

# **Georgia Flood Response Programme**

**Khulo District,  
Republic of Georgia**  
April – December 2005

Executive Summary

Oxfam GB Programme Evaluation

**January 2006**

**Authors:**

Karen Arakelyan, Director STC, Yerevan, Republic of Armenia  
Tim Forster, HSP – Capacity Builder, Humanitarian Department, OGB  
Ghazi Kelani, Public Health Engineer, Oxfam Jerusalem

## Executive Summary

In the last week of April 2005, a combination of torrential rains and the melting of snow caused heavy flooding in the mountainous regions of the Republic of Georgia. The rains also coincided with the release of water from two dams by the authorities, resulting in raised water levels in several rivers, exacerbating the situation further. Although there were no casualties, the floods caused massive landslides and mudflows, leading to damage and loss of agricultural land; homes; livestock; and water drainage systems. Roads and bridges were swept away, isolating many communities in mountainous areas. The worst affected districts were identified as being Mestia, Oni, Ambrolauri, Tsagehri, Lentekhi and Khulo. Since the collapse of the former Soviet Union, these regions have suffered economically, resulting in; social infrastructure being poorly maintained; poor quality public services; and the loss of vegetation cover through deforestation. Livelihoods were badly affected by the floods, reducing people's overall resiliency. Many water supply systems were destroyed, as were surface drainage systems in some towns resulting in more flooding and contaminated water supplies. 321 homes were also destroyed, and farmlands flooded, disrupting planting and the subsequent agricultural cycles. Livestock was also lost.

In response to the floods, the government worked through their regional institutions to assist people cut-off in remote areas, the government publicly pledging to support those affected, through compensation, humanitarian aid and technical assistance. A number of organisations, led by UNDP Disaster Management Team (DMT) carried out assessments to identify immediate needs with various agencies launching appeals; food aid (WFP); medicine and immunization (UMCOR and UNICEF); agriculture and livestock (ACH); and water and sanitation (IFRC and GRCS). Oxfam Georgia, as a member of DMT, identified gaps in water and sanitation, education and shelter. Disaster mitigation was also identified as being of concern.

Based on initial assessment by an Oxfam team and the Red Cross, Khulo District was prioritised. The three key areas for intervention were identified as; to improve access to potable water supplies; public health promotion; and to provide mitigation, preparedness and disaster response training for communities and institutions, living in disaster prone areas. Based on the initial needs assessment; the decision was taken to rehabilitate the water supply system in Khulo District, with GRCS as a partner. The programme aim was

“To relieve distress and suffering by addressing water and sanitation needs of the flood-affected population of 6,400 in Khulo, Danagleba, Dagnavilebi, Okurashvilebi and Vashlovan communities in Adjara Region of Western Georgia”.

Oxfam GB approved a budget of GBP 99, 435 for a period of 7-months, starting in June 2005. An evaluation of this programme was undertaken in mid-December 2005. The main findings of the evaluation were:

1. Improved access to an ample quantity of potable water for an estimated 7,500 people in target communities, through repairs to water storage, water treatment and water conveyance systems. An estimated 1,500 households benefited from the rehabilitated water supply. Prior to the intervention, only 750 households were connected, meaning 3,250 new people are now receiving a stable water supply. Now an estimated 150 l/p is provided daily, 24 h/d. This compares with 4 hours connection per day, every third day prior to the intervention. The quality of the water is perceived by community to have improved since the intervention, but this was difficult to quantify, given the extremely old equipment available at water-testing laboratory in Khulo. It was also noted that some household connections were made upstream of the treatment plant, meaning such people will definitely not benefit from treated water.
2. Improved personal and communal hygiene for an unknown number of people through an additional 780 m of sewerage collection network, along with 38 collectors and manholes. According to the contractor, 70% of the target group (4,480 people) are

now connected to the sewerage network; however, it was not possible to verify this figure. According to data from 2005, for Khulo District, obtained by OGB HPO from the public health department, there were 156 cases of water-borne diseases in 2005. Of these, 150 cases were registered up to end October 2005. In November and December, there were only 6 registered cases for both months.

3. An unspecified number of people also benefited from public health promotion activities, these activities were still on going at the time of the evaluation. Approximately 200 members of the community will benefit directly from the workshops, while 2,000 others will benefit from two booklets. However, it will be difficult to measure the impact of these activities. The 20 households that should have benefited from family latrine structures did not, as this activity was replaced by a communal public toilet at the District Administrative centre (currently under repair). The number of people benefiting from the communal toilet is unknown, and the impact on the population is difficult to quantify.
4. The Khulo District authority departments participated actively in the programme, contributing GEL 280,000 to rehabilitate the water system. Perhaps this implementation role is greater than would normally been expected, given the selected contractor, Poni Ltd., is also the head of communal works department! The community's role was limited to village heads attending District Council meetings, and approx. 200 people participating in the PHP workshops. On top of this, the contractor (Poni Ltd.) employed 53 specialist staff and daily labourers on a permanent basis for the duration of the technical works.

The main conclusions of the evaluation were that the type of rehabilitation project supported was appropriate in responding to post-flood needs. Working through partners and key stakeholders was appropriate, although both community participation and the role of women need to be strengthened in future. Overall, it has been difficult to measure the true impact of the activities on beneficiaries, as the initial indicators selected for the logical framework were weak, and opportunities were missed to review the initial planning. As a consequence, it was difficult to monitor progress of the programme, as much of the monitoring focussed on verifying progress on the technical work rather than impact monitoring. Opportunities were also missed to introduce specialised equipment such as the DelAgua kit, which would have benefited the relevant authorities and also provided better quality monitoring data. Opportunities were missed to undertake emergency water supply and the hospital early on in the response. A rehabilitated communal toilet replaced 20 family latrines planned in the early stages of the programme, measuring the impact of this action on people's health was not possible.

Coordination with key stakeholders, partners and participation in the DMT, appears to have been a strong point of the programme. Cooperation with local government was also good. Around 50% of the total technical works budget came from government. However, the communities themselves must be included more in the planning process. Accountability to beneficiaries should also be improved. As a partner organisation, GRCS is ideally suited to conducting PHP activities using a community-based approach, although it would be worth investing in coordination, planning and training at a Tbilisi level. For future responses, HR resources could be managed more effectively, and the livelihood "Cash-for-Work" element of such programmes could be planned and monitored more effectively. Overall, the PHP activities started late in the project cycle, and could almost be considered a "add on" to the technical work. Although participative approaches were planned, the approach taken was felt to be "top down" and the quality of the educational materials could have been more suited to literacy levels in Khulo. Only 4% of the OGB budget was used for PHP work, in future, this proportion should be increased. Again, gender aspects of such programmes need to be strengthened; more female staff members should be employed; and women should be encouraged to participate more actively in all stages of the programme.

Lastly, the community and the authorities in Khulo District were very grateful to both OGB and GRCS for the support given to Khulo District. The majority of the people interviewed during the evaluation claimed that both water quantity and quality had improved because of the programme, but it was difficult to show this using quantitative measures.

For the future, it is recommended that both Oxfam and GRCS/IFRC undertake a joint participatory workshop of both the Oni and Khulo programmes, as this would provide “lessons learnt” for both organisations. For future emergency responses, programmes should also respond to short-term emergency needs as well as looking at the more long-term rehabilitation needs. There should be a better balance between software and hardware, and gender should be included in the log frame. Monitoring should look at impact on beneficiaries, mixing both quantitative and qualitative indicators. Monitoring should not mean checking progress on technical works. Cash-for-work is an ideal tool for boosting the livelihood component of a programme. Staff should develop a better understanding of; beneficiary selection; the role of women; reporting; and monitoring of cash-for-work activities.

In terms of strengthening disaster preparedness response capacity for the future, OGB and GRCS should consider different training options, including; SPHERE; disaster management; programme management and project cycle; monitoring and evaluation; Training of Trainers; participatory methods; and emergency watsan response. In future, community participation and gender should be strengthened; in particular better standards and indicators should be selected to measure this “*participation*”. Also, it would be worthwhile for OGB to invest in a number of books and manuals on participatory approaches. Oxfam staff in Georgia should have more in-depth knowledge of OGB emergency procedures and practice, as well as having good knowledge of OGB emergency equipment. As a preparedness exercise, OGB and GRCS should conduct a SWOT analysis of Red Cross branches in Georgia, and create a database of skills available in various regions. Other potential partners should also be included in such a database. Similarly, a regional database should be created for partners and partner skills.

## Glossary of Acronyms

ACF	ACCION Contra el HAMBRE
ADRA	Adventist Development & Relief Agency International
CDC	Centre for Disease Control
CHF	Community Habitat and Finance
CPM	Country Programme Manager
DMT	Disaster Management Team
EC	European Commission
ESCSS	Emergency Situations and Civil Safety Service
FACT	Field Assessment and Coordination Team
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
GRC	Society of the Georgian Red Cross
IFRC	International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OFDA	USAID/Disaster Assistance
TACIS	Technical Assistance for the Commonwealth of Independent States
UNICEF	United Nations Children Fund
UNOCHA	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Assistance
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UMCOR	United Methodist Committee on Relief
WFP	World Food Programme
WV	World Vision

## Table of Contents

<b>1.0</b>	<b>Background</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Context, poverty analysis and objectives		1
1.2	Regions and people affected by the floods		1
1.3	Analysis of context of vulnerability and coping mechanisms		1
1.4	The Impact of floods on the livelihoods of people		1
1.5	The policy environment as it affects the project		2
1.6	Programme overview		2
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Overview of the Evaluation</b>		<b>4</b>
2.1	Purpose and objective of the evaluation		4
2.2	Evaluation methodology and timetable		4
2.3	Team composition and budget		4
2.4	Evaluation outcome		4
2.5	Constraints encountered during the evaluation		5
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Impact of the Response</b>		<b>6</b>
3.1	Project purpose		6
3.2	Planned beneficiaries		6
3.3	Actual verses planned logical framework outputs		6
3.4	Observations on results obtained		8
3.5	Impact on the lives of men, women and children in Khulo District		11
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Timeliness, Appropriateness, Efficiency and Cost-effectiveness</b>		<b>13</b>
4.1	Timeline of the key response activities/processes		13
4.2	Appropriateness of the response		14
4.3	Efficiency of the response		15
4.4	Cost-effectiveness of the response		16
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Technical Review of the Hardware Components</b>		<b>18</b>
5.1	Technical Overview of the Water System		18
5.2	Technical Overview of the Sanitation Component		20
5.3	Water Quality Analysis Procedures		21
5.4	Review of the Tendering Process		22
5.5	Review of the Contractors Work		23
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Review of the Software Components</b>		<b>24</b>
6.1	Stakeholder Consultation and Participation		24
6.2	The Role of the Red Cross		24
6.3	The Role of the Georgian Red Cross Society		25
6.4	The Role of Local Government		26
6.5	Hygiene Promotion		27
6.6	Gender Aspects		29
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Review of the Programme Management and Accountability</b>		<b>30</b>
7.1	Overview of Programme Management within OGB		30
7.2	Overview of Programme Management within Georgian Red Cross		30
7.3	Review of Good Practice and International Standards		31
7.4	Programme Accountability		31
<b>8.0</b>	<b>Implications for OGB Emergency Response in Caucuses</b>		<b>32</b>
8.1	Lessons learnt from the flood response programme		32
8.2	Possibility for replication in Georgia and other CIS countries		32
8.3	Opportunities in Disaster Response Preparedness		33
<b>9.0</b>	<b>Main Conclusions of the Evaluation Team</b>		<b>34</b>
<b>10.0</b>	<b>Main Recommendations for Future Programmes</b>		<b>36</b>

**List of Tables**

<i>Table 1:</i> Actual number of beneficiaries assisted verses planned	6
<i>Table 2:</i> Actual project results measured against the planned project indicators	7
<i>Table 3:</i> Resume of Key Milestones, April – December 2005	13
<i>Table 4:</i> Yearly Consumable Costs for Use of an Oxfam Delagua Kit	22

**List of Figures**

<i>Figure 1:</i> Percentage of Planned Programme Expenditure by Category	16
<i>Figure 2:</i> Actual Programme Expenditure Verses Planned Programme Expenditure	17
<i>Figure 3:</i> Actual Expenditure (%) Expressed as Hardware, Software & Operational Costs	17

**List of Annex****39**

I	Map of the Affected Areas in Georgia	40
II	Logical Framework for the Intervention	41
III	Approved Budget for the Intervention	42
IV	Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Evaluation	43
V	Planned Evaluation Methodology	46
VI	Evaluation Schedule and People Interviewed, 12 <sup>th</sup> – 19 <sup>th</sup> Dec. 2005	48
VII	Success Indicators	50
VIII	Minutes from the Tender Selection Meetings	51
IX	Details of Cash -Transfer Programming in Emergencies Book	54
X	Actual Programme Expenditure	55
XI	Details of Oxfam DelAgua kit	56
XII	Details of Swimming Pool Tester and Delagua Consumables	57
XIII	Details of the OGB Chemical Testing Kit	58
XIV	Tender Related Documents	59
XV	Questionnaire Distributed during PHP Campaign	61
XVI	Front cover of the Information Booklets	63
XVII	Evaluation Form used for Seminar 22-25.XI.05	64
XVIII	ERM Format for a Situation Report	65
XIX	SPHERE Minimum Standards Common to All Sectors (Chapter 1)	67
XX	Book List – Community Participation and Management	68
XXI	Pictures from Khulo District Flood Response Programme	70

---

© Oxfam GB 2006

First published online by Oxfam GB in 2010.

This document is part of a collection of programme evaluations available from Oxfam GB in accordance with its evaluation policy.

This document was originally written for internal accountability and learning purposes, rather than for external publication. The information included was correct to the evaluator's best knowledge at the date the evaluation took place. The views expressed in this report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect Oxfam's views.

The text may be used free of charge for the purposes of advocacy, campaigning, education, and research, provided that the source is acknowledged in full. The copyright holder requests that all such use be registered with them for impact assessment purposes. For copying in any other circumstances, or for reuse in other publications, or for translation or adaptation, permission must be secured and a fee may be charged. Email [publish@oxfam.org.uk](mailto:publish@oxfam.org.uk)

For further information on the issues raised in this document email [phd@oxfam.org.uk](mailto:phd@oxfam.org.uk)

Oxfam is a registered charity in England and Wales (no 202918) and Scotland (SC 039042). Oxfam GB is a member of Oxfam International.

**[www.oxfam.org.uk](http://www.oxfam.org.uk)**