First Draft

GUIDEBOOK
for
Inter-church
Collaboration
on
Post-IDAI
Reconstruction

Contents

<u>Forward</u>

What it is…

This is only a first draft.

Worse yet, it is unsolicited. So it may still be a bit off the mark.

What it is *not*…

This manual is not "carved in stone".

It only tries to capture where this is going.

All we have now is still information, but it is already complex. So this is a first attempt to give it a shape and some indication of how it will roll out

Abbreviations & Terminology

KZN	KwaZulu-Natal
MOZ	Mozambique
SA	South Africa
TOR	Terms of reference
Zim	Zimbabwe
Guia de remessa	Delivery Note
Conselho de Direccao	Steering Committee
Gestor do Projecto	Project Manager
Caderno de encargos	Terms of reference
Interessados	Stakeholders
Fundador	Originator

1. Background

In early 2019, Cyclone Idai flattened the city of Beira on the coast of Mozambique. It also affected eastern Zimbabwe and southern Malawi.

The first phase of disaster response - Search and Rescue – took some months because the Pungwe Flats around Beira were flooded badly.

Then came the second phase of Emergency Relief – food, water, blankets, tents, and so on.

We have now reached the third stage of Recovery and Rehabilitation – trying to plant crops to replace those washed away; trying to get basic services and business operating again; building temporary bridges or detours to get traffic circulating once again; and providing some rudimentary building materials like roof sheets.

This Guidebook has a very narrow focus – supporting the fourth phase of Reconstruction with only a narrow bandwidth of key building materials. Our response aligns with a Government of Mozambique plea to incorporate stronger, more storm and flood resistant building systems, in the Reconstruction phase.

1.1 Our Focus

Reconstruction will not just take months like the other phases. It will take 5 – 10 years to rebuild central Mozambique:

1. Roads
2. Bridges
3. Dykes
4. Schools and clinics
5. Public infrastructure

Our focus will be on getting a skeletal structure and roof onto:

6. Residences
7. Churches and mosques
8. Private enterprises
9. Farm buildings

The “solution” that we are offering does not apply to high-rise buildings in the city.

The structures lost may have been built previously with mud and wattle, or adobe (i.e. sun-dried) bricks, or in some cases with burned bricks or cement blocks. When buildings collapse, the roof structure usually gets damaged, if it remains at all given the high winds of a Cyclone.

As outlined above, the four phases seem very linear. Whereas Disaster Management is usually seen as a cycle.

The truth is that by rebuilding in a way that is stronger and more storm-resistant, this initiative is also entering into the Disaster Mitigation phases – that is, already preparing for the next hazard.

Thus we have adopted a smaller *cyclical model* as opposed to a linear one, in writing this Guidebook. For Project Management is also seen as a cycle. Each building project is a learning opportunity to feedback into the planning of future projects so that improvement is continual.

1.2 The Project Cycle

This Guidebook is therefore set out in steps that follow a familiar cycle:

1. Needs Assessment
2. Planning
3. Implementation
4. Monitoring
5. Evaluation

By un-packing the logic of this initiative this way, the projects are visited before the partners. To some this might seem backwords? But this is a bottom-up approach instead of a top-down approach.

Needs assessment must arise on the ground in Mozambique and Zimbabwe (in the target areas).

We do envisage a catalogue with some easy-to-use designs. That is, in terms of the quantity survey for each project. Each and every project approved and constructed can add to this catalogue of designs.

Planning involves a number of actors:

- The family, congregation, businessman or farmer on the ground
- The member organization that is financing the delivery of building materials to that project sire
- Local government officials required to approve plans and inspect roll-out
- Local builders
- Volunteers who may be mobilized from time to time

Implementation has three sides to it:

a) The delivery of the building materials to the project site
b) The erection of the structure using those building materials

c) Completion of the building is ex-post in terms of our projects

Different sites will fill in the walls and finish the interiors etc, in diverse ways and at different paces. Our initiative will not fill in and complete the structures. Our highly specialized focus is to erect a durable structure with a roof on. Beyond that, we will not engage, that is preferably up to the Beneficiaries, otherwise to our member organization (the one that paid for the delivery and erection).

Monitoring is a very important function. For example, we cannot delivery a package of building supplies to a site without keep a close eye on it. There are too many risks of theft, weather damage, and so on

One monitor in each country must see that the materials are arriving at designated sites on time; that they are being properly stored and utilized; and that the erection is completed in real time. Their duty will be to liaise with:

a) The Beneficiary first
b) Or C4L as the single point of contact in middle of this logistics chain

There should not be direct contact between the Monitors and the member organization that has financed the purchase and delivery of the building materials.

Evaluation should ideally wait until the ex-post stage, when the building has been fully completed.

However, periodic programme evaluations may be organized that could include field visits to unfinished sites.

In the light of this model, and by way of introduction, this Guidebook only highlights the following key points:

1	*Needs Assessments*	• Residents, churches, businesses and farms should formulate their plans at site level • If there is an existing connection between the site and one of our member organizations (e.g. a Baptist church in Busi in contact with Baptist Union Care), then the requisition goes from site to member organization – then to C4L with payment • There may be cases where C4L receives applications pending some kind of funding appeal

2	*Planning*	• One of the Monitor's functions is to inter-act with the beneficiaries as their plans are evolving, to be sure that the specific building system that we are championing can be applied • The monitor should also see the building site to make sure that it is suitable for the erection of a pole-frame building • Ownership and authorization to build will also be checked by the Monitor • In most cases, consultation between the Beneficiaries and the member organization will be paramount. C4L simply engages as a technical and logistics expert
3	*Implementation*	• The erection will ideally be done by a local builder • Volunteers can add value but should not entirely substitute the local tradesmen • There may be some delays in delivery of building materials caused by C4L's "bundling" of different orders to fill up a truckload going that same way. Economies of scale will benefit all stakeholders
4	*Monitoring*	• Two consultants are enough to cover the target areas – in Moz and Zim • Monitors should take benchmark photos of the delivery and erection to transmit to C4L • Lessons learned from each erection should be recorded by the Monitors and shared back to the single-point-of-contact in SA • There will be a process in place to allow Monitors to stop the work on site, if it is not going according to specs
5	*Evaluation*	• Both progress (quantitative) and impact (qualitative) must be reviewed • There should be a team of reviewers with representation from the beneficiaries, local

		officials, and the member organizations • Data collected should not just reflect the dates and narratives involved, but also any change in quality of life, church attendance, volumes handled by business, and sustainability of farming

2. **Programme Objectives**

As I understand it, there are three main objectives to this programme:

a) To improve the quality of one-storey structures in the target area. Namely by making them stronger, more durable, and more sorm-resistant

b) To obtain economies of scale for deliveries to project sites that economise the purchase and delivery of building materials

c) To collaborate as a operational alliance in such a way that might attact value-added donor funding because of the efficiency and effectiveness of the initiative

In my experience, I can think of three other such "ligaments" in the Body of Christ. There are probably many others:

2.1 Zimbabwe Association of Church-Related Hospitals

ZACH was founded as a single point of contact between church-owned and run hospitals (mostly in rural areas) and government. Ministry of Health institutions operated mainly in urban areas. This NGO had a very narrow focus – health.

For example, any imports of medicines by the Vatican to a catholic hospital in Zimbabwe was consigned to ZACH. It negotiated the passage of the cargo through customs and delivered it to the respective mission hospital(s).

2.2 Christian Development Trust Foundation

This NGO exists in South Africa to provide credit to church congregations that want to build a sanctuary. Not to be mistaken for "church planting" this function is very specific. But when banks will not lend money to churches because they do not regard tithing as reliable "business" income, it plays a critically important role.

Priority is naturally given to member organizations that have contributed capital to the fund (directly or indirectly through affiliates overseas). But not to the exclusion of any congregation that wants a new or bigger church building.

2.3 Canadian Foodgrains Bank

The CFGB was founded as a single point of contact between generous Canadian farmers and famine victims around the world.

Twelve church denominations govern the CFGB jointly. Their missions partners overseas are their window on food insecurity. Where it arises from time to time, the CFGB delivers foodgrains to areas that are nutritionally challenged.

This civic action by Canadians attracts additional government funding in a country which has huge food surpluses to manage in its economy.

3. Role Players & Task Descriptions

One of the reasons for drafting this Guidebook is to sort out exactly what is expected of whom. The following distribution of responsibilities includes only some of what I have captured to date from preliminary discussions and meetings.

First of all the list of individuals actors, to be followed by a list of institutional actors:

Alfredo Allan Andrew Chuck Colleen Damon Ernest Gavin Haydn Lynette Martha Max Nigel
AE Baptist Union Care Christian Development Trust Foundation Desmond Tutu Centre for Leadership OM Pole suppliers

Pro-Vision World Vision Australia *Prospective* DBSA Habitat for Humanity Mennonite Central Committee Christian Council of Mozambique

Based on this list, the task descriptions are as follows:

- **CDTF**

We hope that the CDTF can be a “match-maker” in terms of broadening the scope of member organizations. It could be called a role of “coalition building”. Or the “host” until the Network can boot itself up by its own bootstraps.

- **Pro-Vision**

A South-African NGO with cadres already on the ground in both Mozambique and Zimbabwe, PV can ideally serve as a door-opener to Project Identification. This of course leads to Needs Assessment, which measures and verifies the prospective projects.

- **Desmond Tutu Centre for Leadership**

C4L’s role is envisaged as a Monitor. It is located close to the Mozambique border, and in a direct line between KZN and the gateway to Zimbabwe.

- **The new Network**

The Logistics Manager based in SA and the two Monitors in Moz and Zim should report to the single-point-of-contact. At first, it may have to operate in the “womb” of a host organization?

- **BU Care**

Identify Baptist churches in the target area that need to be rebuilt and mobilize resources to assists them through this mechanism.

- **Christian Councils (SACC, TEASA, ZCC, MCC, etc)**

Identify reconstruction projects that “fit” our initiative and try to match them with Donors that can provide the finance.

The following institutions (that is, organizations *like them*) are envisaged in a Donor role. This could be:

a) to specific projects on the ground,
b) or it could be to a “General Fund” managed by C4L to respond to requisitions that arrive direct from the field, without passing the optimal step of submitting their requisition to a member organization first

- **Development Bank of South Africa**
- **World Vision of Australia**
- **Habitat for Humanity**
- **Mennonite Central Committee**

We also need to mount a charm offensive to:

- **Heads of Denomination in all three countries**
- **Corporate donors**
- **Forestry companies**

4. <u>Assessing Needs</u>

C4L (the intermediary) cannot drive this process. Other than the two Monitors networking with local officials and other actors in the target area, to make them aware that this mechanism exists.

4.1 Methodologies

The optimal linkage would be for beneficiaries with some kind of affiliation (e.g. denominational) to connect – at the level of Beneficiary and member organization.

The C4L Monitor can speak into that process in technical terms only. Once Needs have been assessed properly, the Monitor can also help with the Quantity Survey. Please note this does not include plumbing fixtures or paint! The initiative is very narrow – to deliver pressure-treated gum poles and the related hardware to the sites. Plus some roofing (which could be temporary roofing like tarpaulins), nails, ridgecap, etc.

4.2 Variances

The Monitor may stimulate some interest and demand from projects that do not have any natural affiliation. These orders can also be handled, either:

a) On a demand-driven basis (for example an NGO may wish to rebuild some houses and use this mechanism to purchase and deliver some building materials)

b) By entering on a waiting list in case the above-mentioned “General Fund” should contain some resources. In this case, there would need to be some intermediation by C4L between the Donor and the Beneficiary – as stipulated by that Donor

There could be other scenarios as well? It is doubtful that we have foreseen them all at this stage.

4.3 Materials needed

The Quantity Survey must originate at field level, in consultation with the two Monitors.

The list of materials along with other particulars about payment and delivery are then sent to C4L.

Shipping may be delayed until a full load can be bundled onto one truck.

4.4 Where to assess needs

At this stage the geographical points are Busi (south of beira), Beira itself, the Pungwe Flats around Beira, then west along the Beira Corridor to Chimoio, then south-west to Chimanimani, Espungabeira and Chipinge.

At this stage we are still trying to nab funding and response to needs caused by Cyclone Idai. For we are still well within the aftermath timelines of that natural disaster.

Further mapping and strategic planning still need to be done.

5. <u>Plan Your Work</u>

Before individual projects can be approved, there is still a need to do more strategic thinking.

For example…

5.1 We have not yet explored in detail the issues around cross-border delivery.

5.2 We also need to get the Moz and Zim governments to sign off on our strategic plan to export BULK gum poles and related hardware to help with Disaster Reconstruction. They may be ways ????? to obtain exemption of customs duty for these building materials – however that is likely to require stringent clearances.

5.3 We need to design some basic units for our catalogue:

- Housing – T1, T2 and T3
- Churches – one size hall
- Business – small tuck shop, large trading post
- Farm – a barn for animals, a depot for inputs and machinery…

5.1 Each of these designs must include a detailed Quantity Survey

5.6 We need to scope for both projects and member organizations. The Coalition can be built from both ends

5.2 We need to identify some local builders in the target area who can be called on to erect the structures from the building materials delivered

5.8 We need to discuss if erections should be tendered out, and if so, according to what procedures?

5.9 Design Specifications

We need to check the building codes for one-story buildings and if the proposed building system is indeed the kind of improvement that government has called for. The vendors of the gum poles should really be driving this technical exploration to obtain some kind of validation that can be used going forward.

5.10 Public Relations

There are several formalities which could be observed, although not all are necessary:

- Announcements in the media
- An information kit for interested parties
- Perhaps some endorsements from senior church leaders?

5.11 Eligibility Criteria

A key issue is, *who can apply*?

Stakeholders have noted in initial discussions that there are opportunists out there whose only motive is to turn a fast profit. How can this initiative be kept in the ethos of Service and Ministry?

5.12 Price List

This needs to be fixed and agreed for a long enough period to keep start-up on an even keel.

5.13 Margins

These also need to be negotiated and fixed on a basis that will assure:

a) Affordability to the end user (market-related at the most)
b) Sustainability for both suppliers and intermediary

5.14 Scoring system

Requisitions should not just be given a “Yes” or “No”.

	Aspect:	Points maximum
1	Was there an authentic Needs Assessment?	5
2	Is there buy-in from the beneficiary?	5
3	Where is it based? - Urban - 5 points - Rural - 10 points	15
4	Is the process owned by Mozambicans?	5
5	Has a competent builder been located?	10
6	Is the site? - Owned – 10 points - Allocated – 5 points	15
7	Is the financing secured? - Denominational linkage – 10 points - General Fund must pay – 5 points	5
8	Has a building permit been approved?	10
9	Has a project Logframe been formulated?	10
10	Can it be a “showpiece” for marketing?	20
11	Is there a prospect of further building?	10
	PERFECT SCORE (out of 110 points)	**100**

There is enough room in this instrument for comparison of submissions. Each bid can be graded in 11 respects. Some will be stronger than others. 50 is not a “pass” but a threshold does need to be set to optimize the prospects of success.

In othjer words. If C4L senses that a given project is not likely to succeed, it should have “veto power”. Send it back to the drawing board, with regrets. The main thing is to have an instrument which removes as much subjectivity as possible.

6. Work Your Plan

Ovid said "He who has begun is half way there" and this is true of projects that are well planned; much of the hard work has already been done.

6.1 Steering Committee

What composition should an Advisory Board for this Programme have?

How often should it meet?

Will it want the admin of this Programme to be sequestered? Or integrated into the mother NGO's systems of admin and finance?

6.2 Sequence of events

The meeting at Bundu Lodge on August 18th and 19th 2019 is just the first step in a long journey. We need to pace ourselves.

A research trip to Mozambique will follow in October.

Pledges should then be solicited based on an expanded version of this Guidebook. These should be converted into orders by a given deadline

The following points are pertinent to implementation:

- Timelines will vary from one project to another based on a number of variables
- *All actors* need to utilize the Standard Forms provided (e.g. requisition forms, delivery notes, etc.)
- Storage facilities need to be identified in advance. This problem should be solved before - not after - the delivery of building materials. This goes back to the needs assessment, during which each site's specific needs and resources should be examined
- There will be a standard form Contract for builders to use. Even when projects are applied for with pre-approved funding. C4L wants to achieve a uniform standard of results.

6.3 Quality Control

6.4 Risk Management

6.5 Progress Payments

The rule of thumb suggested is:

- 40% upon approval by C4L of a requisition
- 40 % second installment, once the materials are ready for export
- 20% third installment, released after proof of delivery has been submitted

6.6 Deliveries

6.7 Benchmarks

To keep implementation on track, each project will follow the same benchmarks:

1. Date requisition received
2. Date requisition approved
3. Date of export
4. Date of delivery to site
5. Date that erection is complete

6.8 Staging areas

Secure storage space will not always be available ON SITE. If not, this needs to be noted from the outset (the needs assessment) not discovered upon delivery of the building materials.

The project will try to arrange “staging areas” in Moz and Zim where building materials can be stored until the builder is ready to begin on site.

7. Related Training

As a training organization, C4L must explore training opportunities for:

1. Its own staff
2. Builders
3. Related opportunities in RE (e.g. solar water heater installation skills)
4. Logistics including export

8. Monitoring

Monitoring has been defined as "*the continuous or periodic surveillance over the implementation of an activity (and its various components), to ensure that input deliveries, work schedules, targeted outputs and other required actions are proceeding according to plan."*

In order to facilitate the collation of individual project site reports into comprehensive Programme Reports (probably on an annual basis), the two Monitors will need to agree on Indicators that can then be adopted by all project sites.

9. Evaluation

Unlike monitoring which is relatively focused, evaluation involves a wider group of role players including the target group (which helped to define the needs in the first place). It is a much bigger and broader affair.

Monitoring:	**Evaluation:**
• Continuous	• intermittent (mid-term, end, ex-post)
• during the life of the project	• mainly at the end or after
• deals mainly with project functioning	• wider issues like performance, efficiency, impact, sustainability
• uses people from inside the project	• often uses outside people
• managers are the main users of findings	• many people use the findings; managers, donors, beneficiaries
• results in minor corrective action	• can result in major changes in strategy

9.1 Evaluation Yardsticks

These vary, but TORs for annual evaluations should include some of the following:

- *Progress* - what is being accomplished with the resources being deployed
- *Indicators* - benchmarks established by the planners to guage success
- *Effectiveness* - how and whether work is attaining project objectives
- *Efficiency* - the cost of achieving the objectives, loss rates, level of technologies deployed, time saved or wasted, etc.
- *Impact* - the effects of the work (positive and negative) in every sense, including environmental
- *Relevance* - whether or not the work is "scratching where it itches" with the target group
- *Sustainability* - the extent to which the work can be carried on beyond the life of the DME project (e.g. whether suppliers have been fostered to a self-sustaining level)

9.2 Impact Evaluation

As time goes on, the emphasis can shift from progress to *impact*.

Early on in the Programme, it is important to record figures that can provide the *baseline* against which later evaluations can compare their findings. This is called a Baseline Study. It is not the Needs Assessment. Nor it is the Business Plan. But without it, future evaluations struggle to prove either progress or impact.

It might be a good idea to consider having the same evaluator(s) return year after year to ensure that the same methodology and instruments are used.

9.3 Organizing evaluations

A familiar pattern for an "evaluation project" follows the same path of the Project Cycle:

Goal	This needs to be stated clearly - the purpose of the evaluation. *What are we trying to find out?*
Yardsticks	Criteria must be established against which to measure the answers to evaluation questions (as outlined in the previous section).

Data collection	Methods and tools have to be selected (as outlined below in the following section). *From whom will data be collected (how much? and when?).* An evaluation schedule is also required.
Data analysis	How will the data be processed? The choice of instruments for collecting data should take this into account.
Reporting	Interpretation of the findings must be put into a form that can easily be disseminated and understood. Unfortunately, reports can be put on the shelf and forgotten. Hopefully that will not be the case with this manual!
Action planning	*Who* will be involved in programme improvement? *How* will the findings, conclusions and recommendations be internalized? By *when*?

9.4 Scope of evaluations

Every evaluation should review:

Project initiation	Who was involved? Was the problem diagnosed correctly? Has the context since changed?
Project operation	Is it on track? On time? Are there cost overruns? Will it solve the problem?
Project improvement	Is monitoring leading to adjustments? Are evaluations helping DME project personnel to learn? Are mistakes being repeated?

Evaluators should always be provided with clear and concise terms of reference to guide them. The TOR of the "mid-term review" which led to the preparation of this manual can be found at the end of this section. They could serve as a useful guide in drafting TORs for the remaining evaluations.

9.5 Evaluation planning

The most powerful and influential people must be involved in this process. Without them, it will be difficult to effect change. Once they are on board, a useful framework for planning an evaluation is as follows:

Activity:	Who should participate in this activity?	Who should be informed of activity?	What procedures will be used to accomplish this activity?	When will this be done? (tentative date)	What resources are needed for this activity?
Initial planning & goal setting					
Establishing criteria					
Collecting data					
Interpreting data					
Reporting					
Action planning					

9.6 Data collection

Various instruments can be used to collect data, in order to facilitate the processing and interpretation. Data collection without carefully designed instruments can end up taking a huge amount of time to collate. The chart below compares some of the methods that are frequently utilized:

Method:	**Interview**	**Group Interview**	**Questionnaire**	**Observation**	**Records & Documents**	**Drawings Drama Songs**
Design:	Easy (keep simple)	Easy	Difficult (time consuming)	Varies (depends how systematic)	Easy	Easy
Depth:	MUCH (most)	Much	LESS (varies)	MORE (can't deny behaviour)	Varies	Varies
Flexibility:	MOST	Much	LESS	Varies	Least	Most

Quanti-fication:	Difficult	Difficult	Easy	Varies	Least	Varies (tends to be difficult)
Time to do:	Much	Medium	Least (saves time)	Much	Little, Varying with complexity	Little
Effects of doing:	Builds trust	Strong on team building	Less trust building - can change views	Can upset people if they dislike intruders	Least (no effect)	Ranges from great fun to threatening
Other:	Open to bias	Hard to keep focus	Covers more people - more objective	Video medium can backfire	Public data Vs. real data	May not be taken seriously

No single method should be used exclusively. The more techniques are used, the more reliable the findings will be. Combining any three sources of data is called *triangulation*, and is a recognized way to increase data credibility.

The cut-off between collecting and interpreting data should not be sharp. In other words, start to process data soon after it begins to come in.

9.7 Processing data

There are various ways to interpret data, but one tried and tested approach is to develop findings, conclusions, and recommendations:

- *Findings* tend to be highlights or patterns which always emerge

- Out of these, certain *conclusions* can be drawn, which are fewer in number (e.g. lessons learned).

- *Recommendations* capture the essence of the interpretation, but express this in action steps which can be used for improvement.

Consultants usually bring along a toolbox with some of their favourite tools. These can be useful, but the process of selecting which of these to use still needs to involve key role players in the Programme.

The following chart compares the advantages and disadvantages of involving insiders and outsiders:

	Internal evaluation	**External evaluation**
Advantages	• Evaluators know and understand the project or group • An opportunity for them to see and correct their own errors	• Offers an objective perspective • Evaluators are experienced in conducting reviews, and may have seen similar projects before
Disadvantages	• Evaluation my be subjective • Evaluators may not know how to conduct evaluations	• An outsider may never catch all the nuances and details • Outsiders can be so threatening that they create discomfort

It is a good practice to have mixed evaluation teams, using both internal and external people. This achieves the best of both worlds, and can still be thoroughly *participatory*. To ensure this, methodology of the evaluation should be spelled out clearly in the consultant's Terms of Reference, not just the content of the review.