladu	INTERSSOS	Emergency Response Team	<a href="mailto:Taban.ladu@gmail.com">Taban.ladu@gmail.com</a>
Wani Julious	INTERSSOS	Emergency Response Team	<a href="mailto:babapatience@yahoo.co.uk">babapatience@yahoo.co.uk</a>
Susan Konga	INTERSSOS	Emergency Response Team	<a href="mailto:susankonga@gmail.com">susankonga@gmail.com</a>
Thomas Koja	IOM	Emergency Response Team	<a href="mailto:tkoja@iom.int">tkoja@iom.int</a>
Godfrey	IOM	Emergency Response Team	
Harriet Inyani	IOM	Emergency Response Team	<a href="mailto:hinyani@iom.int">hinyani@iom.int</a>
Natalie Edblad	UNHCR	Camp Management Officer	<a href="mailto:Edblad@unhcr.org">Edblad@unhcr.org</a>

**Beneficiary Numbers: Breakdown by Population and Support Type**  
(please provide **ONLY** actual data collected from the distribution list, not estimations)

### NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFI)

Population Type:	Including 6,311 HHs of people in Leer town (based on ICRC list), and 299 HHs of IDPs identified by UNHCR									
HOUSEHOLDS	INDIVIDUALS									
TOTAL	TOTAL		0 – 18 years		19 – 59 years		60 + years		Vulnerability (total)	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F		

**6,610**

According to the ICRC registration the average family composition in Leer Town is 8 persons. Therefore, the distribution has reached around 52800.

--	--

### EMERGENCY SHELTER

<b>Population Type:</b>	<i>(ie conflict or disaster IDPs, returnees, or host community – complete a separate table for each population type)</i>									
<b>HOUSEHOLDS</b>	<b>INDIVIDUALS</b>									
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>0 – 18 years</b>		<b>19 – 59 years</b>		<b>60 + years</b>		<b>Vulnerability (total)</b>	
	<b>M</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>F</b>		

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

#### Beneficiary Numbers: Breakdown by Location

*If the distribution took place in multiple locations and/or the beneficiaries had multiple places of origin, please complete this table indicating the number of beneficiaries per location and/or place of origin.*

Payam	Boma	Households	Individuals	
			<i>Total Total</i>	
			<i>Female Total</i>	
			<i>Male Total</i>	
			<i>Total Female</i>	
			<i>Total Male</i>	

#### Stock Distributed

Procuring organization and warehouse	IOM, UNHCR, Irish Aid	
from which stock was sourced	All items were air-lifted from Rumbek through Logistic Cluster	
<b>Quantity of each item distributed per household</b> <i>- specify variations by household size</i>	1. 1 mini kitchen set (contains 1 sauce pan, 2 plates, 3 spoons, 1 large spoon, 2 cups) 2. 1 plastic sheet 3. 1 mosquito net 4. 1 blanket	5. 1 bar of soap (except 68 HHs for whom we unfortunately run out of soap) 6. 7. 8.
<b>Total quantity of each item distributed in the response</b>	1. 6,603 mini kitchen set 2. 6,603 plastic sheets 3. 6,603 mosquito nets 4. 6,603 blankets	5. 6,422 bars of soap (distribution of soap was disturbed by lack of items transported from Rumbek. In Day 5 team broke soap bar into a half, to have as many people being served as possible. 230 HHs received a half bar, while 68 HHs did not receive any soap. So total number of soap distributed is 6,307 (HHs served until Day 4) + 115 (230/2) = 6,422.
All remaining stock after the distribution was transferred to ICRC compound. As ICRC is not associated with the Cluster system, ICRC is purely lending space, and all responsibility/ right for stock there belongs to Shelter/NFI		

Cluster partner(s). Following is items being stored in ICRC compound.

- ✓ Plastic sheets: 34 bales (170 pieces)
- ✓ Blankets: 1 UNHCR bale (20 pieces), 4 Irish Aid bales (25 pieces x 4 = 100 pieces), 3 full and 1 opened IOM bale (3 x 100 + about 80 = about 380 pieces): total About 400 pieces
- ✓ Mosquito nets: 8 bales of 100 pieces and 1 opened bale which contains about 50 pieces. Total number is therefore about 850 pieces
- ✓ Cooking sets: 23 cartons, each of which contains 4 full kits. So there are 92 full kits (which can be separated into 184 mini-kits)

Type of Item	Brand/Manufacturer	Style/Version #	Size	Colour	Other
1. Plastic sheet	IOM Procurement	4m x 5m			
2. Mosquito net	Yorkool (IOM), Olyset (UNHCR)	W1.9m x H1.5m x L1.8m			
3. Blanket	IOM procurement, UNHCR procurement, Irish Aid procurement	Approx 1.5m x 2m			
4. mini-Cooking set	IOM Procurement				1 sauce pan, 1 big spoon, 2 plates, 2 cups, 3 small spoons
5. Soap	IOM Procurement	800g			
6.					
7.					
8.					

#### Summary of Distribution

- Where was the distribution held and how was it organised?
- What and how were beneficiaries informed?
- How was equal access ensured for men, women, girls and boys?
- How was order maintained during the distribution?

Distribution was conducted on June 20, 21, 22, 24 and 26 at SSRRA office, where also called locally as VMT building. (SSRRA stands for 'South Sudan Relief and Rehabilitation Agency', same organization as what we called SSRRC but people in Leer requested us to call so. VMT stands for "Verification and Monitoring Team").

Beneficiaries were informed through SSRRA so that information will spread into community, at least 1 day before distribution. The team believes, given proximity of SSRRA office and area where people live, the information was appropriately informed so that vast majority of people turn up for distribution.

Prior to actual distribution, distribution team distributed coupons for people who possess ICRC registration card, so that there will be less confusion and distribution will go smooth. The team were supported by 17 to 19 SSRRA crowd controllers/ supervisors, and security guard as laborers.

Thanks to the support by SSRRA staffs, well planned distribution site, and efforts by all distribution team member, there was no remarkable case of order being disrupted.

#### What actors were involved in the decision-making regarding the distribution process?

- Explain what role the following people had in the process: local authorities, partners, humanitarian officers, volunteers, beneficiaries, etc.

**INTERSOS**, as organization joined assessment, planned the overall response from the beginning under consultation with Cluster Coordinator. It played major role in setting up storage places, in charge of stock counting and preparing NFI kits during distribution process.

**NRC** exercised strong initiative in distributing tokens for people who has ICRC card, coordination with ICRC in both Juba and Leer level and leading verification exercise of lists submitted by SSRRA. Also, they drafted distribution site planning, which was endorsed by everyone and later proofed to be quite effective in terms of crowd control.

**IOM** was also attending assessment, and discussed the overall planning for response. They were in charge of logistic arrangement from Rumbek to Leer. Its ERT members were also supporting verification and distribution quite effectively.

**SSRRA** provided crowd controllers and lend space for storage in its compound. It also supported the distribution as link between distribution team and community, most notably passing information about distribution to communities.

**UNHCR** was in charge of identifying IDPs (in coordination with IOM and NRC) who were not included in ICRC list, which distribution team used as basis of distribution, so that the team can reach to as many vulnerable people as possible. Their staffs also supported distribution.

### Changes from assessment recommendations

*-If there were any changes to the original plan, please explain what changes occurred and why they were necessary.*

In the assessment report (which was participated by INTERSOS and IOM), recommendation was to conduct shelter-to-shelter re-registration. After the discussion with Cluster, however, it was decided to use already existing ICRC list as basis for distribution, as re-registration exercise would take much time so that it will delay entire process while urgent response is necessary given rainy season effectively started.

ICRC list was therefore used as basis of distribution. Distribution team believes that, even though ICRC list may not be comprehensive (for example, there was no way of capturing people who came after the registration), the team as a whole tried its best to capture those people left out, by asking referral of Protection partner (UNHCR) so that most vulnerable IDPs who were left out received NFIs.

### Targeting criteria

*-Who finally received and why? Did the group to be targeted change in any way between the initial assessment and those who received on distribution day?*

Beneficiaries registered by ICRC: 6,311 HHs  
Vulnerable IDP HHs left out from ICRC list: 299HHs

### Challenges and lessons learned

*-Did you face any major challenges, and/or learn any useful lessons?*

#### Logistic challenge:

The response has been very, very expensive one. It is due to the fact that price level in Leer town is so high that people do not accept salary which is regarded as reasonable in other town. For example, normal daily rate of casual workers in Mayendit (4 hours to 8 hours by footing) was 25 SSP per person per day. But in Leer town, the rate was double. There was also initial confusion of location for Logistic Cluster's helicopter to be landed. In at least 3 occasion, helicopters landed about 20 to 15 minutes apart from where the team wished them to land, causing the team to pay for extra money for casual labourers, giving people not recruited by the team to offload at their own will and request the team to be paid, and also let the team to hire car (which is also absurdly expensive – one trip which would take only 5 minutes costs 250SSP).

One of reasons why helicopters landed is, even though they were communicated prior to land in front of MSF compound (which was used as land mark of offloading point), there was no 'flag' so that they could not identified the exact location. One of lessons learnt is for each agency to be responsible for offloading to bring a flag, so that pilot can easily identify where to land.

Also, for some unknown reason by the time of writing this report, even though team submitted request to send 7,000 bars of soap, the team received approximately 500 less bars of soap. This brought team on the ground very much difficult position, as beneficiaries on the last day of distribution complained to SSRRA for lack of soap (SSRRA expressed they would like to be communicated in case if there will be lack of items in future distribution).

#### **Recommended next steps**

*-Should any further action be taken in the area by the Shelter and NFI Cluster, or other actors?*

To continue response for people outside of Leer town. There are five payams which ICRC continues its registration, namely Adok, Guot, Gandor (Padeah), Thonyor and Pilleny. Total HHs registered by ICRC is about 12,800 HHs.

The reconciliation exercise "way bills" against "items distributed" is not feasible because there is no comprehensive track of the pipeline origin on the related way bills. Lessons learnt for the next distribution.

#### **Anecdotes, Stories, Photos**

*-Please share any interesting or illustrative stories of people's experiences, responses, and needs; and photos*

Photos available upon request

**Please submit to IOM Juba (cc your Shelter and NFI Cluster State Focal Point)**

**Attach the signed/thumb-printed distribution lists**

**Thank you!**