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Executive Summary

In recent years, Leh has grown significantly in popularity among tourists, trekkers and backpackers, who are drawn by its forbidding terrain, stunning landscapes and the distinct culture and lifestyle of its people. In the early hours of the 6th of August 2010, mudslides and flash floods triggered by a cloudburst and heavy rains left an estimated 192 people dead, while destroying homes and damaging property and livelihoods across the region of Ladakh. For a region classified as a cold desert on account of its long, harsh winters and low levels of precipitation, the scale and impact of the disaster were entirely unprecedented.

The Common Forward Looking Learning Mission is an attempt to reflect on the significant response mounted by a range of actors to the devastation across the district of Leh. It looks back at the response to identify what went well and attempts identifying areas for further improvement, both for the recovery and reconstruction efforts in Leh as well as in future responses.

Facilitated by the Unified Response Strategy (URS) of Sphere India, the exercise involved consultations with major stakeholders, including members and representatives of the affected communities, representatives of the district administration and agencies and organizations involved in the response.

The reflections and lessons identified pertain to the overall response (including the response in the relief camps and covers aspects of appropriateness, needs assessment and timeliness of the response), coordination and information sharing carried out during the response and in the area of advocacy, including outstanding needs and issues for advocacy in the recovery and reconstruction phase.

Chapter 1: Methodology

The Terms of Reference for the Common Forward Looking Learning Mission were drafted following consultations with NGOs operating in Leh in the month of November, and subsequently finalised in a multi-stakeholder consultation that in addition to NGOs working in Leh, included representatives of the district administration and leaders and members of the affected communities. The experiences and opinions of local, national and international NGOs involved in the response were recorded through a questionnaire designed specifically for the purpose. A total of 18 responses were collected through the questionnaire over the month of January and early February. The experiences and suggestions of the affected community members were recorded through consultations in early February, across six settlements and villages chosen on the basis of the severity of the impact of the flash floods and their proximity

---

1 The region of Ladakh in the state of Jammu and Kashmir is comprised of the districts of Leh and Kargil.
to Leh town. The choice of the month of February helped capture the challenges the affected communities faced during the peak winter season. The views of the district administration were also gathered through interviews carried out in person or telephonically.

**Key Findings and Lessons**

**Chapter 2: Overall Response**

The response to the situation in Leh saw the involvement of several actors, including the military, national and state governments and a range of civil society groups and volunteers. It was among the most significant mobilizations by civil society groups and organizations in recent times.

Most community members and community leaders consulted expressed satisfaction with the quantity of aid received and with the process of consultation followed by most agencies while carrying out distributions. There were isolated cases of inappropriate relief materials being distributed and of individuals and some civil society groups not consulting existing village leadership structures.

Among the major concerns identified by community members and agencies in the relief phase were the initial conditions of hygiene and sanitation in some of the relief camps, though these improved subsequently. Most community members also reported receiving non-food items such as blankets, far in excess of their requirements. Inequalities in the distribution of relief material were also noted, where areas in the vicinity of Leh received significantly larger amounts as compared to further areas that were more difficult to access.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-fabricated shelters – a costly error and a lost opportunity?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a means of addressing the urgent shelter needs before the onset of winter, pre-fabricated units were provided to nearly all the affected families by the Leh district administration. These units included an estimated 450 units supplied by Hindustan Prefab Limited (supported by a number of public sector undertakings) and close to 100 additional units supplied by the National Bamboo Mission. In the course of consultations with the community members in the month of February, it was found that these shelters were unsuitable for the local needs and climatic conditions and had low occupancy levels. The occupancy levels were much lower in the case of the bamboo units. Apart from being unsuited to the local conditions and a questionable use of resources (each unit supplied by Hindustan Prefab Ltd costs close to Rs. 4,00,000), these units have also meant an increased dependence on heating appliances and fuel and a lost opportunity to build local economic and social capital. (Details in Box 4.1, pg 18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the many lessons, the experience of the response in Leh has highlighted the need to continuously monitor the situation in relief camps. The Sphere Minimum Standards for Disaster Relief and the newly developed Guidelines of the National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA) can be useful tools for this purpose. The incident, in which 28 children from
Leh were separated from their families and moved to Jammu by an agency, also highlights the need for increased awareness and monitoring of such issues in future emergencies.

**Chapter 3: Coordination and Information Sharing**

The efforts to coordinate the response to the flash floods included, facilitating the formation of the Leh NGO Relief Coordination Committee comprised of local NGOs, information gathering and sharing with the district administration in Leh and facilitating coordination among agencies by establishing an NGO Facilitation Centre based in the premise of the Ladakh Ecological Development Group (LEDeG) in Leh. The NGO Facilitation Centre also attempted to identify and highlight areas of shared concern and facilitate common approaches on the response in various sectors and the development of common sector strategies. The results of these were initiatives were mixed.

The challenges in terms of poor flow of information during the first few weeks due to damage to communications, infrastructure and other logistical challenges as well as the large number of civil society groups and individuals who were involved in the response and distributions compounded the task of coordination.

The following lessons in the area of coordination and information sharing were identified from the Leh response:

- The need for increased local ownership of coordination processes with Sphere India through the Unified Response Strategy (URS) playing the role of a facilitator. Also of significance is the need for strengthening local capacities and preparedness through mechanisms such as the Inter-Agency Groups (IAGs)
- The coordination or facilitation centre should attempt to maintain a balance between working closely with the district administration, while retaining its independence and identity as a representative of civil society groups and concerns
- The need to engage the media and have a coherent media strategy as part of future coordination efforts
- The need to streamline coordination processes, including the duration of meetings and meeting outcomes, by the coordination or facilitation centre in the future

**Chapter 4: Advocacy**

The preparation of common strategies was one way of highlighting and sensitizing stakeholders about factors and issues that needed to be taken into account during the response. The preparation of common strategies was facilitated for the shelter, livelihoods, WASH, health, education, child protection and psycho-social support sectors, based on discussions among agencies involved in the response in each of these sectors. While the strategies were able to successfully identify several of the issues and concerns across the different sectors, the subsequent experiences, particularly the experience with pre-fabricated shelters points to the
need for more sustained advocacy efforts with all stakeholders on the issues that were identified in the common strategies.

The preparation of common strategies following discussions and development of a consensus among stakeholders could also be a useful tool for advocacy in future emergencies.

The most significant outstanding concerns and needs, which are also the top most issues for advocacy as the recovery and reconstruction process resumes in the spring and summer of 2011 are as follows:

1. **Shelter**: Construction of permanent shelters in the spring and summer of 2011 should be carried out after due consultation with the communities and take into account their preferences and the distinct climatic conditions of the region.

2. **Restoration of Livelihoods**: The restoration of livelihoods, particularly the restoration of irrigation channels and reclamation of agricultural land covered in silt and boulders, needs to be undertaken on an urgent basis.

3. **Disaster Risk Reduction and Mitigation measures over the medium to long term**: Attention needs to be given to disaster risk reduction, mitigation and preparedness measures among communities and all other actors in Leh.

4. **Provision of sanitation facilities in reconstructed shelters**
Introduction

The flash floods and mud slides following cloudbursts and heavy rains across the Ladakh region in the month of August 2010 were unprecedented for the region, in the extent of losses caused as well as the geographical spread of the area affected. The official figures estimate a total of 192 deaths that included personnel of the Indian Armed Forces and visiting tourists. The ensuing response saw the involvement of personnel of the armed forces, the state and district administration, a range of local, national and international NGOs and a significant role of volunteers and community based organizations. Their tasks were compounded by the challenging terrain and severe disruptions in communications infrastructure.

In the aftermath of the flash floods, efforts towards facilitating a more coordinated response were made through the NGO Facilitation Centre in Leh and the Unified Response Strategy (URS) of Sphere India. The Common Forward Looking Learning Mission on the Leh Flash Floods of 2010 is an attempt to document the response to the flash floods of August 2010 across Leh and to reflect on what went well and what could have been done better.

Apart from documenting the experiences and suggestions of the affected communities and community leaders, representatives of the district administration and agencies that responded to the flash flood, the exercise has also attempted to identify issues that remain unresolved and that require attention in the immediate and the medium to long term future.

This report - based on the feedback received from community members and leaders, agencies involved in the response and discussions with officials of the district administration, contains five sections. The first of these outlines the methodology used in the study. The second addresses aspects of the overall response in the affected areas and relief camps, including the timeliness, assessment of needs and proportionality of the response. The third chapter covers areas of coordination and information sharing, among the primary responsibilities of the NGO Facilitation Centre in Leh. The fourth chapter is devoted to the area of advocacy during the response, and more importantly issues and needs that are in continued need of attention. Each chapter attempts to reflect on the experience in Leh compiled through the feedback received from the major stakeholders, and concludes with suggestions for areas of improvement and lessons for responses in future emergencies.

It is hoped that the reflections and findings captured through the exercise, can assist and inform the actions of Sphere India, agencies, civil society groups and the district administration as they continue their efforts in the spring and summer of 2011, and also responses to future emergencies and disasters across India.
Methodology

The Terms of Reference (Annex 2) for the Common Forward Looking Learning Mission were formulated during a consultation involving representatives of agencies working in Leh in the month of November 2010. The Terms of Reference for the exercise were then shared and discussed at a multi-stakeholder consultation in the month of November 2010 held in a community hall in Solar Colony Camp, Choglamsar (Leh). The multi-stakeholder brought together representatives of the affected communities and community leaders (Gobas/Numberdars), agencies and the district administration.

Feedback from agencies was gathered by means of a questionnaire developed specifically for this purpose (Annex 3). The questionnaire was piloted in the month of December and was revised and circulated through email in the month of January 2011 among agencies and individuals involved in the response to the flash floods. Feedback was recorded through email, telephonic conversations and individual meetings with some of the respondents over the months of January and February 2011.

The profile of the 18 respondents from agencies who responded to the questionnaire can be found in Figure 1.1.

Consultations with the affected and relocated community members and community leaders were carried out in February 2011. The choice of the month of February was deliberate, and guided by the fact that it provided an opportunity to review the conditions and challenges that the affected communities were experiencing during the peak of winter, when minimum temperatures across the district of Leh are known to fall to as low as minus 30 degrees Celsius. In addition, the consultations with communities would also provide an opportunity to highlight issues that require attention during the reconstruction phase scheduled to begin in the spring and summer.

Six affected villages were chosen for the consultations (Figure 1.2). The choice of villages was based on a random sample chosen on the basis of the extent of damage due to the flash floods (estimated through reported loss of lives and damage to houses and assets) and their distance from Leh town.
Consultations with the affected communities were carried out using a combination of transect walks in the affected villages, observation, focus group discussions with community members and semi-structured interviews with community members and leaders. The discussions were facilitated by residents of Leh, who were briefed by the researcher before the visits and provided a copy of the lead questions for the focus group discussions. A researcher was present during all focus group discussions and interviews to record the views expressed by community members.

The views of representatives of the district administration were recorded through semi-structured interviews conducted telephonically and in person.
Overall Response

The response to the heavy rains and flash floods in Leh saw one of the most significant mobilizations of support by both state and civil society groups in India in recent times². This included members of the Indian Armed Forces, the national and several state governments, public sector undertakings, and a significant number of volunteers and local community based organisations. An overview of the responses of some of the agencies, as shared with Sphere India is contained in Annex 1.

The questionnaire shared with agencies and the consultations with the affected communities attempted to capture their opinions on the overall response in the affected areas and relief camps, the response in different sectors and specifically on the issues of timeliness, appropriateness to people’s needs and the proportionality (in relation to the needs) of aid delivered. It also attempted identifying outstanding needs and issues that continue to require attention.

2.1 Opinions of community members and agencies on response

In the course of the consultations, it was found that community members were largely satisfied with the quantity and quality of support received from both the government as well as civil society organizations during the relief phase. Most villages established relief distribution committees to manage the relief distributions or in some cases, the existing village leadership structures took on the additional tasks of assisting in beneficiary selection and management of relief material. Several groups and organizations chose to directly distribute to affected families or organised distributions by the side of roads without prior intimation. Such distributions were reported to have led to divisions and

²In relation to the number of people affected. Estimates of the total number of people affected in Leh range from 9,000 to 15,000 and the extent of total damages at no more than Rs. 350 crore (Source: Information shared by Leh District Administration, September 2010 and NGO estimates). Following his visit to the affected areas, the Prime Minister of India announced the release of Rs. 125 crore as assistance from the Central Government.
differences among some community members. Most eligible community members reported having received half the sums they were entitled to for partially or fully damaged houses. The views of community members, expressing satisfaction with the relief is largely reflected in the responses of agencies to the questionnaire (Figures 2.1), where most agencies were of the opinion that the relief provided in the affected areas was satisfactory or highly satisfactory.

2.2 Concerns

1. Disparity in distribution of aid

Areas in and around Leh which were easily accessible received a disproportionately large amount of aid (particularly non-food items) while those further away. This view was shared by a large number of agencies. Limited access on account of damage to roads and infrastructure also led to delays in relief reaching some of the more remote locations. Some such areas identified by agencies included those of Lingshed, Photoksar, Sku-Markha and Wanla.

2. Initial conditions in some relief camps

The conditions in some of the relief camps were a matter of concern during the first few weeks. Among the areas identified by agencies, were the lack of adequate sanitation facilities and lack of separate bathing facilities for women, poor conditions of hygiene and a shortage of tents due to which two or three families had to share the same tent. Conditions subsequently improved significantly, with the support of the district administration and NGOs and civil society groups.

3. Excessive amounts of non-food items (NFIs) particularly blankets

Nearly all community members, leaders and representatives of the district administration were of the opinion that the quantity of blankets and clothing materials received was far in excess of what was required. The lack of uniformity in the quality of materials distributed by agencies on occasion was pointed out by the community members.

4. Inappropriate relief materials

The situation in Leh, following the flash floods, was able to generate a significant amount of attention and interest among organizations across India (and internationally), and resulted in a number of civil society organizations and individuals who were not entirely familiar with local conditions and needs, organizing visits and distribution of relief items. Several community members and leaders reported cases of culturally inappropriate foodstuffs and material being distributed both in the relief camps as well as in the affected areas.

Families whose houses were classified as fully damaged are eligible for Rs. 2,00,000 and those partially damaged to Rs. 1,00,000 from the District Administration. The sum is to be released in phases based on the completion of construction of new houses.
Community members in the village of Igoo, expressed dissatisfaction with new storage units provided by some agencies for food and fodder after the flash floods⁴.

5. Poor response in the areas of livelihoods, shelter and psycho-social support

Agencies responding to the questionnaire identified the sectors of livelihoods, shelter and psycho-social support as those in which the response was poor or lacking. The responses in the livelihoods and shelter sectors have been addressed in further detail in the subsequent sections of the report.

Note: The NGO Facilitation Centre was aware of attempts by few agencies to assess and address the psycho-social needs of the affected communities in close coordination with the mental health professional and the Chief Medical Officer in the district, and a common strategy on the same was also developed. However, it is difficult to infer from the data available, the exact reasons (a perception or based on definite experiences) for the widespread view among agency respondents.

2.3 Outstanding Issues and Unmet Needs

The following issues (in order of priority) were identified by agencies as requiring further attention, and which the immediate response by government and agencies was not able to adequately address. The issues identified agencies were largely echoed by community members during the consultations.

1. Livelihoods
   An overwhelming majority of the respondents identified the area of livelihoods as one requiring immediate attention. This includes the activities of land reclamation and restoration of top soil fertility, restoration of irrigation canals, adequate compensation for loss of horticulture plantations and restoration of water mills (runtaks)

2. Reconstruction
   Including reconstruction of shelter and damaged infrastructure such as bridges over streams

3. Disaster Risk Reduction
   Adequate planning of new settlements and putting in place improved disaster preparedness and risk mitigation measures

---

⁴ Traditionally, to help sustain themselves through the long, harsh winters, families in Ladakh have stored vegetables (such as potatoes) and grain in cellars within their homes or in earthen pits dug for this purpose. The new storage units were pre-fabricated units distributed before the onset of winter.
4. **Others** – including sanitation in newly constructed shelters, access to shelter and sanitation facilities for differently-abled community members and psycho-social support

The reasons attributed, by agencies for the gaps in the response were primarily the challenging climatic conditions that made it difficult for reconstruction efforts to continue beyond November. Among the other reasons cited by agencies that responded to the questionnaire were, the poor flow of information and coordination between the district administration and the Ladakh Autonomous Hill Development Council (LAHDC) – which was reconstituted following elections in November 2010, as well as between agencies and the district authorities, due to which significant issues such as livelihoods were largely ignored.

Elections to the Ladakh Autonomous Hill Development Council held in the month of October, that resulted in a change in leadership of the Council and transfers in the district administration were also widely seen as having slowed the recovery efforts.

2.4 Lessons and Areas for improvement:

1. **Regular monitoring of needs and situation in camps during future emergencies**

The Sphere Minimum Standards and the National Guidelines being developed by the National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA) could be useful tools for this purpose. A possible way of doing this could be evolving checklists with key issues and concerns relating to the different thematic areas in consultation with agencies. These checklists could be useful in sensitising and guiding agencies, aid workers, as well as officials of the administration working in and operating relief camps agencies. These checklists could also be adapted to include specific local conditions, preferences and considerations wherever necessary.

2. **Protection and Trafficking**

The case of 28 children who were separated from their families and sent to Jammu received widespread coverage in the national media. There circumstances under which the children were separated from their families and the motivation of the organization responsible for relocating these children in Jammu remain unclear. However, that this incident remained unknown to agencies until it was highlighted by the district administration and the media is a cause for concern.

It also points towards the need for increased awareness on the issues of protection and rights violations in disasters, and the need for a review by agencies of the ways and methods employed in monitoring situations in future emergencies.
The Unified Response Strategy (URS) of Sphere India aims at facilitating an organized and coordinated response to disasters, by building common understanding among stakeholders. In accordance with its mandate, the URS was activated following an emergency coordination meeting in New Delhi.

The following steps were taken as part of the efforts to coordinate the response in Leh:

- Facilitating the formation of a local coordination committee (Leh NGO Relief Coordination Committee) composed of local agencies based in Leh.

- Establishing the NGO Facilitation Centre based in the office of the Ladakh Ecological Development Group (LEDeG).

The activities carried out by the NGO Facilitation Centre in turn were:

- Dissemination of Common Assessment Formats among agencies, and compilation, collation of responses.

- Facilitation of information sharing and meetings between the District Administration and NGOs, including with the Relief Coordinator’s office.

- Facilitating exchange of information among NGOs with a view to avoiding duplication and helping agencies to better complement each others efforts and ensure greater sustainability of their interventions.

- Facilitating the delivery of aid to unreached villages through interactions between representatives of the community and the civil society groups.
3.2 Concerns

1. Information flow during first weeks

Communications infrastructure was severely affected by the flash floods, and the inability to gain access to some affected communities meant that there were significant delays before clarity on the scale and extent of damages and needs emerged.

2. Volume of aid, particularly non-food items (NFIs)

The sheer volume of aid in relation to the number of people affected, particularly of NFI such as blankets made it extremely difficult to avoid duplication. The presence of a large number of unorganized responses by several private individuals, groups and agencies considerably compounded the task of coordination and avoiding duplication.

3. Inequality in terms of geographic distribution

This indicates that there was room for improvement in coordination among agencies (areas easily accessible and near Leh received more than required and further areas inadequate aid)

3.3 Lessons

1. Increased local ownership of coordination processes with Sphere India and the Unified Response Strategy (URS) playing the role of a facilitator

While this was attempted in Leh (by facilitating the formation of a Leh NGO Relief Coordination Committee, after the floods in August 2010), it met with limited success owing to the unprecedented nature of the disaster and the lack of local structures which could take on the task quickly.

The experience in Leh highlights the need for increased preparedness and strengthening Inter-Agency Groups (IAGs) and capacities at the state and regional levels so that they can quickly take over the task of coordination in an emergency. Attempts towards this have already been initiated in Leh.

1. Balance between working closely with district administration and not losing independence and retaining identity as civil society

The task of coordination was also being facilitated by the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Leh and the Relief Coordinator. As the principal respondent during a disaster the significance of coordinating closely with the district administration is acknowledged and accepted by all actors. However in doing so, several NGOs are also of the opinion that civil society groups need to preserve their independence and identity. This process also requires the presence of strong leadership among local civil society groups. Some agencies have also suggested inviting and
involving community leaders or camp leaders to coordination meetings or consulting them periodically as part of the coordination process.

2. **Need to engage the media and have a coherent media strategy as part of coordination efforts**

The experience of Leh, underscores the need to engage media at all levels as part of future coordination efforts. This could possibly include periodic briefs from the coordination or facilitation centre, highlighting the situation and needs as well as issues for advocacy with different stakeholders.

3. **Need to streamline coordination processes, including duration of meetings and outcomes by the coordination or facilitation centre in the future**

Note: The development of Common Sector Strategies to build a consensus on the approach adopted by agencies is also an important aspect of the coordination process. This has been addressed in the subsequent section on advocacy.
4 Advocacy

This chapter seeks to highlight issues and areas that are in continued need of attention and advocacy as the recovery and reconstruction efforts restart across Leh, while also reflecting on some of the lessons learnt from the advocacy efforts initiated during the relief phase.

In the course of the initial response, the NGO Facilitation Centre also attempted identifying and highlighting issues of concern among the different stakeholders, particularly the district administration and agencies. Advocacy was carried out primarily through facilitating the preparation of ‘Common Strategies’ through consultations among agencies, for the sectors of shelter, livelihoods, WASH (water-sanitation-hygiene), health, education, child protection, and psycho-social support. The subsequent experiences (particularly those in the area of shelter), appear to validate several of the points outlined in the strategies and underscore the need for more sustained advocacy at the time with all stakeholders centred on the Common Strategies.

The following are the major issues for advocacy in the months ahead:

1. **Shelter**

   *Construction of permanent shelters in the spring and summer of 2011 should be carried out after due consultation with the communities and take into account their preferences and the distinct climatic conditions of the region.*

   **Box 4.1: Pre-fabricated shelters – a costly error and a lost opportunity?**

   With shelter emerging as a critical need, and a short window of opportunity before the onset of winter in Leh, the District Administration opted for the provision of pre-fabricated housing units to the affected families. An estimated 450 units were provided by Hindustan Pre-Fab limited (supported by other Public Sector Undertakings) and an additional 100 by the National Bamboo Mission.

   Consultations with community members who had received both the types of pre-fabricated shelters showed the units had proved unsuitable for the extreme winters of Leh.
Leh and had low levels of occupancy among those who had received them. The occupancy rates were significantly lower in the case of bamboo shelters. The concerns with these units include:

*Unsuited to local climatic conditions and extremely low occupancy rates*

The shelters were too cold in peak winter, and as a result were unoccupied in a large number of cases. The suitability of these shelters for summers in Ladakh remains uncertain. Community members complained of poor lighting and ventilation in the bamboo shelters, and several complained that being light, the structure is prone to shaking violently whenever there are strong winds.

*Ecological concerns*

The shelters have resulted in an increased dependence on *bukharis* and heating appliances among families who received them. Due to a lack of ventilation, fires cannot be lit inside these units and in families are forced to live in the adjoining shelters (wherever constructed) built using traditional mud blocks, where they can light fires.

*A Lost Opportunity?*

*Social support structures:* A large number of people chose not to occupy the pre-fabricated units and instead live with family members or to rent out houses for the winter. This is an indication of community support structures that could have been further supported and strengthened through the use of alternate options such as providing rental support to families for the winter or extending support to host families with whom the affected families could stay.

*Economic opportunities:* The use of pre-fabricated units, apart from being extremely expensive (the cost of each unit provided by Hindustan Pre-fab Corporation is estimated at approximately Rs. 4,00,000) were also the loss of an opportunity presented by the reconstruction process to stimulate the local economy. Through the use of local Ladakhi construction techniques and materials (such as mud blocks and timber), a significant amount of income, employment, entrepreneurship, training and skill creation opportunities as well as demand in the local economy could have been created.

### 2. Restoration of Livelihoods

*The restoration of livelihoods, particularly the restoration of irrigation channels and reclamation of agricultural land covered in silt and boulders, needs to be undertaken on an urgent basis*

As agricultural producers in Leh are able to harvest only a single crop in the year, the restoration of agricultural land in time for the sowing season is of particular significance for the food and income security of the communities. Both the Ladakh Autonomous Hill Development Council (LAHDC) and the office of the Deputy Commissioner have taken particular note of this fact and are actively involved in efforts to initiate this task at the earliest. Other urgent tasks those of restoring the fertility of top soil and addressing the
concerns and needs in the particular cases of agricultural producers who have lost their land entirely and may require relocation. As several of these tasks entail significant investments of resources, the role of NGOs and other civil society organizations may perhaps play a greater role in the task of advocacy and identifying and highlighting cases of exclusion and gaps in the efforts of the district administration.

3. **Disaster Risk Mitigation and Reduction measures over the medium to long term**
   *Attention needs to be given to disaster risk reduction, mitigation and preparedness measures among communities and all other actors in Leh*

Several locations and villages affected by the flash floods of 2010 have been affected by floods in previous years. However given the limited scale of the floods at the time, they did not generate significant responses or attention. Several agencies have pointed out the lack of any early warning to areas around the villages of Nimo and Basgo where four deaths were reported due to heavy rains a day before the devastating cloudburst of 6th August 2010.

Due consideration also needs to be given to site planning of new constructions and that the Ladakh region is an area which is highly vulnerable to earthquakes.

4. **Provision of sanitation facilities in reconstructed shelters**

While most families have received some form of shelter support, the lack of sanitation facilities was identified by several families as an outstanding need. Ladakhi families have traditionally used dry compost latrines. Sanitation facilities, wherever they are being provided, should take into consideration the local preferences and environmental concerns.

**Lessons:**

The development of Common Strategies for the various sectors were a good beginning, but required to be sustained further. Such strategies should be developed with the active participation and consultation of local actors and groups and can be useful in alerting actors responding to a disaster about specific local needs and concerns. They can also serve as effective tools for advocacy. As far as possible, the strategies should engage all actors involved in the response in a particular sector to help widen the consensus around an approach.
Conclusions

This report has attempted to reflect on the response to the flash floods in Leh and capture the lessons, opinions and suggestions of some of the major stakeholders on the response. Apart from helping document the response to the flash floods, the consultations held as part of the Common Forward Looking Learning Mission have helped highlight a number of important lessons.

These include highlighting concerns in the responses in the area of shelter and livelihoods, lessons in facilitating coordination and how the task of collective advocacy is taken up in future disasters. The response in Leh can also offer significant insights and lessons for future responses in other mountainous regions of India, where access and information flow is hampered by terrain, infrastructure and poor communication networks.

While the Common Forward Looking Learning Mission is not the first time that a learning initiative has been undertaken, it is the first time that this has been realized as one of the stages of the Unified Response Strategy (URS) of Sphere India. To that extent, the response to the flash floods in Leh has also been of great significant for the Unified Response Strategy (URS) as it provided an opportunity to review the functioning of the different phases of the URS and how this can be taken forward in the future. It is hoped that the lessons emerging from this exercise are useful in informing the actions of all actors, including Sphere India for future emergencies and help institutionalize the process of collective reflection and collective learning in future emergencies.
Annex 1: Details of Agency Interventions in Leh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Name of Organisation (and partner organisations, if any)</th>
<th>Villages Covered</th>
<th>Thematic Coverage (Health, Water, Sanitation, Shelter etc.)</th>
<th>Population Covered</th>
<th>Duration of Response</th>
<th>Additional Remarks or further details on intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>All India Disaster Mitigation Institute (AIDMI), Censfood and RDY</td>
<td>10 villages and 1 urban area covered under the need assessment and 4 villages covered for shelter support</td>
<td>Water (Handpump as community level water supply), Shelter, livelihood, School Safety including Sphere standards for key officials</td>
<td>120 families for livelihoods, 5 families for shelter</td>
<td>September 2010 to August 2012</td>
<td>Shelter, Livelihood, School Safety, Training on CMDRR, Sharing of learning material for advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Child Rights &amp; You (CRY)</td>
<td>Leh Block – 5 schools Khaltsi Block – 7 schools Kharu Block – 1 school</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>13 schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>One time grant provided for material like white boards, carrom boards, chess boards, ludo, skipping ropes and building blocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CASA and partner agencies</td>
<td>Hanu Yokma, Hanu Gongma, Thyagursta Hanu, Bema, Lehdo, Tia, Timmosgam, Domkhar Gongma, Domkhar Burma, Domkhar Do, Skurbuchan, Achinalungba, Achinathang</td>
<td>Hygiene kit, blanket, utensils, pressure cooker, solar lantern, 6 houses constructed in Achinathang</td>
<td>100 families</td>
<td>17 August - 25 September</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>CASA, LEHO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>CASA, RDY</td>
<td>Igoo, Shey, Lato, Miru, Kung Gyam, Teri, Sumdo, Nyomce</td>
<td>Hygiene kit, blanket, utensils, pressure cooker, solar lantern</td>
<td>150 families</td>
<td>17 August - 25 September</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>CASA, WWF India</td>
<td>Gey Phey Line Choglumsar, Saboo, Degree College, Housing Colony, Skamapari</td>
<td>Hygiene kit, blanket, utensils, pressure cooker, solar lantern</td>
<td>50 families</td>
<td>17 August - 25 September</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>CASA, Women's Alliance of Ladakh</td>
<td>Phyang, Basgo, Taru, Nimo, Ney</td>
<td>Hygiene kit, blanket, utensils, pressure cooker, solar lantern</td>
<td>100 families</td>
<td>17 August - 25 September</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CEE Himalaya</td>
<td>Igoo, Saboo, Taru, Shey Phyang</td>
<td>Education, psychosocial care</td>
<td>15 days</td>
<td>CEE visited relief camps and some affected schools, provided psychosocial support to children and interacted with teachers/education department/distributed relevant education materials.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Confederation of Indian Industry (CII)</td>
<td>21 locations across - Choglumsar, Saboo, Chilling, Hankar, Himank Camp, Kaya, Mane-tselding, Markha, Nimoo, Phyang, Rumbak, Saboo, Samdachay, Samdchachu, Samdhador, Shang, Skyu, Solar Colony Camp, Taru, Tashi Gatsal, Tia, Trosty</td>
<td>Family packs (sugar, tea, snacks, salt and fruit), hygiene kits, community tents, woolen blankets, solar lanterns (200), kitchen utensils, water purification units and tablets (10,000), medicines, tools for clearing debris, community tents to house 30-40 people</td>
<td>1000 beneficiaries</td>
<td>Will construct 13 houses in Saboo village, 2 of which have already been completed Has distributed construction material to 35 BPL families and 100 bags of cement in Skyu village CII has also commissioned a JCB machine to clear silt and agricultural land in Saboo village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Covenant Social Services</td>
<td>Food, psycho-social counselling, relief kits, water tanks, distribution of bukharis, medical camp</td>
<td>Based on the information shared in September 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Villages</td>
<td>Sector/Activities</td>
<td>Beneficiaries</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>EFICOR</td>
<td>Taru, Shey, Saboo, Stakmo, Igoo, Phyang, Ney, Choglamsar, Basgo, Nimmo, Leh, Upshi, Miru, Skyu and Kaya, Mathoo, Karu, Nepali migrants (from different villages)</td>
<td>Food and Non-Food Items</td>
<td>3357 people</td>
<td>Two months</td>
<td>5 power tillers will be provided towards agriculture purpose after the winter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Emmanuel Hospital Association (EHA)</td>
<td>Ney, Basgo, Nimmo, Taru, Phyang, Sabo, Shey, Stakmo, Nang, Solar Colony</td>
<td>Health, psycho-social support, radio distribution</td>
<td>Note: Based on the information shared in September 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Handicap International and People's Action Group for Inclusion and Rights (PAGIR) and Sonam Norboo Memorial Government Hospital, Leh</td>
<td>Phyang, Saboo, Stakmo, Leh (SNM Hospital, Chulung camp, Degree College Camp, Tibetan Relief Camp, Tashi Camp, Old Age Home, Camp TRC-1,2,3,4,5,6,7,9,10,11) Nang, Thiksey, Shey, Choglamsar, Ney, Nimo, Taru, Umla, Basgo</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>419 direct beneficiaries</td>
<td>August - October</td>
<td>• Targeted persons and children with disabilities, elderly people and injured • Aimed at improving the capacity of target beneficiaries to access mainstream relief support • Provision of physical rehabilitation (physiotherapy and occupational therapy) and provision of aids and appliances to improve physical and functional mobility of beneficiaries • Referral linkages with SNM Government Hospital • Provided technical input on accessibility issues for provision of shelter, watsan. • Training to staff of PAGIR in area of disability identification and assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>HelpAge India (with Cordaid, Thiksey Monastery, Mahabodhi International Meditation Centre and Shey village community)</td>
<td>15 villages</td>
<td>Health, livelihood/land Reclamation, Winter food stuffs to the affected elders</td>
<td>5000 people</td>
<td>August - ongoing</td>
<td>Planning to establish Elders Village at Shey Village and Livelihood programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Services Provided</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Indian Red Cross Society (IRCS) and IFRC</td>
<td>Water purification, temporary shelter, helping in dead body management &amp; tracing services (ICRC)</td>
<td>Dispatched 2 small water purification units of (3000-4000L/hr) capacity, relief material (Non Food Items &amp; Tents),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ladakh Arts and Media Organisation (LAMO) and partner agencies</td>
<td>Waris-Fastan villages of Nubra Valley</td>
<td>Clothing, food rations, sleeping bags and blankets</td>
<td>52 households</td>
<td>Second week of October</td>
<td>LAMO targeted the 'Beda' community, migrant labourers Rental support to families is also being provided, besides this clearance of debris and structural repairs were undertaken. Proposed intervention through an arts and culture programme as part of efforts towards extending psycho-social support to the families and monitoring the flow of water in the glaciers, lakes and streams in Ladakh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>LAMO and Care for Ladakh (Group of Tour Operators)</td>
<td>Mane-tsermo and Leh Old Town</td>
<td>Food, Clothing, Shelter</td>
<td>103 households</td>
<td>August - ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>LEDeG and SEEDS India</td>
<td>Shey, Leh town, Choglumsar village, Choglumsar (Tashi Gatsal), Spituk Agling</td>
<td>Shelter and winter support</td>
<td>Shelter - 14 families Winter support - 43 families</td>
<td>• Shelter: Construction of disaster resistant, energy efficient core shelters • Rent support for six months (Rs. 600/month for 6 months), traditional stove cum room heaters (bukharis), fuelwood support (Rs. 400/month for 6 months), Quilt and Blanket sets' • Spituk Agling: Traditional stove cum room heaters (bukharis), fuelwood (4 qntls /family), Quilt and Blanket sets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>MSF- OCA, India</td>
<td>Across affected areas in Leh and Kargil and in relief camps</td>
<td>Health, psycho-social support, watsan assessments, NFI, health education</td>
<td>Handover of activities to concerned government depts./officials</td>
<td>Distribution of household kits and NFI done in Leh and Kargil jointly with Save the Children-Leh Nutrition Project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Areas of Work</td>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>Result</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Oxfam India, RDY, Censfood</td>
<td>Water, sanitation, hygiene, food security, temporary shelter</td>
<td>Basgo, Kumdok, Nidder, Nyoma, Gayik, Mudh, Tsaga, Mahe, Leh Town (various locations), Ney, Loma, Nimmo, Phyang, Photoksar, Stakmo, Skyu, Kaya, Markha, Taru, Umla, Wanla, Hanupata, Fanjilla, Umsi, Thiksey, Temisgam, Tia, Miru, Relief Camps and several schools across Leh</td>
<td>2600 households (2000 WASH kit distribution, 400 Food Security, 200 Thermal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Pragya (with Care Today, Honeywell Bharti Foundation, Godrej Honeywell, Jubilant Foundation Medentech, Liberty and Bata)</td>
<td>Food and Fodder Storage, Food and nutrition, sanitation, water, hygiene, NFI (including clothing, blankets, shoes, lanterns, heaters), livelihoods (agric. implements and livestock feed)</td>
<td>Achinathang, Chilling Sumdo, Gya, Hanu Yokma, Hemis, Hanuthang, Igo, Kungyam, Karu, Lamayuru, Nimmo, Phyang, Stakmo, Shey, Saboo, Skurbuchan, Saspoche, Tarchit, Taru, Takmachik, Tia, Temisgam, Umla, Wanla, Leh (various locations), Relief Camps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>RDY Ladakh, Association Weaving Peace-France</td>
<td>Livelihoods</td>
<td>1 village</td>
<td>1,132 people</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>RDY Ladakh, Censfood, Swiss Red Cross</td>
<td>Livelihoods</td>
<td>4 villages</td>
<td>3,045 people</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Samarpan Foundation</td>
<td>Warm clothes, blankets Wheat, barley, rice and antibiotics (with HelpAge India), Shelter</td>
<td>Tia, Ney, Basgo, Saspol, Wanla, Ursi, Umla, Taru, Nimmo, Saspoche, Lamayuru, Photoksar, Sku, Kaya, Shey, Thiksey, Igo, Achinathang, Biama, Dha, Hemis, Yang Thang, Stok</td>
<td>Samarpan has completed constructing 2 houses (1 Choglamsar, 2 Nimmo) Plans on returning later for construction of more pre-fabricated houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Towns Covered</td>
<td>Project Details</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Save the Children, Leh Nutrition Project, MSF Holland</td>
<td>Leh town (including relief camps), Saboo, Shey Igoo, Choglamsar, Photokasar, Spituk, Taru, Phyang, Umla, Nemo, Basgo, Ney, Skurbuchan, Domkhar Dho, Achinathang</td>
<td>Family kit (1 Hygiene Kit, 1 Household Kit, 1 Shelter Module) per family, Child Friendly Spaces (only Save the Children-LNP)</td>
<td>Approx. 5000 families</td>
<td>Note: Based on information shared by Save the Children in September 2010.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Seva Bharti</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shelter, repair flour mills</td>
<td></td>
<td>Note: Based on information shared by Seva Bharti in September 2010.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>World Society for Protection of Animals</td>
<td>Shey, Phyang, Nimoo, Igoo, Taru, Stakmo, Kharu, Gongpa, Temisgam, Basgo, Ney, Choglamsar, Skurbachan, Khalsi, Tia, Gya, Meru, Upshi, Nurla (vaccination); Shey, Phyang, Saboo, Igoo (cattle feed)</td>
<td>Veterinary Health Camp (FMD vaccination) and Cattle feed distribution</td>
<td>Cattle-3728, Dzo/Dzom-671, Yak-65, Sheep/Goat-3214 Total animals-767</td>
<td>Vaccination ongoing</td>
<td>A total of 20 tonnes of cattle feed was distributed in the 4 villages covered 10,000 doses of FMD vaccine were given to the Animal Husbandry Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>WWF India</td>
<td>Choglamsar, Gya, Meru, Hunder (Nubra Valley), Sumdo, Thiksay and Stakmo, Support to students at Sadbhavana Hostel (Hemis National Park) and Lamdon School (Thiksey)</td>
<td>650 Solar Lights, 15X1000 litres Water tanks, Sanitation, Warm clothing, Health (Medicines and Masks at Choglamsar), Digging equipment, heating systems and emergency food supply</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>August till now and propose to continue</td>
<td>• WWF along with wildlife department has initiated Disaster Risk Reduction education programme for various educational institutions. • Further rehab work has been worked out and will be implemented for long term ecological benefits for the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Leh Flash Floods: Common Learning Exercise

Terms of Reference

Background

The flash floods and heavy rains in early August 2010 across Ladakh, resulted in the loss of life and destruction of property on an unprecedented scale in the region. The subsequent response and relief efforts witnessed the involvement of a large number of actors spanning state institutions and a range of civil society organizations.

In the course of the response, attempts were made towards streamlining the relief efforts by facilitating coordination among the many actors with a view to ensuring that the affected communities receive their entitlements. While much was achieved through these efforts, the end of the relief operations of most agencies provides an opportunity to reflect on the experience, the lessons learnt and areas for improvement in the course of the relief and recovery efforts.

By documenting the lessons from this phase, it is hoped that these will help provide insights into the achievements and areas for improvement in the relief phase, help all actors learn from them, strategise the recovery and rehabilitation efforts in Leh and improve future humanitarian responses.

Objectives

The Joint Learning Exercise aims at:

1. Documenting the unified humanitarian response
2. Identifying key advocacy issues and joint strategies for recovery and rehabilitation in Leh
3. Facilitate the formation of an Inter-Agency Group (IAG) in Ladakh that can collectively take forward the effort

Outputs

a. A document detailing learning through the relief phase. Possible areas for examination include:
   i. Assessments and collation of assessment data
   ii. Analysis and use of data collected
   iii. Joint Response Strategies
   iv. Sectoral Responses
   v. Humanitarian Standards
vi. Monitoring and Surveillance
vii. Handover and Exit Strategies
viii. Coordination and Advocacy
ix. Capacity Development of Local Actors

b. Joint Strategies for Recovery and Rehabilitation in Ladakh

c. Visioning the Inter-Agency Group (IAG) in Leh
   i. Appreciating the need for an IAG
   ii. Strengthening the local process
   iii. IAG structure and process
   iv. Key milestones

Methodology

- Stakeholder Analysis
- Documentation Review
- Field Visits
- Stakeholder Consultations
- Multi-stakeholder Consultations

Timeline

It is proposed that the process run on a parallel basis in both Leh and New Delhi. Below is a suggested timeline for the processes, which will be finalized after a multi-stakeholder consultation in Leh:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Process in Leh</th>
<th>Suggested Dates for Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Multi Stakeholder Consultation</td>
<td>3 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Formation of Steering Committee</td>
<td>3 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Stakeholder Analysis and Documentation Review</td>
<td>10 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Stakeholder Consultations and Interviews</td>
<td>20 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Field Visits</td>
<td>30 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Draft Report Prepared and Circulated</td>
<td>7 December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Multi-Stakeholder Consultation for inputs on Report</td>
<td>12 December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Finalisation and Dissemination of Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Questionnaire for Agencies

Leh Flash Floods - 2010

Common Forward Looking Learning Mission

The Common Forward Looking Learning Mission is an attempt to document the relief response to the flash floods in August 2010 across Leh, and reflect on what went well and what could have been done better.

The exercise aims at consulting the major stakeholders involved in the response including the affected communities, the district administration and Council in Leh and representatives of local and national/international NGOs, and documenting their experiences and the issues that have emerged. The findings will be disseminated and shared widely among all stakeholders so that they can inform future actions both in Leh and future disasters.

We appreciate your responses and we are committed to maintaining the confidentiality of the sources as well as information shared.

Questions are centred on five themes – Overall Response, Information Sharing and Coordination, Advocacy, Partnerships & Capacity Development of Local Actors and Unmet Needs & Outstanding Issues. Please feel free to include any additional comments, examples or observations that you might have.

Thank you for your time!

1. Overall Response

1.1 How would you rate the overall response in the affected areas to the flash floods?

a. Highly Satisfactory
b. Satisfactory
c. OK
d. Unsatisfactory
e. Highly Unsatisfactory
f. Can’t Say

Comments/Observations/Examples:

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….
Leh Flash Floods 2010: Common Forward Looking Learning Mission

1.2 How would you rate the conditions in the relief camps and the support provided to families living in them?

a. Highly Satisfactory  
b. Satisfactory  
c. OK  
d. Unsatisfactory  
e. Highly Unsatisfactory  
f. Can’t Say

Comments/Observations/Examples:
...……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….
...……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….
...……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….

Timeliness:

1.3 Do you think agencies were able to respond in time? (Yes/No/Can’t Say)

Comments/Observations/Examples:
...……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….
...……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….
...……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….

Appropriateness to People’s Needs:

1.4 In your opinion were agencies able to satisfactorily assess community needs and respond to these appropriately? (Yes/No/Can’t Say)

Comments/Observations/Examples:
...……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….
...……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….
...……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….
Proportionality of Response:

1.5 Do you think the support provided to the affected communities was:

a. More than required  
b. Fair  
c. Inadequate  
d. Can’t say

Comments/Observations/Examples:
………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………

1.6 How would you rate the overall response in each of the following sectors? Mark a (-) wherever necessary to indicate your response.
Please feel free to share any additional thoughts or observations against each in the space marked ‘Remarks’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Response Rating</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Sanitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Livelihoods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Food and Nutrition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Psycho-Social Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **Information Sharing and Coordination**

2.1 How would you rate the efforts to coordinate responses to the flash floods?
   a. Excellent  b. Good  c. Fair  d. Poor  e. Very Poor  f. Can’t say

2.2 How would you rate the following processes carried out by the NGO Facilitation Centre based in Leh in the course of the response?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information gathering and sharing between NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information collection and sharing with Govt. and District Authorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Coordination Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 How do you think this could have been better or can be improved in the future?

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….

2.4 What is your opinion of the Response Strategies that were developed?

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….

2.5 Do you have any comments on the Strategies for the following sectors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector Strategy</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psycho-Social Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water, Sanitation &amp; Hygiene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihoods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Advocacy**
3.1 What were the major issues for advocacy that you observed in the course of the relief operations?

.............................................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................................

3.2 How well do you think these were addressed by individual agencies and/or collectively?

.............................................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................................

3.3 What lessons or observations do you think emerge from these?

.............................................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................................

4. **Outstanding Issues and Unmet Needs**

4.1 As the relief operations have now come to an end, what in your opinion are the major outstanding issues and unmet needs?

.............................................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................................

4.2 What do you think are the main causes for these gaps? Or How could these gaps have been avoided?

.............................................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................................
4.3 What steps do you think are now needed to address these gaps?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

5. **Partnerships and Capacity Development of Local Actors**
5.1 Did you face any challenges in securing the participation of the affected communities in the course of your response? If Yes, what were these?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

6. **Miscellaneous**
6.1 Would you like to share any examples or instances of successful interventions or responses to the flash floods?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

6.2 Would you like to share any examples or instances of any aspect of the response that could have been better?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

6.3 Please share any further comments you have on any aspect of the response to the Leh Flash Floods
7. **Summary of Agency Response**

7.1 Please include a brief description of your agency’s response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Villages/Areas Covered:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thematic Coverage (Health, Water, Sanitation, Shelter etc.):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Covered:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of Response:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. CEE Himalaya
2. CENSFood
3. Church’s Auxiliary for Social Action (CASA)
4. Cordaid, Netherlands
5. Evangelical Fellowship of India for Coordination Of Relief (EFICOR)
6. HelpAge India
7. Ladakh Arts and Media Organisation (LAMO)
8. Ladakh Ecological Development Group (LEDeG)
9. Leh Nutrition Project (LNP) & Save the Children, India
10. Medécins Sans Frontiers (MSF) OCA
11. Mr. Andrew Merat (formerly with Handicap International)
12. Ms. Elisa Garrido (formerly with Handicap International)
13. Ms. Rekha Shenoy
14. Pragya
15. Rural Development and You (RDY)
16. Samarpan Foundation
17. Snow Leopard Conservancy (SLC), Leh
18. World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA)