

**EVALUATION REPORT
STRENGTHENING CAPACITY FOR
DISASTER MANAGEMENT IN
ZIMBABWE PROJECT
2005-2009**

**PREPARED BY G.J MANIKAI
BEST PRACTICES (PVT) LTD
TELEPHONE: 792020/792612/3
E-MAIL: Manikai@bestpractices.co.zw**

Table of Contents

List of abbreviations	
List of tables	
Executive Summary	6
1. Introduction and Background Information.....	9
<i>1.1 Project Context</i>	
<i>1.2 Project Institutional Arrangements</i>	
2. Our Understanding of the Terms of Reference.....	12
3. Challenges Encountered in undertaking the Evaluation.....	12
4. Findings.....	13
<i>4.1.1 Types of Disasters experienced in Zimbabwe</i>	
<i>4.1.2 Project Planning and Design</i>	
4.2 Project Implementation.....	15
<i>4.2.1 Institutional Arrangements</i>	
<i>4.2.2 Coordination of Projects implemented by other organisations</i>	
4.3 Project planning, monitoring and evaluation.....	17
<i>4.3.1 Project Monitoring and Evaluation</i>	
4.4 Financial Management and accountability.....	20
4.5 Project Sustainability.....	21
4.6 Project Deliverables.....	22
<i>4.6.1 Institutional Capacity Needs Assessment</i>	
<i>4.6.2 Disaster Risk Assessment</i>	
<i>4.6.3 Updating Disaster Management Plans</i>	
<i>4.6.4 Legislation and Policy management</i>	
<i>4.6.5 Institutional Capacity Strengthening</i>	
4.7 Project Contribution within the context of UNDP Commitments.	32
5. Lessons learned	33
6. Recommendations.....	35
7. Conclusion-----	38

- Annex 1-** Terms of Reference
- Annex 2-** Data collection instruments
- Annex 3-** Interview Schedule
- Annex 4-** Documents reviewed
- Annex 5-** List of respondents

List of Abbreviations

BCPR – Bureau for Crises Prevention and Recovery
CPAP – Country Programme Action Plan
DA- District Administrator
DCP- Department of Civil Protection
DCPC- District Civil Protection Committee
DMOC- Disaster Management Operation Centre
DMTC- Disaster Management Training Centre
DRM- Disaster Risk Management
DRR- Disaster Risk Reduction
EWS- Early Warning System
GPA- Global Political Agreement
GOZ – Government of Zimbabwe
IOM- International Organisation for Migration
ISDR-International Strategy for Disaster Reduction
MDGs- Millennium Development Goals
MLGPW- Ministry of Local Government Public Works and National Housing
NEX-National Execution Modality
NUST- National University of Science and Technology
OCHA- Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
OPC- Office of the President and Cabinet
PA-Provincial Administrator
PDC- Provincial Development Committee
PCPC-Provincial Civil Protection Committee
RDDC-Rural District Development Committee
SADC-Southern African Development Community
UNDAC- United Nations Disaster Assessment Coordination
UNDP-United Nations Development Programme
WSSD- World Summit on Sustainable Development
ZUNDAF-Zimbabwe United Nations Development Assistance

List of Tables

Table one: Disasters experienced in Zimbabwe in the sampled provinces

Table two: Institutional capacity strengthening priority area delivery assessment

Table three: Performance rating of major project components

Table four: Money disbursed and spent over the years as a percentage of the approved budget

Executive Summary

The support for strengthening national capacity for disaster management in Zimbabwe project was implemented from January 2005 up to initially December 2008, but extended to December 2009. The project aimed at strengthening the capacity of government at all levels to support local communities to be better prepared for disasters and to be more effective in responding to disasters when they occur. As a result of this intervention, communities will become more aware of disaster risks and how they can be reduced. The primary target beneficiaries are central government through the Department of Civil Protection, local government through Provincial and District disaster management committees and local population at grassroots.

This project package, focuses on five main areas,

- Institutional capacity needs assessment (Assessing structures, systems, human resources, capital, equipment etc)
- Disaster risk assessment (analysis of the hazards, vulnerabilities and capacity of communities to determine the nature and extent of their risk)
- Updating the national strategy and plan and also supporting the preparation of pilot provincial and district disaster management strategies and plans in selected pilot provinces and districts
- Support to the legislative and policy development and implementation process
- Institutional strengthening (Done through training, equipment and materials acquisition)

The first two activities that is institutional capacity needs assessment and disaster risk assessment constitute the preparatory phase of the project. The outputs from these two activities were meant to sharpen the other activities that followed.

This evaluation in the main sought, to assess and explain the level of project performance against planned targets in the above identified project focus areas, draw lessons from project implementation and recommend the way forward. The assessment validated the fact that the country experiences a number of disasters, primarily draughts, floods, traffic accidents, veldt fires, land mines, epidemics, lightning and heat waves, with devastating consequences. As a result of these disasters, socio economic infrastructure is destroyed, lives are lost and livelihoods disrupted and sometimes completely destroyed. It is evident in the findings that over the past two decades, the frequency, intensity and impacts of disasters have increased. An institutional arrangement at national, provincial, district and in a few areas at community level exists and is functional, albeit with capacity challenges (financial, human, material and equipment).

Project performance

Project performance has been satisfactory, given that five of the six components were rated average to above average performance in this evaluation. The institutional capacity needs assessment, legislative and policy development were successfully carried out with the participation of a wide range of participants. Disaster risk assessment and institutional strengthening were rated average in terms of delivery, essentially because quite a number of the planned activities have been carried out. However, with regard to disaster risk assessment, no comprehensive assessment was undertaken, while in terms of institutional strengthening, a lot of training of staff has been carried out and some materials and equipment purchased, there are however a number of activities which are still outstanding. These include computerising DCP, introducing DRM programmes in tertiary institutions, developing project proposals for the setting of a National Disaster Management Training Centre and a Disaster Operations centre. Project monitoring and evaluation has been done through progress reviews by the steering committee, audits by the comptroller and Auditor General's office and also teams have been sent out to evaluate the project. In terms of developing disaster management plans, little was achieved, as a few of these were undertaken. The reasons for this performance level have include limited capacity in DCP(financial, equipment & materials), bureaucratic processes employed by UNDP in plan approvals, disbursement of funds and procurement of goods & services, bureaucratic processes involved in legislative reforms and a difficult socio-economic and political environment, characterised by hyperinflation, political polarisation, poverty, non availability of goods & services, high staff turnover and the erosion of trust between government and donors.

Major lessons from implementing the project

These included among others;

- That project outputs such as reports, should provide for mechanisms to facilitate the implementation of recommendations, to avoid situations where good recommendations are made, without being implemented
- Key/critical activities must be implemented as they have a greater impact on whether or not a project succeeds or fail. This applies in this case to two activities, carrying out a comprehensive national disaster risk survey and enacting the DRM law. Without these being delivered, other activities are compromised in terms of effective implementation
- Misunderstanding between/among critical players in project implementation should be clarified once and for all to ensure successful project implementation. The perceived lack of full planning information by DCP and the Steering Committee from UNDP, has frustrated efficient project implementation
- Periodic project evaluation/on going evaluation is critical in adjusting project performance. It is good project management to continuously evaluate project implementation, as terminal evaluations are historical in nature and can only inform future planning & management at the expense of current project performance.

The way forward

The project design in terms of breath and depth is adequate, sound and still relevant to the obtaining disaster management situation in the country. Project performance was severely affected by the difficult operating environment, limited capacity of DCP. To this extent project component outstanding and accomplished, remain key and relevant in turning around the disaster management system in the country. It is therefore specifically recommended that;

- The coordination capacity of DCP should be strengthened through provision of an adequate operational budget, employment of qualified personnel at national and sub national levels and consideration should be given to relocate the department to the President`s office, as a way of according it the prominence and muscle it deserves to drive this function
- To facilitate efficient and effective project management, project planning and management procedures should be streamlined. This specifically applies to the production & approval of quarterly and annual plans, disbursement of project funds and procurement of goods and services. DCP and UNDP staff should be made conversant with such procedures
- Critical success factors such as carrying out a comprehensive disaster risk assessment and the enactment of a DRM act should be prioritised and pursued as a matter of urgency
- To facilitate swift reaction to disasters, disaster management committees should be set up nationwide
- Training and awareness campaigns should focus on communities and their structures
- DRM should be integrated in development planning & management and in educational curricula at all levels
- A comprehensive monitoring and evaluation system should be put in place and operationalised in DCP

1. Introduction and Background

This report outlines the findings of the end of project/ terminal evaluation of the Support for strengthening national capacity for disaster management in Zimbabwe project implemented from January 2005 up to initially December 2008, but extended to December 2009. The project aimed at strengthening the capacity of government at all levels to support local communities to be better prepared for disasters and to be more effective in responding to disasters when they occur. As a result of this intervention, communities will become more aware of disaster risks and how they can be reduced. The primary target beneficiaries are central government through the Department of Civil Protection, local government through Provincial and District disaster management committees and local population at grassroots.

The report is divided into sections, which together provide adequate information on the project background & scope, a description of our understanding of the terms of reference the approach and methodology used in undertaking this evaluation, an outline of the findings of this evaluation, the lessons learnt from implementing this project and recommendations being proffered.

1.1 Project context

A disaster is “a serious disruption of the functioning of a community or a society causing widespread human, material, economic or environmental losses which exceed the ability of the affected community or society to cope using its own resources”, (International Strategy for Disaster Reduction: ISDR), quoted in the support for strengthening national capacity for disaster management in Zimbabwe project document. Worldwide trends indicate that both natural and human induced disasters are increasing in frequency, intensity and complexity. NEPAD has noted that Africa is the only continent whose share of reported disasters in the world total has increased over the last decade. When disasters strike, they cause socio- economic and ecological disruption, more often resulting in the destruction of socio-economic infrastructure, livelihoods sources and loss of life. The impact of such disasters is further worsened in poor countries whose capacity to prevent, prepare, mitigate and respond is weak.

Disaster management issues have increasingly appeared in a number of important international development agendas, including the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The Plan of Action for the World summit on sustainable development calls for mainstreaming of disaster management into the development process.

At regional level, the African Union (AU), NEPAD and SADC have initiated disaster risk management programmes. NEPAD has produced a draft “Africa Regional Strategy for disaster risk reduction” and SADC secretariat continues to engage Disaster Management Units of the various SADC states so as to enhance their disaster risk management capacities. There is also a SADC initiative being supported by UNDP’s

Bureau for Crises Prevention and Recovery (BCPR) to undertake a regional capacity needs assessment, to inform the development of a disaster risk management capacity building framework for the region to effectively respond to each country's respective needs.

Zimbabwe is a disaster prone country that suffers many disasters, natural and man-made, including, droughts, floods, veldt fires, other fire emergencies, traffic accidents (road, rail and air), drowning accidents, disease outbreaks, construction accidents, dam wall failures, cyanide contamination, chemical explosions and stadium stampedes.

Droughts have posed the greatest disaster threat to date, the 1992 drought affected an estimated 10, 5 million people, 20% of the national cattle herd and wildlife was lost. In 2002, at least 5, 2 million people needed food aid.

Areas along the Zambezi valley, notably Mashonaland Central & West, some areas in the Midlands, Masvingo & Matabeleland North provinces, as well as the Limpopo valley and the Save catchment areas are very prone to flooding. Flooding in these areas, one example being the effect of cyclone Eline in February 2000 caused extensive damage to infrastructure (Dam walls collapsing, bridges, schools, houses etc), requiring huge reconstruction costs by the relevant sectors. Villagers are frequently marooned in isolated areas, buses have been swept off bridges, boat accidents have occurred in large water bodies and Zimbabwe is reported to be one of the countries in the world with the highest deaths due to lightning, particularly in the rural areas.

Other disasters that continue to occur in the country include, road and rail traffic accidents, involving public transport, haulage trucks and tankers, mining and industrial hazards, disease outbreaks, land mine explosions and the HIV/AIDS pandemic. Examples include the Hwange mine accident which resulted in 427 lives being lost in 1972, the 2008 cholera outbreak which killed an estimated 1000 people. It is estimated that over 3.2 million landmines were laid along the northern and eastern borders of the country covering an area of 210 square kilometres, to disrupt access and supply lines for combatants operating from Mozambique and Zambia. The landmine problem is causing humanitarian problems which include maiming and or loss of human and animal life and inhibit economic development.

It is against this worrying trend globally, regionally and nationally, characterised by an increase in the frequency, variety and intensity of disasters that this project was conceptualised, designed and implemented.

The project focuses on five main areas namely;

- Institutional capacity needs assessment (Assessing structures, systems, human resources, capital, equipment etc)
- Disaster risk assessment (analysis of the hazards, vulnerabilities and capacity of communities to determine the nature and extent of their risk)
- Updating the national strategy and plan and also supporting the preparation of pilot provincial and district disaster management strategies and plans in selected pilot provinces and districts

- Support to the legislative and policy development and implementation process
- Institutional strengthening (Done through training, equipment and materials acquisition)

The broad national goal is to reduce the level of disaster risk to reduce the number of casualties and or damage or loss of property and livelihoods means. The strategies to achieve this goal are as follows;

- Integrate disaster management concepts into development plans and strategies
- Improve legislative provisions
- Capacity build disaster management institutions
- Orient towards comprehensive disaster risk management
- Government to promote a community based approach to disaster management
- Effective coordination of decentralised structures and community participation to reduce disaster risks

1.2 Project Institutional Arrangements

The government of Zimbabwe through the Department of Civil Protection (DCP) and other national stakeholders involved in various aspects of disaster management in Zimbabwe, with support from UNDP, is implementing the project under the National Execution (NEX) modality. It is the overall coordinator/manager for this project, with the Director for DCP overseeing the day to day implementation and monitoring of the project. UNDP provides only technical and financial support, including monitoring compliance with financial accounting procedures, work plans and budgets. It is important to note that while the project was meant to be implemented under the NEX modality, the economic environment during the project lifespan (2005-2008), was among others characterised by hyperinflation, managed foreign currency exchange rate, multiple pricing systems, shortages of goods and services. In this connection, it was seen logical that UNDP assist DCP in the acquisition of project materials and equipment at competitive prices on the international market.

The Government of Zimbabwe and UNDP constitute a Steering Committee that meets quarterly to make policy decisions, coordinate, monitor and review progress in project implementation. The committee comprises of MLGPW & NH/DCP, Finance & Economic Development, Agriculture & Rural Development, Health & Child Welfare, Public Service, Labour & Social Welfare, Office of the President & Cabinet, Office of the Commissioner of Police and UNDP. Technical staff from DCP and UNDP meets regularly to discuss the planning and implementation of the project.

2 Our Understanding of the Terms of Reference

It is our understanding that GOZ in conjunction with UNDP solicited the services of a qualified and experienced consultant to undertake an end of project/terminal evaluation. The overall objective of the evaluation is to assess the degree of achievement of project deliverables in the five key areas identified earlier, assess the contribution of the project towards meeting UNDP's commitment of support to the Government of Zimbabwe and draw lessons that will inform future interventions. In undertaking the evaluation the consultant is required to review relevant documents to familiarise himself with the project and related issues, conduct interviews with relevant stakeholders to obtain first hand information and use other participatory methods in gathering information. The width and depth of the issues to be covered in the assessment and the suggested methodology are captured in the terms of reference attached to this report as appendix 1.

Three provinces, Mashonaland Central, Masvingo and Matabeleland South were purposively selected for this evaluation with the endorsement of DCP as they experience disasters representative of other provinces. Also project activities implemented in these provinces are indicative of activities being implemented nationwide. To this extent, it was felt that findings from this evaluation would be a good indicator of what is happening in the country, with respect to disaster management.

3 Challenges Encountered in undertaking the evaluation

The major challenge in undertaking this evaluation exercise was that the time set and budgeted for this national and critical end of project evaluation was inadequate given that this was a nationwide project. The ten days allocated for this evaluation was not enough just to do the fieldwork, later on to review relevant literature and write the report. This was compounded by the failure to find some key respondents who have since resigned and or have changed jobs, but could not be located. In some instances, due to poor communication and or non existent means of communication with the remote parts of the country, it was difficult to schedule appointments in advance, these had to be done on the road, thereby eating into the already compressed time. In responding to these challenges, the consultant had to work over time as it was not practical to complete the exercise in ten days, eventually it took twenty days to undertake this evaluation. It is recommended that in future adequate resources be set aside for such a critical exercise. However, be that as it may, the evaluator believes that the results of this evaluation are quite informative.

4 Findings

4.1.1 What disasters?

The respondents noted that disasters are now appreciated at all levels, that is national, provincial, district and community levels. This, it was noted is because of the increasing frequency and intensity with which disasters are occurring, the destructive and disruptive consequences suffered by communities and awareness campaigns by different stakeholders. Because of this, communities cannot afford to ignore disasters. Respondents indicated that the number of drowning cases is dropping and this is attributed to the effectiveness of awareness campaigns. Teachers indicated that in some instances school children were detained at school when rivers were flooded, in Dambakurima ward of Muzarabani district, some households have relocated to high grounds in order to safeguard their lives and property. While the numbers of such movements are small, it is an indication that the campaigns are beginning to generate the desired impact and as such these should be continued. In addition, respondents indicated that community members in flood prone areas have devised their own means of monitoring surface water levels using existing features such as trees. If flood water goes beyond certain marked points on trees and other objects, flooding alarm signals are sent out to members of the community. Also to curb malaria outbreak, some households took heed of advice to cut tall grass and close open ponds around their homesteads in Dambakurima ward. There is still scope to continue with campaigns, given that behaviour change is a process and communities need continuous reminding. The following were identified as the disasters that occur frequently in the provinces sampled.

Type of Disaster	Mashonaland Central	Masvingo	Matabeleland South
<i>Floods</i>	✓	✓	✓
<i>Epidemics-epidemiological (Cholera, Malaria)</i>	✓	✓	✓
<i>Lightning</i>	✓	✓	✓
<i>Road accidents</i>	✓	✓	✓
<i>Land mines</i>	✓		
<i>Fire</i>	✓	✓	✓
<i>Drought</i>	✓	✓	✓
<i>Heat Waves</i>		✓	✓

Table One: Disasters experienced in Zimbabwe in sampled provinces

Source: Evaluation Respondents, November, 2009

An analysis of the table generally shows that all the sampled provinces experience more or less the same types of disasters, although with variations in terms of intensity. Floods are quite frequent and destructive in the low lying areas in all the provinces, droughts & heat waves are persistent also in the same low lying areas, generally characterised by erratic rain and the land mine problems are prevalent along the border with Zambia and Mozambique. Road accidents and fires are experienced in all the provinces. It was also noted that veldt fires were quite frequent in the resettlement areas largely because of the absence of fire guards and in one province it was also noted that fires were being started to scare off settlers from the farms, a reflection of rejection of new settlers by some community members. In other areas veldt fires were started by individuals deliberately for hunting purposes. Just to state the obvious, the low lying areas in the provinces are much more vulnerable to the full range of disasters including epidemics, due to their physical make up.

4.1.2 Project Planning and Design

This project was conceptualised by DCP and the UNDP, having realised that there was a dire need for capacity building in disaster management at all levels of government (local up to national). The needs included awareness campaigns, review of legislation, training of staff and undertaking a national risk assessment. DCP realised that they did not have adequate resources to embark on such a nationwide programme and therefore put together a draft project proposal which they then shared with UNDP for feedback, before finalisation. In engaging UNDP, DCP had noted that their counterparts in the region were benefitting from their UNDPs in these areas. An analysis of the program design in terms of the intervention logic clearly points at a project package that was and still responds to relevant needs on the ground. The design adequately diagnosed the problem situation and recommended adequate interventions to counter the situation. The package of interventions, that is review of legislation, crafting disaster management policy aligned to the new legislation, development of national & sub national disaster management plans,

conducting a national needs assessment on disaster management, awareness campaigns & training of stakeholders, undertaking a risk assessment survey, acquisition of equipment for different stakeholders, among others, constituted a holistic approach to dealing with the disaster management challenges facing the country. An analysis of the menu of interventions identified, shows that the design was responding to the disaster management planning and implementation challenges. The multifaceted nature of disasters calls for an integrated approach to an intervention, and hence in this regard the design was adequate in terms of identifying and addressing the key issues, as well as the stakeholders at all levels of government. The project activities were sufficiently detailed with the anticipated results, whose achievement would have contributed to the overall objective of the project.

Respondents were of the opinion that the design was quite solid, with the project components on paper reinforcing each other. However, on equipment perhaps the project failed to anticipate and realise that basic communication gadgets in the form of radios are critical success factors in disaster management. As is, with a poor road net work and telecommunication in the remote parts of the country, it is virtually impossible to send messages, when help is needed. In terms of time framing delivery of activities in general, planning should have perhaps factored the complex and rather slow processes & procedures used by UNDP in the release of funds and or procurement of services and government processes, in terms of legislative review. As such this should have been identified in the risks and assumptions section of the project, to facilitate the management of these risks.

4.2 Project Implementation

According to the project proposal, the MLGPW & NH is responsible for the overall coordination and management of the project under the NEX (National Execution) modality. The thrust of the modality is that the implementing agency is in total control of the project once the budget has been released and its adoption is an indication that the implementor has the capacity to undertake all the functional activities of the project. The modality promotes project ownership and accountability.

The director of the DCP is responsible for the day to day management of the project and is the contact point representing the government on this project and UNDP also appointed a contact person who acts as a contact person with government, to facilitate smooth implementation of the project. A steering committee comprising of MLGPW & NH, Ministry of Finance & Economic Development, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Ministry of Health and Child Welfare, Ministry of Public Service, Labour and Social Welfare, Office of the President and Cabinet, Office of the Commissioner of Police and UNDP will be put in place to make policy decisions on the project, coordinate and review project management. The committee is to be co – chaired by MLGPW & NH and UNDP and scheduled to meet every quarter. DCP and UNDP will closely work together to define and design the scope of activities and detail the work plan to be reviewed regularly as necessary.

UNDP support will comprise of funding, technical assistance in the form of local & international experts and equipment & materials. It will also be responsible for resources mobilisation from other development and humanitarian partners.

In terms of accountability, any equipment purchased by UNDP, will remain the property of the UNDP until after hand over formalities to government have been completed. The project will be audited by government in line with government/UNDP procedures project.

4.2.1 Institutional Arrangements – The situation on the ground

The project structure as proposed in the project document was put in place and is largely functional, albeit with challenges as will be discussed in this section. DCP is in charge of project implementation on a day to basis, with the steering committee giving policy direction and monitoring project implementation through reviews conducted on a quarterly basis. UNDP is offering technical support in the form of reviewing submitted work plans, including budgets, ensuring that DCP follows the agreed UNDP financial management procedures and due to the hyperinflationary environment experienced up to December 2008, UNDP also assumed the procurement function of goods and services. The reasoning was that they could buy competitively at stable international prices.

Up until 2008, the steering committee was meeting regularly as per schedule, conducting business as per its terms of reference, which is reviewing project implementation progress, adopting work plans and making policy decisions. Post 2008, has witnessed the collapse of these meetings, largely due to a combination of reasons including the perceived lack of decision making power, as evidenced by changes to work plans that they will have approved by UNDP, wholesome changes in representatives from committee members due to high staff turn over experienced in the last five years and general disillusionment at the slow rate of project implementation attributed to perceived ineffective UNDP policies and procedures.

At provincial level, the Provincial Administrator (PA) chairs the Civil Protection committee, which comprises of heads of departments and Non Governmental organisations at this level. The committee meets once every month under normal circumstances, however when disaster strikes, meetings become frequent until the disaster has been managed. Committee deliberations feed into the Provincial Development Committee (PDC) meeting, which is held on a quarterly basis.

Respondents noted that the role of the committee is to plan & prepare and more evidently, to coordinate disaster management interventions when disasters occur, including planning, budgeting and mobilising resources for such interventions. They are also involved in awareness campaigns on disasters in their provinces.

At district level, the same structure, that is the district civil protection committee exists and is chaired by the District Administrator (DA). Their terms of reference are similar to

those of the provincial civil protection committee and their plans feed into the Rural District Development Committee (RDCC). They also meet once every month and more often when disasters strike. Respondents felt that at sub national levels, there is need for DCP to employ fulltime officers with expertise in disaster management to drive DCP activities. The current sub national structures are part time in focus as they draw staff from sector ministries/departments, which have other responsibilities. The end result is that, less priority is given to disaster management.

At local/ community level, in very few wards and villages, committees comprising of local leadership exist. These however, need strengthening in terms of capacitating them on their roles and responsibilities. At the moment, they coordinate efforts of partners involved in disaster management in their communities and also carry out awareness campaigns.

In implementing this project DCP employs these structures, for example committee members are involved in awareness campaigns as facilitators, planning and coordination of the same, identification of participants in workshops conducted by DCP at national and subnational levels and through these structures the project has assisted in responding to disasters that have occurred, for example the Nkayi bus disaster and participation in the Chipinge District earthquake damage assessment.

4.2.2 Coordination of Projects implemented by other organisations

At national level, this is done through the National Civil Protection Committee, which comprises of relevant stakeholders, including Non Governmental Organisations. At this level, they share their plans with the objective of rationalising and optimising resource utilisation by ensuring that there is no duplication of efforts and where there is scope for joint implementation, this is done. As such DCP has jointly implemented projects with World Vision, IOM and has also received logistical support, expertise and funding from OCHA and UNICEF respectively. At district level, the District Civil Protection Committee (DCPC), chaired by the District administrator is responsible for the coordination of disaster management interventions and at community level in some areas, ward and village committees coordinate disaster management interventions. Entry and participation is managed by these committees. However, some respondents noted that, this coordination role both at national and sub national levels needs strengthening given that other organisations, particularly new players have gone down to communities without clearance from these offices. It is also noted that preparedness plans exist in some areas without DCP knowing. There are also sentiments to the effect that DCP needs to be located in the president`s office, to enable it to wield the necessary coordination muscle. In addition other respondents felt that, DCP needs to be manned by some experts in disaster management, for it to assume leadership and attract respect from other partners in disaster management. DCP in this programme makes use of expertise from other organisations such as OCHA and UNICEF in its workshops as resource persons and in some instances they offer logistical support in terms of availing transport to project sites.

4.3 Project Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation

The signed project document became the baseline document for the preparation of work plans on an annual basis. Suffice to say, work plans were produced, drawing from the baseline report and discussed and agreed priorities by the steering committee, which was attended by the UNDP representative. The borne of contention is that, DCP feels that the rejection rate of issues covered in quarterly and annual plans by UNDP is high given that, these priorities were basically agreed in the baseline proposal, cases in point are workshops which UNDP is said to regard as routine activities. UNDP is said for example to have reneged on the payment for the Capacity Needs Workshop held at Troutbeck Hotel in Nyanga. While it is appreciated that, there is a provision in the baseline proposal for the development and review of work plans on a continuous basis, throughout the project lifespan, there is a feeling in DCP that UNDP is failing to provide adequate planning information, in terms of what are routine activities and also providing adequate information on project finances. The overall impact of this has been delays in project implementation, arising from the repeated reviews of submitted plans. To demonstrate misunderstanding between the two parties, workshops included in the main proposal are being rejected as routine activities by UNDP in the submitted work plans. The net effect of this misunderstanding has been increased frustration on the part of DCP and the steering committee, who feel that their priorities are not being seriously considered and that their authority to prioritise project activities is not respected. In addition to this, the rather bureaucratic processes/requirements by UNDP in the release of funds has further demoralised the implementing agency, as this has had a cumulative effect of slowing down project implementation and ultimately the project impact.

However UNDP staff are of a different view on these matters, indicating that, the UNDP policies and procedures on what is budgeted for operations via-avis what is set aside for community support is known to DCP. Also, they are of the view that information on finances is always provided by the office.

It is therefore important that this apparent misunderstanding be resolved, to ensure good working relations that promote efficient project management.

4.3.1 Project Monitoring and Evaluation

The steering committee plays a critical role in the monitoring and evaluation of project activities through the quarterly meetings. At the beginning of each quarter, a review of project activities is undertaken through the tabling and discussion of quarterly progress reports, before the proposed quarter plan is presented. These reports detail project outcomes and rate and explain the outcome delivery. Unfortunately, since February 2008, the committee has not been meeting regularly largely due to among others, low levels of project activities, frustration caused by perceived challenge of the authority & power of the committee to sanction project decisions by UNDP, through its rejection of submitted plans and also the huge turnover of representatives from committee members. New members were attending, without sufficient background briefing on the project, thereby affecting the quality of committee deliberations. Increasingly junior officials were now being asked to attend, perhaps an indication that the committee had and has lost its value, as the project activity levels have gone down.

When project activities are undertaken, reports are produced, such reports include training reports and awareness campaign reports. The project proposal had incorporated a mid term project evaluation, however this was not undertaken. There is scope to strengthen the monitoring and evaluation system through the development and standardisation of monitoring and evaluation instruments of data collection, which will then feed into the progress reports. The work plans will also need to incorporate measurable performance indicators to assist in project monitoring and evaluation. The computerisation of DCP will go a long way in facilitating speedy flow of project information.

4.4 Financial Management and Accountability

The finances are managed using the UNDP procedures, which provide for financial reporting, maintenance of financial statements by UNDP, the conduct of annual audits. Audits since 2005 have examined project expenditure against the detailed expenditure listing and have found them to match. It is also important to note that DCP does not handle cash and project related expenditure is paid for directly by UNDP in accordance with its programming manual. DCP keeps files on all project financial transactions. To date the project has been audited three times and compliance has generally been good.

4.4.1 Financial management processes vis- a-vis efficient project management

Respondents are unanimous in pointing out that the UNDP financial management processes, including the procurement process are cumbersome and therefore not responsive to efficient project implementation and management. The process is reported to involve too much paperwork, thereby delaying release of funds for project activities. One audit report noted that the absence of a qualified accounting personnel for the project in DCP pointed to the weaknesses in the internal control system of the project and this among others has affected the project's ability to process financial transactions. This reported bureaucratic process has been worsened by a nonresponsive culture by UNDP staff, as they are reported to be in the habit of losing documents, sitting on documents & not feeding them in the system.

The overall impact of this financial management system has been that acquisition of goods and services critical in project implementation has been delayed, delaying and slowing down project implementation. Cases in point include delays in the purchase of the project, computers & disaster management equipment, drugs and even delays in the payment of resource persons. This has resulted in stakeholders in the project losing faith, trust and commitment in the project.

The financial management processes need urgent review and or the key stakeholders need education on the system, so as to make it more responsive.

4.5 Project Sustainability

Respondents were of the opinion that the project thrust which fits in with the core business of DCP will be sustained given that the project is complementing its work. They noted that a significant number of activities as captured in the signed proposal, were being implemented using DCP funding. In any case capacity building by way of developing disaster management literature, training & awareness campaigns, policy and legislative reforms, generate long term impacts, which go beyond the project lifespan. It is however important to note that an injection of more resources through projects of this nature, increases the capacity of institutions to do more and therefore generate greater impact, compared to the without project scenario. Hence the response to the sustainability question is yes, but at a lower level compared to the with project scenario. Other suggested strategies include better coordination of disaster management interventions by other organisations and funding partners. This would require DCP to strengthen its coordination capacity at national, provincial, district and local levels.

4.6 Project Deliverables

As captured in the project context subsection, the project was expected to deliver in the following five broad areas;

- Institutional capacity needs assessment (Assessing structures, systems, human resources, capital, equipment etc)
- Disaster risk assessment (analysis of the hazards, vulnerabilities and capacity of communities to determine the nature and extent of their risk)
- Updating the national strategy and plan and also supporting the preparation of pilot provincial and district disaster management strategies and plans in selected pilot provinces and districts
- Support to the legislative and policy development and implementation process
- Institutional strengthening (Done through training, equipment and materials acquisition)

This section will assess the level of achievement in these areas.

4.6.1 Institutional Capacity Needs Assessment

The objective under this priority area was to carry out a comprehensive assessment of the capacity of DCP and its sub national structures for effective disaster management, in terms of structures, systems and resources. An assessment report with recommendations was the expected output. The capacity needs assessment survey was undertaken and a comprehensive report produced and discussed in 2005. Major recommendations included the need to ensure the passing of a bill into an act, hazard mapping in the country, structure computerisation to facilitate information sharing and establishment of necessary structures. To a large extent, these recommendations have not been implemented due to a number of reasons, including bureaucratic procedures on the part of government and UNDP procedures & prioritisation in the review of legislation and disbursement of project funds respectively.

4.6.2 Disaster Risk Assessment

The objective was to undertake an analysis of hazards, vulnerabilities and capacity of communities to determine the nature and extent of their risk. Despite the fact that, delivery of this objective, together with that on institutional assessment constituted the drivers and or critical success factors, for the other project components, that is legislative & policy reform, updating disaster management plans and training & awareness campaigns, just to identify a few, this assessment has not been done comprehensively through the project. This is attributed to lack of capacity (expertise & equipment), but also misunderstanding on what UNDP would and or would not fund. Sentiments were expressed that this exercise needed fieldwork to be undertaken on a large scale and yet as a matter of policy, it's understood that UNDP does not prioritise funding fieldwork. A situation which UNDP says is not true, but rather that DCP is the one that kept postponing implementation of this activity. However, realising the importance of this priority area, DCP, using its limited resources, through a workshop process developed general hazard profiles for the country. The need for a comprehensive disaster risk assessment remains. Respondents also noted that the disaster management database is weak and not consolidated, with each department riding on its silo. Consolidation of this information could be a good starting point in the creation of a national database on disaster.

4.6.3 Updating of the National Disaster Management Strategy and Development of Sub national plans

The objective of this priority area was to update the national disaster management strategy & plan, prepare provincial & district disaster management strategies and plans in a pilot province/district, to guide disaster prevention, preparedness, mitigation and response. This priority area has largely not been undertaken partly because it was supposed to benefit and to feed on inputs from the disaster risk assessment report, the new legislation, which unfortunately has not been finalised as yet. A few district plans have been produced, inclusive of one for Gokwe. The need to update and prepare these plans still remains

4.6.4 Legislation & Policy Development and Implementation

The objective of this priority area was to support the legislative and policy development and implementation process so as to ensure an adequate legal framework for effective disaster management in the country. The Emergency Preparedness & Disaster Management Bill was completed in 2005, accepted by the cabinet committee and is currently with Attorney General. The draft policy was completed in 2006 and awaits the enactment of the bill into an act before it is finalised. This process is taking too long to finalise largely due to new priorities that have emerged during the course of project implementation, including preparing & conducting harmonised presidential, parliamentary and local government elections, Presidential runoff election, the negotiations that culminated in the Global Political Agreement (GPA), the coming into effect of the Government of National unity, processes taking place in a hyperinflationary

environment co- inciding with the project lifespan. The net effect of these processes, superimposed on a bill drafting and enactment process that on its own is bureaucratic, means that it will take a lot more time before the enactment of the bill into law. This has a knock on effect of delaying the finalisation of the policy.

Given that the attainment of this objective is a critical success factor in the delivery of other project deliverables, in as much as it affects among others the mandate & institutional arrangements, funding, policy in the disaster management sector; its non finalisation has negatively affected the realisation of project objectives. There is therefore need to continue to lobby for the finalisation of this matter as current project efforts are compromised by a weak legal and policy framework.

Other expected outputs in this priority area were the finalisation of the disaster management procedures for schools and other educational institutions and production of a teacher’s resource book. An emergency preparedness manual for schools and other educational institutions was published in 2006 using DCP funding and the resource book for disaster management in Zimbabwe has been finalised drawing from project funding. Funds to copy the resource book were released by the time this evaluation was being carried out. As such integration of disaster management into the educational system is in progress.

4.6.5 Institutional Capacity Strengthening

The objective of this key priority area was to strengthen institutional capacity of the DCP, PCPCs and DCPCs, through provision of training, necessary equipment and other materials/accessories. Assessment on the delivery of this priority area will be presented in matrix form, whereby the matrix will identify the planned activities, indicate the envisaged outputs, achievement rating and comments on level of achievement.

Table Two: Institutional capacity strengthening priority area delivery assessment.

ACTIVITIES	OUTPUTS	ACHIEVEMENTS
Train policy makers on disaster risk management	Enabling environment for disaster risk management is enhanced	Workshop was undertaken through funding by DCP (Government of Zimbabwe)
Conduct a national consultative workshop to agree on a national action plan for capacity building in disaster risk management (DRM)	Shared understanding of key areas requiring capacity building in DRM	The workshop was undertaken & a national action plan for capacity building was agreed & produced using project funds.

Training of provincial and district civil protection committees	Committees at various levels trained in disaster management	Training was undertaken using DCP funds.
DCP to participate in a UN disaster assessment & coordination (UNDAC) team induction course for the Southern Africa Region	DCP staff member becomes part of UNDAC team	No staff member from DCP participated due lack of funding.
Support the DCP to prepare for and participate at the Kobe – Japan Disaster reduction conference in January 2005	Enhanced knowledge & skills of DCP staff	Director attended using funding from DCP. Project funding had not been disbursed, hence the identified staff member could not attend.
Conduct public awareness programmes on seasonal hazards	Increased awareness of seasonal hazards and how to manage them by communities	<p>10 000 pamphlets on psychological trauma as a result of disasters were produced and distributed to vulnerable communities in 2005.</p> <p>Public awareness on hazards related to rainfall were conducted in vulnerable areas of Muzarabani, Malipati, and Tsholotsho in 2006.</p> <p>Campaigns conducted in some of the identified flood prone areas but could not cover other areas as UNDP withdrew its</p>

		support citing the activity as a routine government function.
Support DCP staff members to undertake critical disaster management training courses	Well trained staff members able to coordinate disaster management activities in the country	<p>In 2006, two members of staff attended scheduled DRM course contact sessions as scheduled with one obtaining and M.Sc. degree and the other due complete in 2010. two officials attended a sub regional exercise in Tanzania which simulated a food relief program and during the same year one staff member attended IT training program. One member attended a DRR workshop in Tunis</p> <p>One member of staff attended a course on data management in Swaziland as scheduled</p> <p>Two members of staff attended contact sessions at University of Free State</p> <p>One member of staff attended a regional workshop on the application of space technologies to the management of disasters</p> <p>Director attended a</p>

		<p>regional workshop in Gabon to strategise on the threat of avian influenza</p> <p>In 2005, one officer attended a logistics and warehousing seminar. There was also a course for the Director in Israel.</p>
<p>Conduct a study tour of a Disaster Management Training Centre (DMTC) and a Disaster Management Operations Centre (DMOC), to input into the preparation of project proposals on the DMTC & DMOC.</p>	<p>Government has full information on how such institutions operate</p>	<p>This activity has not been done due to lack of funding</p>
<p>Provide logistical, financial, material & technical support in the event of sudden onset of disasters such as flooding, in any part of the country</p>	<p>Government is able to respond to emergencies</p>	<p>87 asbestos sheets were purchased to assist some of the hail storm victims in MT. Darwin district as roofs to their homes were damaged by strong winds.</p> <p>12 coffins were purchased for some of the victims of a road traffic accident on the 167 km peg along the Harare Chirundu Road in bid to expedite burials</p> <p>Nkayi bus disaster expenditure for drugs and medicines</p> <p>Support for the</p>

		production of the earthquake damage assessment report for Chipinge District Nkayi district assisted with logistical support to conduct identification of risks & conducting an EPR planning seminar
Support the designing of a comprehensive (computerised) information system for DCP	Operational information management system	The IT/MIS national needs assessment was completed and training of staff has been ongoing, however computers, are still to be installed.
Support institutions of higher learning to develop & administer disaster management courses	Curricula developed and institutions offering courses	A number of institutions including, National University of Science & Technology (NUST) and Bindura University have been targeted. Request for reference material has been made to UNDP and tenders to recruit a consultant to develop the curricula have been floated (June, 2009).
Support the setting up and implementation of early warning system (EWS)	Functional early warning system	Request placed during the third quarter of 2008 for the requisite equipment and awaiting delivery and subsequent training.

<p>Provision of appropriate equipment, materials and other accessories to facilitate effective disaster management</p>	<p>Enhanced capacity to manage disasters</p>	<p>A dingy and 34 life jackets were purchased for Sub Aqua for use during rescue missions in the second quarter of 2005.</p> <p>One four wheel drive vehicle was purchased</p> <p>Body bags and boat engines were purchased end of 2006.</p> <p>A photocopier was purchased in 2006</p> <p>LCD projector ordered early in the year however undelivered by end of the year</p> <p>Purchase/ upgrade equipment and systems: Request submitted in 3rd quarter to UNDP, no delivery by end of year for follow up in 2009.</p> <p>Purchase DRM reference books, periodicals for DCP and institutions of higher: Deferred to 2009 as UNDP has suspended all Zim\$ denominated activities</p> <p>Support tertiary institutions develop DRR curricula: Deferred to 2009 as UNDP suspended all Zim\$ denominated activities.</p>
--	--	--

		Develop a flood forecasting model, purchase special applications software, hardware, related equipment, communications equipment, resuscitation of rainfall stations, set up automatic weather stations and related networks as well as facilitate requisite fieldwork: specifications and request submitted to UNDP during 3 rd quarter, no delivery end by of year. Flood monitoring equipment has been ordered.
Conduct mine awareness campaigns	Increased awareness of the risk caused by landmines	Between May and June 2006 awareness campaigns were conducted in Mukumbura and Mt Darwin

A summary qualitative achievement rating of the delivery of major project components using a rating scale of; above average performance, average performance and below average performance yields the following results.

Table three: Performance rating of major project components

Project Component	Above average performance	Average performance	Below average performance
-------------------	---------------------------	---------------------	---------------------------

Institutional capacity needs assessment	<u>✓</u>		
Disaster risk assessment		<u>✓</u>	
Update of plans			<u>✓</u>
Legislative and policy development	<u>✓</u>		
Institutional strengthening		<u>✓</u>	
Monitoring and evaluation		<u>✓</u>	

Clearly, from the table plan performance has been satisfactory, given that five of the six components rated average to above average performance. The institutional capacity needs assessment, legislative and policy development were successfully carried out with the participation of a wide range of participants. It is however incumbent upon DCP to push for the enactment of the bill into law. Critical changes suggested in the bill can only be effected once the bill has been effected into law. Disaster risk assessment and institutional strengthening were rated average in terms of delivery, essentially because quite a number of the planned activities have been carried out. However, with regard to disaster risk assessment, no comprehensive assessment was undertaken, while in terms of institutional strengthening, a lot of training of staff has been carried out and some materials and equipment purchased, there is however a number of activities which are still outstanding. These include computerising DCP, introducing DRM programmes in tertiary institutions, developing project proposals for the setting up of a National Disaster Management Training Centre and a Disaster Operations centre. Project monitoring and evaluation has been done through progress reviews by the steering committee, audits by the comptroller and Auditor General's office and also teams have been sent out to evaluate the project. However, a system needs to be put in place to facilitate tracking of project impacts on beneficiaries. In terms of developing disaster management plans, little was achieved, as a few of these were undertaken. The reasons for this performance level have already been discussed, and include limited capacity in DCP(financial, equipment & materials), bureaucratic processes employed by UNDP in plan approvals, disbursement of funds and procurement of goods & services, bureaucratic processes involved in legislative reforms and a difficult socio-economic and political environment, characterised by hyperinflation, political polarisation, poverty, non availability of goods & services, high staff turnover and the erosion of trust between government and donors.

The table below shows the money disbursed over the years as a percentage of the approved budget.

Table Four: Money disbursed and spent over the years as a percentage of the approved budget

Year	Total expenditure as a % of total approved budget
2005	55,3 %
2006	93,6 %
2007	91%
2008	75%
2009	98.78%
Average expenditure as a percentage of total budget	82.74%

It is understandable that expenditure was rather low at project inception, largely because the project was taking off and project systems were being put in place and shot up to 94% in 2006, before going down to about 75% in 2008. There is no reason why expenditure should not equal the budget especially when there are outstanding project activities. The activity levels also tended to match expenditure level, with high levels of activity carried out in 2006 and 2009.

4.7 Project Contribution within the Context of UNDP's commitments

These commitments include among others the Zimbabwe United Nations Development Assistance Framework (ZUNDAF) 2007 – 2011 and the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) 2007 – 2011.

Six ZUNDAF outcome areas were identified as appropriate within the development context of Zimbabwe as follows;

- 1 Reduction of the spread and mitigation of the impact of HIV and AIDS
- 2 Enhanced national capacity and ownership of development processes towards the attainment of Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by 2015
- 3 Strengthened mechanisms for promoting the rule of law, dialogue, participation in the decision making process and promotion of human rights
- 4 Reduction in the negative social, economic, political, cultural and religious practices that sustain gender disparity
- 5 Improved access to good quality and equitable basic social services
- 6 Improved food security and sustainable management of natural resources and the environment.

Whereas according to the UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP), the ultimate objective of the programme is to support Zimbabwe achieve priorities set out in the ZUNDAF framework. One of the outcomes of this programme is enhanced sustainable livelihoods, recovery and disaster risk reduction integrated into development planning.

To the extent to which the project has delivered the activities as discussed in the section above, the project has made some contribution within the context of UNDP's

commitments under ZUNDAF and CPAP. However, as already discussed, the contributions could have been greater had the project activities been fully implemented.

5. Lessons learned

A number of useful lessons were learnt from the implementation of this project as follows;

- ✓ Disasters are occurring with greater frequency and intensity in the country, as such they have become a reality to communities
- ✓ When project activities include production of reports, for example disaster management capacity development report and others, mechanisms should be put in place to ensure that recommendations from such reports/plans are implemented. Stakeholders are getting frustrated with providing information when studies/surveys/workshops are conducted with recommendations being crafted which are not implemented
- ✓ Project activities that have forward and backward linkages with other activities/ critical activities must be implemented, as they affect the successful implementation of the rest of the program. A case in point was the need to ensure that a disaster risk assessment survey was carried out, without it, it has become difficult to produce other plans which require inputs from such a survey
- ✓ Misunderstanding between implementing agency (DCP) and technical partner, in this case UNDP with respect to what is regarded as routine activities and program activities that draw on the project budget should have been clarified once and for all, with all stakeholders involved in project planning and management.
- ✓ Project activities should by all means possible be implemented on time, to avoid outputs becoming irrelevant and or requiring major review before they are implemented. Case in point is the draft bill and policy, which may require a review now before approval as the time lag between formulation and adoption, is significant, to the extent that environmental changes necessitate a review of the documents
- ✓ Program annual reviews should be budgeted for and implemented, without fail, as they provide a structured and objective way of assessing program implementation, to facilitate corrective action being taken, rather than wait for a terminal evaluation
- ✓ Given the capacity (financial, human resources & equipment/materials), of DCP, the program components were perhaps too many and therefore in future there is scope to streamline and focus on the key components
- ✓ Planned activities, known to stakeholders should not fail to be implemented, as this negatively affects the undermines the credibility of organisations and future stakeholder participation in projects

- ✓ That there is great need for public education and information dissemination on disaster management
- ✓ To be able to cover all areas in need, DCP should have the necessary resources (human, appropriate cars designed for rough terrain, computers, etc)
That people trained/involved in public education are mobile (change jobs, some have left the country, communities and therefore there is continuous need to train and conduct awareness campaigns

6 .Recommendations

The recommendations being proffered here include those that were suggested by respondents as well as those emanating from the analysis of the data generated through this evaluation. The recommendations are as follows;

6.1.1 Institutional Arrangements

- ✓ It is therefore recommended, informed by other experiences that DCP be relocated to the President`s Office, to enable it to wild the necessary coordination muscle.
- ✓ The Steering Committee should be accorded the necessary authority and its decisions should be binding. Permanent representatives should attend meetings, to avoid new comers attending in every sitting. This has the impact of reducing the quality of committee deliberations. The technical advisor should attend all the time to service the committee.
- ✓ The impact of disasters are much more devastating at local level, hence local civil protection committees should be established nationwide, with clear terms of reference to improve the response rate, when disasters strike. At the moment, a few of these exist.

6.1.2 DCP Staff

- ✓ To ensure that disaster management issues are adequately dealt with at Provincial and District levels, DCP should employ staff, qualified in disaster management, so as to ensure that issues of disaster management are dealt with on a fulltime basis and not receive partial attention as is currently the case, with sector ministry staff undertaking this extra function. At central level, it is recommended that, the project employs a projects finance officer, to work with DCP staff, with the aim of strengthening the DCP financial management system.

6.1.3 Project Planning and Management

- ✓ The misunderstanding of what constitutes routine activities and project funded activities has frustrated DCP and Steering committee members. To deal with this issue, DCP and UNDP should agree on activities that

qualify for inclusion in the quarterly and annual plans, so as to speed up the approval of such plans for approval.

- ✓ Delays in plan approvals and disbursement of project funds have caused delays in project implementation. UNDP financial management and procurement processes and procedures need reviewing, so as to make them more responsive to facilitate timeous implementation of project activities. In addition, there is need to acquaint DCP and UNDP staff involved in project management with such policies and procedures. Also time framing of project activities should consider the response rate of such procedures.
- ✓ The monitoring and evaluation(M& E) system needs further strengthening, through the development and standardisation of M & E instruments of data collection, which will then feed into the progress reports. Computerisation of DCP, which is long overdue, will facilitate the speedy flow of project information.
- ✓ Given the centrality of disaster risk assessment and having an enabling legislative and policy environment, to disaster planning and management, it is herein recommended that a national disaster risk assessment be undertaken as a matter of urgency and that an updated disaster management bill be enacted into law as soon as possible.

6.1.4 Training and Awareness Campaigns

- ✓ Training of stakeholders at national, provincial, district and community levels in disaster management is a continuous exercise. This is further necessitated by the high staff turnover experienced by government and quasi – government institutions. However, more of this should be directed at communities and their structures.

6.1.5 Disaster Management Operational Budgets

- ✓ Provincial and Districts committees should have an operational budget to facilitate quick responses when disasters occur. The current situation where these committees have no budget and hence have to resource mobilise to attend to disasters, delays reaction, resulting in injuries, destruction of property and loss of life

6.1.6 Disaster Management Equipment

- ✓ Among others, communication is vital in efficient and effective disaster management. Unfortunately, disaster prone areas are inaccessible due to poor road & telecommunications infrastructure and non availability of public transport. Government radio system at local level is dysfunctional. It is therefore recommended that local structures be equipped with radios to enable them to relay messages

- ✓ Flood prone areas become inaccessible when floods strike, it is recommended that “disaster management depots”/ satellite/local stations be established and stocked with necessary basic equipment and materials, to facilitate local disaster management interventions

7.0 Conclusion

The design of this project in terms of the project package was relevant to the disaster management situation obtaining in the country. Project implementation has significantly delivered results in five of the six major components of the project, namely institutional capacity needs assessment, disaster risk assessment, legislative and policy development, institutional strengthening and monitoring and evaluation. The component on developing disaster plans at national and subnational levels still needs serious attention. It is therefore recommended that the project be extended to cover outstanding activities and strengthen and sustain the momentum created by this project. Without totally ignoring institutions at national level, focus should be directed at communities and their structures, in terms of capacity building and awareness campaigns. A comprehensive disaster risk assessment should be carried out, as it is critical in the development of disaster management plans. The next phase, should lobby heavily for the enactment of the disaster management bill into law. A proposal for the next phase of this project should be developed, informed by the lessons and recommendations from this evaluation.

Annex 1
Terms of Reference
For
The Evaluation of the Support for Strengthening National Capacity for Disaster
Management in Zimbabwe- 00070100

Background

Zimbabwe is a disaster prone country, where the probability of risk and vulnerability is high. The country experiences disasters that include the devastating effects of droughts and floods, veldt fires, other fire emergencies, traffic accidents, drowning accidents, disease outbreaks, chemical explosions and contaminations. Recent earth tremors have occurred in the south east of the country that damaged social and physical infrastructures.

Droughts are the most serious natural hazards that occur in the country. The 1992 drought affected over 10 million people resulting in massive humanitarian food imports, 20% of the national livestock herd and wildlife were lost. Since 2002 the country has been experiencing annual agriculture droughts resulting in food insecurity and vulnerability of both the rural and urban households.

Zimbabwe also experiences flooding particularly in the low lying areas of Zambezi valley in Mashonaland Central and West, Midlands and Matabeleland North and South especially along the Limpopo and Save valleys. In 2000 Cyclone Eline induced floods destroyed infrastructure including bursting medium sized dams, bridges, schools, clinics and homesteads. Related to these floods is the extensive environmental degradation.

Finally man-induced disasters from landmines laid during the war of liberation pose disasters to humans, livestock and wildlife and inhibit economic development in the affected areas along the northern, eastern and south eastern borders of the country. The minefields stretch for over 700 km covering an area of about 210 km².

Support for Strengthening National Capacity for Disaster Management in Zimbabwe project.

The project commenced in January 2004 initially to end in December 2008 but was extended to December 2009. The government of Zimbabwe through the Department of Civil Protection (DCP), and other national stakeholders, with the support from UNDP, is implementing the project under the National Execution (NEX) modality.

Main areas of focus

The project focuses on five main areas which are:

- a) Institutional capacity needs assessment;
- b) Disaster risk assessment;
- c) Updating the national strategy and plan and also supporting the preparation of pilot provincial and district disaster management strategies and plans in selected pilot provinces and districts;

- d) Support to the legislative and policy development and implementation process;
and
- e) Institutional strengthening.

The first two activities are the preparatory stage of the pilot and will inform and be immediately followed up by the other activities. The landmine project is undertaken in partnership and close cooperation of the Ministry of Defence.

The target beneficiaries are:

- a) Central government through the DCP;
- b) Local government through the Provincial and District Disaster Management Committees; and
- c) The local communities through the local authorities and the private sector.

The intended outcome of the project is an enhanced capacity of the government at all levels to support local communities to be better prepared for disasters and to be more effective in responding to disasters when they occur. Communities will become more aware of disaster risks and how they can be reduced.

The Zimbabwe government and UNDP constitute a Steering Committee that meets quarterly to monitor and review progress in the project implementation. Technical staff from the DCP and UNDP meets regularly to discuss the implementation of the project.

Objectives of the evaluation

It is against this background that UNDP in conjunction with the Ministry of Local Government, Urban and Rural Development– through the DCP, are seeking the services of a consultant to carry out a Terminal Evaluation of this project. Overall, the evaluation has the following three aims:

1. Assess the project design and its achievements against the intended objectives and outputs
2. Draw lessons that will guide the design of future interventions, in particular a successor community driven recovery project, and enhance knowledge sharing.
3. Assess the contribution of the project towards meeting UNDP's commitment of support to the Government of Zimbabwe.

Scope of the evaluation

The scope of the evaluation is expected to cover UNDP, the implementing ministry, local authorities, and the communities that benefited from the project.

The terminal evaluation is expected to specifically address all the following issues:

1. Assess the progress towards the achievement of project outputs while highlighting the contributory factor to project success on a particular objective, or lack of it.
2. Assess the effectiveness of the project design in terms of depth and breadth vis-a-vis the communities' needs and the capacities of local authorities, the implementing ministry and UNDP to deliver on the intended objectives.
3. Analyse the extent to which the various project components have managed to synergise project impacts through linkages in purpose and coordination.

4. In particular, assess whether the women empowerment on DRM was effectively implemented, citing the strategies engaged.
5. Analyse and assess the effectiveness of the institutional arrangements for project implementation.
6. Assess the accountability, planning and M&E systems and tools and make recommendations for their improvement, if necessary.
7. Analyse the linkages between the project and other projects that are implemented in the government ministries, same communities and the synergies that have been generated towards meeting the communities' capacity to mitigate against disasters, recovery and development needs.
8. Analyse and assess the effectiveness and challenges of the funds disbursement and procurement mechanisms and make recommendations on how these could be improved.
9. Assess the contribution of the project within the context of UNDP's commitments under the ZUNDAF, CPD and CPAP.
10. Make recommendations on the alignment of project focus and design to the UNDP Corporate Strategy 2008-2011, RBA Strategy and Management Review 2006 and Zimbabwe Country Office strategic focus areas of Early Recovery (Support to democratic governance, Support to local level recovery and Support to coordination of early recovery), and the emerging policy thrust of the new inclusive government;

Expected outputs

- A comprehensive detailed evaluation report should be structured along the following lines:
- 5 Executive summary
 - 6 Introduction
 - 7 The project and its development context
 - 8 Findings and Conclusions
 - 4.1 Project formulation
 - 4.2 Implementation
 - 4.3 Results
 - 9 Recommendations
 - 10 Lessons learned
 - 11 Annexes - in addition to the evaluation report , other products such as presentations of findings is requested including annexes detailing names of persons interviewed, documents reviewed, field visits, evaluation methodology, case studies & photographs, TOR's etc.,

In addition the following should be adhered to: -

- The length of the report should not exceed 50 pages in total;

- The first draft of the report should be submitted within 2 weeks of completion of the mission;
- The draft should be submitted to UNDP and it will be circulated for comments to DCP, Project Management and other key stakeholders.
- If there are discrepancies between the impressions and findings of the evaluation team and the aforementioned parties, these should be explained in an annex attached to the final report

Methodology or evaluation approach

The key elements of the methodology to be used by the consultants will consist of the following:

- Desk review of relevant documents (policy documents, project documents and reports)
- Interviews with key informants (implementing partners, communities, stakeholders)
- Field visits of local authorities and communities where the project was undertaken
- Participatory techniques and other approaches for gathering and analysing data.

Documents to be reviewed

Some of the background documents to be reviewed as part of the evaluation include:

- UNDP Corporate Strategy 2008-2011
- UNDP RBA Strategy and Management Review May 2006
- ZUNDAF 2000- 2004 and ZUNDAF 2007-2011
- CPAP
- CPD
- PSD
- Support for Strengthening National Capacity for Disaster Management in Zimbabwe project document
- Quarterly, annual reports and work plans for the duration of the project.
- Key documents produced under the project e.g. the Capacity Needs Assessment report, the Draft Bill on Disaster Risk Management, Resource Book on Disaster Risk Management for Schools and other Institutions in Zimbabwe, Draft policy on DRM in Zimbabwe etc.

Evaluation consultant

The evaluation consultant will be an individual who has at no point directly or indirectly associated with the design and implementation of any of the activities associated with the project. The individual should be a development consultant (social scientist) with over 10 years development programme expertise and experience in the following areas of:

- Participatory project design, management and implementation
- Evaluation of development programmes and projects
- Experience in disaster risk management
- Qualification in development, social sciences or related fields.
- Knowledge of the local environment (rural communities)
- Knowledge of UNDP procedures and programme implementation strategies will be an added advantage.
- Good writing skills
- Computer literacy

Timeframe

The evaluation will be undertaken over a period of 10 days spread over one month from day of signing of contract as shown below.

Annex 2: DCP and UNDP staff questionnaire

1. How was this project conceptualised?
2. Has the project delivered the inputs, activities, outputs and objectives as per plan? Explain the level of performance of the project highlighting the contributory factor to project success on a particular objective, or lack of it.
3. Highlight challenges and how you responded to them during project implementation.
4. How effective is the project design in terms of depth and breadth vis-à-vis the communities' needs and the capacities of local authorities, the implementing ministry and UNDP to deliver on the intended objectives.
5. To what extent have the various project components managed to synergise project impacts through linkages in purpose and coordination?
6. Has the women empowerment on DRM been effectively implemented? , Cite the strategies engaged.
7. How effective is the institutional arrangements for project implementation? Analyse and assess the effectiveness of the institutional arrangements for project implementation.
8. What accountability, planning and M& E systems were put in place and how effective were they? Assess the accountability, planning and M&E systems and tools and make recommendations for their improvement, if necessary.
9. Analyse the linkages between the project and other projects that are implemented in the government ministries, same communities and the synergies that have been generated towards meeting the communities' capacity to mitigate against disasters, recovery and development needs.
10. Describe and assess the effectiveness and challenges of the funds disbursement and procurement mechanisms and make recommendations on how these could be improved.
11. Assess the contribution of the project within the context of UNDP's commitments under the ZUNDAF, CPD and CPAP.
12. What are the learning points from implementing his project?
13. How do you intend to sustain the project beyond funding?
14. Make recommendations on the alignment of project focus and design to the UNDP Corporate Strategy 2008-2011, RBA Strategy and Management Review 2006 and Zimbabwe Country Office strategic focus areas of Early Recovery (Support to democratic governance, Support to local level recovery and Support to coordination of early recovery), and the emerging policy thrust of the new inclusive government;
15. Any other comments you may wish to make on this project

Annex 2: Interview checklist for provincial & district committees and communities

Project Title: Strengthening capacity for disaster management in Zimbabwe – 2005-2009

Provincial & district committees

1. What disasters are experienced in this province?
2. Are you aware of the project deliverables?
3. Did the project achieve its objectives? explain level of performance.
4. Comment on the effectiveness of the project design
5. Comment on the involvement of woman in the project
6. How effective is the institutional arrangements in project implementation?
7. What accountability, planning & M&E systems were put in place and did they work.
8. What is the coordination like with other players implementing related projects in the same areas?
9. In what way did you benefit from this project?
10. What lessons did you draw from the implementation of this project?
11. What are your recommendations for the future?
12. Any other comments you wish to make on this project.

Committees

1. What disasters are experienced in your community?
2. Are you aware of this project?
3. What is your role in disaster management?
4. What challenges did you face and are you facing in executing your functions?
5. What did you benefit from this project/training?
6. What lessons did you learn from this project?
7. What are your recommendations for the future?
8. Any other comments you would like to make

Annex 3: Interview Schedule

Support for Strengthening National Capacity for Disaster Management in Zimbabwe: Project Evaluation

Proposed Interview Schedule

ACTIVITY	RESPONDENT	PROPOSED DATE	ACTUAL DATE
Preliminary meeting	Ndlovu	12/10/2009	
Interviews	DCP Staff	13/10/2009	
	Steering committee	15-16/10/2009	
	UNDP& other NGOs	19- 21	
	Selected provinces & districts(Pilots)	12 – 20/11/2009	
Report Writing		23/11 – 04/12/09	

Fieldwork schedule

ACTIVITY	PLACE	DATE	MANPOWER
Interviews with Provincial and district structures and community	Mashonaland Central Province (Province & Districts)	12 – 13/11/2009(1 night)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ G I Manikai(Consultant) ✓ UNDP Driver ✓ Dept of Civil Protection Staff member
Interviews with provincial and district structures and communities	Masvingo Province (Province & districts)	16 – 17/11/2009(1night)	Same as above
Matabeleland South provincial and district structures and communities	Matabeleland Province (Province & districts)	18 – 20/11/2009(3nights)	Same as above

Annex 3: Documents reviewed

- ✓ NEX Policy & Procedures Manual

- ✓ Quarterly work plans
- ✓ Annual work plans
- ✓ Quarterly progress reports
- ✓ Mid term evaluation report
- ✓ Zimbabwe United Nations Development Assistants Framework- 2007-11
- ✓ Disaster Project annual report- 2008
- ✓ Draft DRM policy document
- ✓ UNDP corporate strategic plan (2008 – 11)
- ✓ Emergency preparedness bill 2005
- ✓ DRM project report
- ✓ Zim DRM CAN final report
- ✓ Disaster management financial and compliance audit reports

Appendix 5: List of respondents

1. M. S. Pawadyira – Director, DCP

2. S. Ndlovu – Deputy Director, DCP
3. L. Betera – DCP
4. A. Made – UNDP, Program Specialist
5. P. Ncube – OCHA, Disaster Risk Preparedness & Reduction Specialist
6. Jachi – Provincial Administrator, Mashonaland Central Province
7. Mukamba – Principal Administration Officer, Mashonaland Central Province
8. Mazai – District Administrator, Centenary District
9. Inspector Mapfumo – Officer In Charge, Centenary District
10. Assistant Commissioner Tevedzai- Centenary District
11. Assistant Inspector Mangwiro- Centenary District
12. Murwira – Village health worker, Mukobwe village, Dambakurima, Muzarabani District
13. S. Murwira – Community member, Mukobwe village, Dambakurima, Muzarabani District
14. Rwodzi – Community member, Mukobwe village, Dambakurima, Muzarabani District
15. A. N. Chivanga – Provincial Administrator`s Office (PA) Masvingo, Senior Officer
16. Nyika – Department of Physical Planning (DPP), Masvingo Province
17. Turo – Provincial Medical Director`s Office (PMD), Principal Officer, Masvingo Province
18. Superintendent Ndou- Police, Masvingo
19. Madzikanda – Senior Agricultural & Extension Services (AGRITEX) Officer, Chiredzi District.
20. Chauke – District Administrator`s Office (DA), Accounting Assistant, Chiredzi
21. S. Mavenga – Department of Social Welfare, Social Welfare Officer, Chiredzi
22. W. Hlongwane – Senior village/community member, Chikwarakwara Village, Beitbridge District
23. J. Hlongwane – School Chairperson, Chikwarakwara village, Beitbridge District
24. T. Mbedzi – School Development Committee member, Chikwarakwara Village, Beitbridge District
25. A. Hlongwane – Vice Chairperson (Irrigation), Chikwarakwara Village, Beitbridge District
26. E Dhuve – Kraal Head, Chikwarakwara Village, Beitbridge District
27. S. Ncube – Nurse, Chikwarakwara Clinic, Chikwarakwara Village, Beitbridge District
28. Assistant Inspector Matutu – Beitbridge District police
29. Superintendent Manhai – Deputy Officer Commanding District, Beitbridge
30. M Maveka – District Extension Officer, Beitbridge District
31. D Ncube – Supervisor, AGRITEX, Beitbridge District

32. A Tsinyo – Acting Chief Executive Officer(CEO), Beitbridge Rural Council
33. Constable Dube – Police, Beitbridge
34. Dube – Ministry of Health, District Environmental Health Officer
35. Constable Mundizvo – Office of the President and Cabinet (OPC), Gwanda
Matabeleland South Province
36. Mushaikwa – OPC, Gwanda, Mat South Province
37. Mashonganyika – Administration, PA`s Office, Mat South Province
38. Donga – PA`s Office, Mat South Province.