

**NFI and Emergency Shelter
DISTRIBUTION REPORT**

Report Date: 10/1/2016	Distribution Date(s): 14 th-18th/12/2015		
Distribution Location Information			
State	Central Equatatoria State (CES)		
County	Lainya County		
Payam(s)	Lainya		
Boma(s) (exact locations- landmarks)	Bereka & Lukurubang		
GPS Coordinates	Bereka N04°51.045' E031°03.579' Elevation=929m Lukurubang N04°19.442' E031°03.567' Elevation =951m		
Distribution Team Details			
Name	Agency	Title	Contact (email, mobile, sat-phone)
Ojok Michael	ZOA	Project Manager	Agri.advisor@zoasouthsudan.org
Agnes chandiru	ZOA	Project officer	Agnes.chandiru@yahoo.com
Leju Joseph	ZOA	Project Officer	jtlkenyi@gmail.com
Ballah Santino	ZOA	Project Officer	santinoballah@gmail.com

NON-FOOD ITEMS (NFI)

Population Type:	<i>(i.e. conflict or disaster IDPs, returnees, or host community – complete a separate table for each population type)</i>								
HOUSEHOLDS	INDIVIDUALS								
TOTAL	TOTAL		0 – 18 years		19 – 59 years		60 + years		Vulnerability (total)
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	
4,024	8,947	8,596	5,106	4,526	3,614	3,614	403	281	17,543

EMERGENCY SHELTER

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

	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	(total)

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	
Lainya	Bereka	1,112	Total	4,848
			Total Female	2,376
			Total Male	2,472
Lainya	Lukurubang	2,912	Total	12,695
			Total Female	6,221
			Total Male	6,474

Stock Distributed

Procuring organization and warehouse from which stock was sourced	IOM Juba warehouse			
Quantity of each item distributed per household <i>- specify variations by household size</i> <i>The items were uniformly distributed to the Households as the average HH size was 4 members.</i>	1. Blankets, 02 pcs	5. Sleeping mats, 04 pcs		
	2. Kitchen sets, 01	6. Soap, 02 bars		
	3. Mosquito nets, 04 pcs	7. IOM blue bag, 01pc		
	4. Plastic sheets, 01pc	8.		
Total quantity of each item distributed in the response	1. 4000 pcs blankets	5. 8000 pcs Sleeping mats		
	2. 4024 kitchen sets	6. 8050 bars of Soap of 800g		
	3. 8000 pcs mosquito nets	7. 4050 pcs IOM blue bag		
	4. 4025 pcs Plastic sheets	8.		

Type of Item	Brand/Manufacturer	Style/Version #	Size	Colour	Other
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					
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?

- The distribution was conducted in the two locations of; **Bereka and Lukurubang boma** concurrently

starting on 14th /December /2015 extending up to 18th /December/ 2015.

- Two channels of communication were used for informing the beneficiaries of the distribution; 1.) Through the chiefs/headmen, and 2.) ZOA staffs going directly to the IDP reception sites & communicating with IDPs.
- Prior to the distribution, the team conducted verification of the registered beneficiaries jointly with the SSRRC and chiefs/headmen and the list updated.
- The beneficiaries were organised under the stewardship of headmen/chiefs of the area they originally came from before the displacement. In each of the above locations, three days were used for the actual handing over of items matching the number of beneficiaries under each headmen/chief. For another two days ZOA team and the volunteers stayed in the area visiting the beneficiaries together with the leaders to identify complains and gaps in the distribution process.
- On the actual distribution day each chief and the beneficiaries, were called out and the quantified items handed over to them, and then individual member's distribution followed under close eye of either ZOA staff or a volunteer appointed for this process. The distribution team comprised of ZOA staffs and some local youth (selection criteria; ability to read and write). The SSRRC and LGAs role during the process was purely passive, majorly observing and ensuring the process is not interrupted.
- Issue of gender equity and equality were integrated at the stage of beneficiary identification and verification. Such that when the items were requested from IOM, it had already addressed all concerns. For instance there were many cases of polygamous families; so instead of registering only the male head of the HH, the wives were registered since each woman and her children lived in separate family unit (Home) from the rest of the co-wives. By doing so, all HH members are catered for in the distribution.
- Since we were working closely with the LGAs/SSRRC, the government deployed policemen at the distribution sites to keep law and order.

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.

- The SSRRC as the main government body responsible for the coordination of all relief works was involved right from the onset of this emergency response i.e. IDP identification, registration, verification through to the final days of distribution of the items to the beneficiaries. To avoid duplication of roles, the SSRRC was consulted and was an important source of information on; what support had been delivered and by who, the unmet needs of the IDPs, sharing the updated list of IDP households, security to the NFIs before distribution etc.
- A group of volunteers comprising of local youth supported ZOA staffs during the distribution and subsequent monitoring to identify complains or distribution gaps.
- Beneficiaries were informed prior to the distribution of their entitlement, therefore throughout the distribution process acted as checks & balance to ensure accountability.

Changes from assessment recommendations

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

No change made to the original plans. This emergency response targeted specifically two groups; the **1911 households** (out of 4024 HH) who had completely not received any NFIs, from the first round of intervention carried out by South Sudan Red Cross/Caritas, and **4024 HH** (the entire IDP HHs in Lainya) for distribution of cooking sets since none had been distributed.

Targeting criteria

-Who finally received and why? Did the group to be targeted change in any way between the initial assessment

<i>and those who received on distribution day?</i>
There was no change in the target group for this response from what was identified during assessment; the intervention was purely for IDP HHs.
Challenges and lessons learned <i>-Did you face any major challenges, and/or learn any useful lessons?</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many members from the host community turned up on the distribution day, demanding to be provided with the NFIs since they are sharing their resources with the IDPs. If the policemen /SSRRC were not present at the distribution venues, the process would have turned chaotic. • Armed soldiers came to the distribution venue in Lokurubang Boma creating fear amongst IDPs during the distribution. • Pressure from the LGAs/SSRRC demanding for their quota. We found there is undocumented rule that the LGAs/SSRRC always have a share of whatever is distributed within their community. It was difficult thus to include them since the planning for specific & exact. • New list of IDPs emerged on the final distribution day; i.e. 791 households that needs to be verified first and if confirmed they are genuine, then future plans shall be made to include them. • The IDPs have refused to settle at the site allocated to them for establish their camp; reason they can easily be identified by the soldiers (SPLA) for reprisal attacks. So they are scared within the host community.
Recommended next steps <i>-Should any further action be taken in the area by the Shelter and NFI Cluster, or other actors?</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ZOA to verify the new list of IDPs and Update the cluster. • Generally high demand for food items among the IDP; limited ration delivered coupled with the high cost of food items beyond affordability of the HHs. Right now a bucket of sorghum cost 70 ssp up from 30 ssp in recent months. • Need for sickles (tools) for harvesting thatching grass as the plastic sheets provided are not sufficient to meet the needs for covered space. Each HH got only one plastic sheet.
Anecdotes, Stories, Photos <i>-Please share any interesting or illustrative stories of people’s experiences, responses, and needs; and photos</i>
<p>Story <i>“My name is Samuel Lokosang, married with four children (two boys and two girls) am happy for ZOA because we were indeed suffering our women (3 HHs) share one saucepan for preparing meals for their dependants but now my family has received full sets of the non food items that we will use as an independent family and prepare our own meals. No organization has impressed me the way ZOA did.” Said Lokosang. However, the relief services given are not enough to sustain us for long time. I am asking ZOA to appeal to donors to support us with food stuff(all our food got damaged in the fields for this year), agricultural inputs (seeds and tools) and the government to allocate us land for farming so that we can use to produce our own farm produce.”</i></p>



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

Thank you!