



International Federation  
of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

QuickTime™ and a  
TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor  
are needed to see this picture.

## **A Review of the Mozambique Floods Response Shelter Working Group**

**April 2007**

Raj Rana, Consultant (report author)

*The views expressed in this review are those of the consultant, and not necessarily those of the IFRC.*

## ***Table of Contents***

Table of Contents .....	2
Summary and Recommendations .....	3
Acronyms Used .....	9
I Introduction .....	10
II Chronology of Events .....	12
III Findings .....	14
Challenging Critical Hypotheses .....	15
IV Survey Results .....	25
V Conclusions and Recommendations .....	26
Annex 1- Methodology .....	32
Annex 2- Bibliography .....	33
Annex 3- List of Interviewees .....	34
Annex 4 - TOR .....	35
Annex 5- Survey Output .....	40

## ***Summary and Recommendations***

This review of the Mozambique Floods Shelter Working Group (MSWG) is the third review<sup>1</sup> commissioned by the Shelter Department of the International Federation of Red Cross and Crescent Societies (IFRC) Secretariat. This learning is intended to inform future field experiences in Shelter activities and Shelter Cluster Coordination. As described in the Terms of Reference (TOR- Annex 4) this review is intentionally very IFRC-centric in its focus; while its contents will contribute to the critical engagement and advocacy the IFRC maintains towards the broader Cluster process/UN system, this is not the primary goal of this review. The focus is very much on the mechanics of the Emergency Shelter Coordination function and the service this entails. This review was disproportionately focused on the interaction between the RC/RC partners and the SCCT. This was inevitable, as personality issues clouded the early stages of the deployment, and it took time for a more productive relationship to emerge. Equally, the Mozambique case study is an important one, despite being what some saw as an emergency too small to merit the full-scale Cluster rollout. Shelter Cluster participation levels along the lines of Mozambique will easily represent the majority of cases that the IFRC will face in future, and not the extreme models of the South Asia earthquake and Yogyakarta.

The core objectives of the MSWG review are to:

1. review and analyze the experience of the International Federation with respect to the establishment and operation of the MSWG, with a particular emphasis on lessons to be learnt for future operations;
2. provide a foundation for establishing policy and guidelines for emergency shelter coordination (cluster) leadership at a national level, including identification of the appropriate mechanisms and procedures to support shelter leadership at the national level within the Secretariat;
3. provide recommendations with regard to the International Federation's leadership of future emergency shelter coordination (cluster) activities both at global and at national levels.
4. examine if there were aspects of the Federation's cluster leadership which potentially might have or actually did compromise the mandate and principles of the Red Cross/Red Crescent.

The report is structured as an accessible working document. The short introduction provides background and some indications of the in-country capacity pre-floods. A chronology of events is presented to help situate the shelter-related decisions, discussions and deployments. The section on findings re-structures the review's objectives, scope and key issues into a series of hypotheses that were then tested in the course of the review. The hypotheses provide a series of expected outcomes of the SWG, and lead to recommendations on how these might be achieved in future. The

---

<sup>1</sup> Previous reviews examining the IFRC contribution to Shelter Clusters in Yogyakarta and the Philippines.

conclusion brings together the broader issues of the review and suggests some ideas for the way forward. The glimpses of the SWG provided through the field visit and survey help to frame the contribution made towards effective provision of emergency shelter in response to the Mozambique floods.

**Quick glimpse of the how the IFRC convened SWG was seen<sup>2</sup>:**

*The Shelter Cluster is seen to be priority forum for its stakeholders. Stakeholders were reserved in their satisfaction with the SWG: their expectations were higher than their levels of satisfaction. In both performance and expectations, the SWG is valued for its IM contribution, Coordination, and Technical Advice/Standards. It is not seen as a venue for Advocacy and Resource Mobilization or for Strategy Development. Most agreed that the distinction between emergency shelter and resettlement/reconstruction is a useful one.*

*The neutrality and independence of the Movement is not jeopardized by the IFRC contribution to the UN-led Cluster approach; stakeholders have great difficulty distinguishing amongst the various RC/RC entities, to the point of confusion.*

*In terms of the Cluster Activation Process, opinions are divided. Half of respondents considered the process to be transparent and logical, and fewer believed that the Cluster activation took into account existing, in-country capacities. A slim majority felt their interests were well represented by the Cluster approach.*

**Broad Conclusions**

**'What did we need Clusters for?'- IFRC advocacy on the Shelter Cluster**

*Who polices compliance with the Guidance Note on Using the Cluster Approach to Strengthen Humanitarian Assistance? Should the IFRC assess the relevance of the Cluster rollout on a case-by-case basis? Is the Shelter Department ultimately responsible for the success of the broader Cluster rollout?*

The rationale to deploy the Cluster system in Mozambique was not subject to a critical debate, and the employment of the Cluster activation process was opaque, with the guidelines largely ignored. The Mozambique government was seemingly little consulted and their existing coordination system rendered the Cluster approach as somewhat incongruous and incompatible counter-part, which didn't adapt to the national system. At its worst, Clusters would hold their meetings at the same time as the INGC held their working group meetings, and Clusters were not adapted to align with the Government's existing working group compositions. Stakeholders in the Shelter Working Group appreciated the efforts made by IFRC to 'deliver some good' in light of these larger issues, and appreciated the basic services of formal meetings, minutes of meeting and a shelter counterpart that could be reached for discussion.

---

<sup>2</sup> Glimpse developed from online survey of shelter stakeholders.

While the IFRC, as an IASC member, participated in the rollout of the Clusters, it had limited influence on the rollout decision itself. The decision to deploy seemed to precipitate a necessary assessment of the relevance of Clusters in Mozambique, the contribution the IFRC could make, and the integration of the experience and perspectives of the regional delegation and the CVM. The IFRC simply did its best to ensure a speedy rollout to meet their obligation to lead the Shelter Cluster.

There is a genuine concern of 'guilt by association' for the IFRC contribution to Clusters. While the Secretariat and Shelter Department are not responsible for the success of the broader Cluster rollout, it is impossible to dissociate the IFRC from the perceived successes and failures of the process. While speed has been identified as a key factor in SCCT deployments, the IFRC should put more emphasis on assessing the needs and developing a clear plan, with outcomes for the Shelter Working Group it deploys. In the Mozambique case study it was unclear if the decision to deploy a SCCT took into account the human resource constraints the Shelter Department faced.

In the form of broader commentary, it seems inevitable that the UN system will deploy the Cluster approach for the majority of future crises, whatever the scale or relevance of the deployment. To their credit in Mozambique, rather than consider at what point to shut down the clusters, they had by mid-March already drafted a plan to make the Clusters a permanent preparedness and response structure of the UN country team. Will the Movement be obliged to participate to this permanent process? Will this become a permanent feature? Will participation to this forum be the roll of national societies or the IFRC regional delegations?

**'I say Shelter, and they hear Cluster'- views of the SWG from within the RC/RC Movement**

*Has the Movement embraced the IFRC commitment to Clusters and the Global Programme Shelter? What needs to be done to improve understanding and integration?*

This quote was used by a member of the SCCT, and captures well the confusion in the Movement as concerns the IFRC commitment to lead the Shelter Cluster and the Global Programme Shelter. The priorities of the Shelter Department are vast, and many prefer the shorthand of limiting understanding to simply 'Clusters'. RC/RC respondents seem to consider understanding the UN Humanitarian Reform process and the IFRC commitment to the Shelter Cluster as being something of a secondary priority. Trying to introduce these issues to a Movement engaged with an emergency response, with few foundations for understanding the Humanitarian Reforms having been laid, is simply a challenge. The result that found the SCCT working in relative isolation from the rest of the Movement present in Mozambique is thus not entirely surprising.

The Shelter Cluster Coordination Team (SCCT) by default has to be better equipped to introduce and explain the Cluster concept in an expedient way; at another level, the Secretariat needs to more

effectively communicate what it already knows about the evolution of these issues to the Movement in a broader way. The Movement should be credited with having been a quick study, with CVM, Regional Delegation and FACT having ultimately understood the added value of the Shelter Department, and thinking towards future deployments.

Bringing 'Shelter' and 'Cluster' together will likely result from bringing the SCCT closer to the FACT, ONS and IFRC structures in the field. Closer ties will allow better mutual understanding, allowing the Movement to benefit from the SCCT's links to the UN system, and for the SCCT to benefit from the Movement resources, networks and assessments in-country. There should be caution in trying to 'have it both ways'- insisting on a SCCT that is functionally and hierarchically independent from the ONS, FACT and national or regional IFRC structure, while benefiting from the resources of the Movement as a whole. If RC/RC partners in an emergency response are more tightly integrated, this will demand a deeper investment by all partners- it is not simply a matter of the SCCT taking better advantage of RC/RC resources in the field.. The FACT Team Leader, for example will have to further engage with- and profit from- the 'window' of access and understanding of the UN world that the Shelter Coordinator can offer. The Shelter Coordinator will also have to 'pull' RC/RC representatives to participate in ALL of the appropriate clusters. The Shelter Coordinator and their team are not a convenient means to 'outsource' participation to the UN system; it should be seen as a means to *improve* the IFRC and RC/RC Movement engagement with UN-led coordination systems.

The external IFRC advocacy on the Cluster issue needs to be dissociated from the Shelter Department. The Inter-agency Cooperation Department might perhaps be better placed to make interventions on the successes and failings of the Cluster process at the IASC level, from the perspective of IFRC. If the Cluster experience is not meeting the expectations and standards of the IFRC, more research, advocacy and policy work should be considered, using the *inputs from the Shelter Department* as its basis. This dissociation might help the Movement hear Shelter Cluster, and not only Shelter or Cluster.

This review was disproportionately focused on the interaction between the RC/RC Movement and the SCCT. This was inevitable, as personality issues clouded the early stages of the deployment, and it took time to refine a more productive relationship. Given the extremely short period of deployment, the SCCT departure seemed precipitous and in the succeeding weeks the various RC/RC participants had come to digest the Shelter Cluster experience.

Finally, there has to be some caution in how the Mozambique case study is used. On the one hand, it would be all too easy to discard the experience as being a poor example of the Cluster rollout, an emergency of a scale that did not merit Clusters, or an example that doesn't fit with the coordination capacity that the Shelter department is constructing. On the other hand, the Mozambique example cannot be seen as the exception compared to the 'Perfect Storms' of the South Asia earthquake, and the Yogyakarta. In all likelihood, the UN will rollout the Cluster approach with increasing

frequency, and for small-scale emergencies where the relevance of Clusters is less clear. The risk is that Mozambique is an indication of how 85% of Cluster rollouts will look like in future, and that Pakistan and Yogyakarta represent the exception. How can/do the existing thinking and experiences of the Shelter department adapt to Mozambique-like examples with a handful of international participants and relatively little government, donor- and media-interest?

**The mechanics of the SWG- developing 'triggers' and criteria for deployment**

*When does the IFRC decide to deploy a Shelter Coordination Team? What are the basic criteria for such deployments? At what point should this responsibility be handed over to UN-HABITAT? Under what conditions would IFRC refuse to deploy a SCCT? What kind of models and structures should be considered?*

The *ad hoc* nature of deployment and decision-making is not helping the cause of the Shelter Department. While the speed of the IFRC Shelter Cluster deployment to the Mozambique rollout was applauded by the UN system, it was difficult to develop a clear chronology of why the team was deployed, nor when the decision was taken to handover. Despite what seemed an unclear assessment for a Cluster rollout in Mozambique, the Secretariat chose to deploy a team. The mobilizing of a team, that team's composition and handover date were not clearly defined for the RC/RC stakeholders nationally and regionally. While the intent of the IFRC SWG contribution seems to have been to be good and fast, the initiative was ultimately not sustainable.

The Shelter Department, in discussion with its partners and stakeholders, must develop a clear, simple and concise checklist of factors that need to be considered in deploying a Shelter Coordination Team. It should be clear why- or why not- the Secretariat responds, with what kind of team, and for how long. The deployment of a Coordinator with the appropriate P5/10 years experience to do an initial assessment would allow the Shelter Department the time to fully consider the needs and realities, and would permit the drafting of an operational plan with financial and human resources needs, and timelines for deployment and handover.

The Mozambique example offers some interesting suggestions for new approaches. There is the clear interest of the regional delegation and CVM to engage in shelter and coordination capacity building and preparedness. A regional shelter delegate position could help support this, and support a more sustainable shelter approach.

**Focussing future learning**

*What was the intent? The output? Impact? How is it measured?* To date the Shelter Department has commissioned reviews of its SWGs. While this is a fast way of getting structured feedback, the next steps should be more comprehensive. With the introduction of evaluation criteria and benchmarks, and perhaps in implementing some recommendations from this review, the IFRC will have a better basis

(i.e. measurable) for evaluating the impact and success of its contribution to the provision of emergency shelter.

**Did the IFRC-convened Shelter Working Group contribute to the effective provision of emergency shelter?**

Overall, the IFRC SWG globally contributed to effective shelter provision, but the degree of this contribution is debateable. From the figures that the IFRC SCCT managed to collate by the time of its departure, it was estimated that there was a level of 66.95% coverage of emergency shelter needs for the flood affected population, and a coverage rate (actual and planned) of around 48.89% for the cyclone affected population. A considerable number of families in the urban areas and surroundings had rebuilt or repaired their own houses with materials available. These results are certainly respectable, given the scale of the emergency. *Can this success be directly attributable to the contribution of the IFRC SCCT?*

To some extent, yes. The IFRC contributed to shaping the coordination, information sharing and management and ensuring the links to other Clusters. It provided some technical advice and contributed to issues of technical standards. The SWG kept focus on the emergency shelter needs, while the early recovery partner prepared for the transition. External constraints limited the effectiveness of Shelter Coordination- lack of quality data, few actors, shelter stakeholders not represented in the capital, doubtful relevance of the Cluster approach compared to the Governments existing structures, etc.

That said the successes in shelter would likely have occurred without the IFRC contribution. It is unlikely that more external actors intervened as a result of the Shelter Cluster. The government was in fact leading the field-level shelter response. Shelter stakeholders' participation to the Cluster was most likely linked to their organization's priorities. Participants did not see SWG as a strategic forum, nor as a means of enhancing advocacy and mobilization efforts. Given that the relief operation was launched before the Cluster rollout, and the contribution of the SCCT was for 17 days, it seems unfair to associate coverage levels with the SWG. The weak links with government coordination ran counter to the intent of the Cluster's *raison d'être*. Given the limited amount of participants to the SWG (less than 5 key organizations), that the Government maintained its own robust and tested structure for managing the disaster, then the degree to which the IFRC influenced this success is somewhat debateable.



## ***Acronyms Used***

BTC	Basic Training Course
CERF	Central Emergency Relief Fund
CVM	<i>Cruz Vermelha Mozambique</i> (Mozambique Red Cross)
DM	Disaster Management
DREF	Disaster Relief Emergency Fund
FACT	Field Assessment and Coordination Team
GRC	German Red Cross
HoRD	Head of Regional Delegation
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
IM	Information Management
INGC (Mozambique)	National Institute for Disaster Management
IOM	International Organization for Migration
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MSF	<i>Médecins Sans Frontières</i>
MSWG	Mozambique Shelter Working Group
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
PNS	Participating National Society
RC	Resident Coordinator (UN)
RC/RC	Red Cross/Red Crescent
RTE	Real Time Evaluation
SWG Cluster)	Shelter Working Group (IFRC equivalent for Shelter Cluster)
SCCT	Shelter Cluster Coordination Team
TOR	Terms of Reference
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
WFP	World Food Programme

## **I Introduction**

This review of the Mozambique Floods Shelter Working Group (MSWG) is the third review<sup>3</sup> commissioned by the Shelter Department of the International Federation of Red Cross and Crescent Societies (IFRC) Secretariat. This learning is intended to inform future field experiences in Shelter activities and Shelter Cluster Coordination. As described in the Terms of Reference (TOR- Annex 4) this review is intentionally very IFRC-centric in its focus; while its contents will contribute to the critical engagement and advocacy the IFRC maintains towards the broader Cluster process/UN system, this is not the primary goal of this review. The focus is very much on the mechanics of the Emergency Shelter Coordination function and the service this entails. This review was disproportionately focused on the interaction between the RC/RC Movement and the SCCT. This was inevitable, as personality issues clouded the early stages of the deployment, and it took time for a more productive relationship to emerge. Equally, the Mozambique case study is an important one, despite being what some saw as an emergency too small to merit the full-scale Cluster rollout. Shelter Cluster participation levels along the lines of Mozambique will easily represent the majority of cases that the IFRC will face in future, and not the extreme models of the South Asia earthquake and Yogyakarta.

The core objectives of the MSWG review are to:

1. review and analyze the experience of the International Federation with respect to the establishment and operation of the MSWG, with a particular emphasis on lessons to be learnt for future operations;
2. provide a foundation for establishing policy and guidelines for emergency shelter coordination (cluster) leadership at a national level, including identification of the appropriate mechanisms and procedures to support shelter leadership at the national level within the Secretariat;
3. provide recommendations with regard to the International Federation's leadership of future emergency shelter coordination (cluster) activities both at global and at national levels.
4. examine if there were aspects of the Federation's cluster leadership which potentially might have or actually did compromise the mandate and principles of the Red Cross/Red Crescent.

The report is structured as an accessible working document. The short introduction provides background and some indications of the in-country capacity pre-floods. A chronology of events is presented to help situate the shelter-related decisions, discussions and deployments. The section on findings re-structures the review's objectives, scope and key issues into a series of hypothesis which were then tested in the course of the review. The hypothesis provide a series of expected outcomes of the SWG, and lead to recommendations on how these might be achieved in future. The

---

<sup>3</sup> Previous reviews examining the IFRC contribution to Shelter Clusters in Yogyakarta and the Philippines.

conclusion brings together the broader issues of the review and suggests some ideas for the way forward. The glimpses of the SWG provided through the field visit and survey help to frame the contribution made towards effective provision of emergency shelter in response to the Mozambique floods.

The report has five annexes that complement the review. [Annex 1](#) describes the methodology for the review. The relevant reporting and background documents on Mozambique Clusters and Shelter are listed [Annex 2](#), and a list of the interviewees [Annex 3](#). This was supplemented by an anonymous online survey that attempted to take a snapshot of how the IFRC role in convening the SWG is perceived ([Annex 5- Survey Results](#)). The Shelter Cluster was at best attended by 8 organizations in Maputo, and the participation to the survey is a reflection of this- ultimately too few response to provide anything more than a glimpse of how the SWG was perceived.

### **Background to the Flood and Cyclone**

Since December 2006, Since December, torrential rains hit Mozambique, causing major floods in the central and southern parts. On February 22, while the country was struggling to assist flood victims, Mozambique experienced a very intense tropical cyclone - Cyclone Favio - which killed nine people. More than 130,000 people have been affected, 6,000 houses and 20,800 hectares of crops have been destroyed, especially in the areas of Vilanculos, Inhassoro and Govuro. The various IFRC Appeal documents provide further background.

In late January the Mozambique Red Cross (*Cruz Vermelha Mozambique-CVM*) launched a relief operation. The 30 January IFRC DREF Bulletin Mozambique: Floods and Cyclones was followed quickly by the nomination of a FACT Team leader. Almost immediately, the UN Country Team (UNCT) proposed the adoption of the Cluster approach for Mozambique, a process that went from proposal, through (limited) consultation to implementation in the space of four days. A request for Shelter support by the CVM and the FACT team was staffed by the Secretariat with the first staff arriving Maputo 15 February. This shelter support to Mozambique would continue for a total of 26 days, with a dedicated Shelter Coordination Team (SCCT) for a total of 17 days.

There were special considerations for the operation. The international response to the 2000/2001 floods had been seen as poorly coordinated with the Mozambique government. Particular sensitivity was shown by Government and international responders to avoid a repeat of the humanitarian circus arriving in Mozambique. This was equally true for the IFRC and PNS, who at the onset of the crisis had no permanent presence in the country. The CVM is a strong national society, with established links to Government structures, and clearly defined roles in disaster management.

In terms of government capacity, the state has invested heavily in re-structuring and conducting simulations to test its emergency management approach. A national policy on disaster management was formulated and a new Institute of Disaster Management (INGC) was

created in June 1999. The Institute was established as a national coordinating entity with the legal authority to call on all partners to plan and implement response and prevention measures. As they had only recently conducted a flood-response simulation their response reflected their training. The government's disaster response structure has pre-established entry points through which the international community could integrate their contribution and with whom to coordinate.

The UN system is well established in Mozambique, with some agencies having substantial means and programs in country. WFP and UNICEF are seen as the heavyweights, with the latter alone having 50+ expatriate staff. The decision to deploy the Cluster approach in Mozambique does not appear to have been a response to a particular priority expressed by agencies or the government. The process from proposal to implementation was a consultation process of a mere three days. The Clusters seemed to be a 'one-size fits all' approach, and were not adapted to the government's existing partition of sectors. There were instances of UN-led Clusters holding their meetings at the same time as their equivalent Government working groups. At best, the Cluster approach seemed a somewhat self-serving effort that was imposed on the Mozambique government. Attempts to link effective humanitarian response to the success of clusters in Mozambique, risked stretching the truth.

The Mozambique example has to be seen as a critical case study that looks at the Movement and its understanding and acceptance of the Coordination role the IFRC has committed to undertake with the UN system and Clusters. The reviewer ultimately put more focus on the RC/RC aspects than was foreseen, in an attempt to understand the negatively portrayed shelter experience of the RC/RC counterparts in Maputo, and to answer lingering shelter/cluster questions and concerns expressed by RC/RC stakeholders. Not enough time was available during the field visit to have a better grasp of government or beneficiary perceptions of the IFRC contribution.

## ***II Chronology of Events***

The following chronology is not an exhaustive version of events, but is presented to give some context to the findings and commentary that follow. Accent is put upon situating shelter-related decisions, discussions and deployments. It is well understood that SCCT members held numerous formal and informal meetings, beyond those listed, over the course of their deployment.

**December-** Torrential rains hit Mozambique. Early warning systems in Zambesi valley, in place since the floods of 2001, indicated that the water levels would increase and force displacement of people. Management of water flow from Cahora Bassa dam in Tete province was well managed; lack of management of the un-dammed Shire River flowing from Malawi caused flooding problems downstream of its confluence with the Zambesi. Government of Mozambique

- (INGC) therefore initiated their developed contingency plans for resettlement and relocation sites, notifications to the populations et al
- Late January-** CVM begins their relief operations to affected populations
- 30 January-** IFRC DREF Bulletin Mozambique: Floods and Cyclones ([MDRMZ002](#))
- 10 February-** Dr. Hanna Schmuck (GRC) nominated FACT Team Leader
- 12 February-** RC/OCHA convene meeting to discuss Cluster Leads (FACT/CVM)- Movement is proposed for the 'Shelter and Protection' Cluster  
FACT Team Leader asks Secretariat support/clarification on Clusters and IFRC Role
- 13 February-** Shelter Department Secretariat provides suggestions and documents by email and phone
- 14 February-** Teleconference FACT/CVM with IFRC Secretariat to discuss Shelter Cluster support (request from Maputo for coordinator and technical support)  
Departure for Maputo of Robert Mister (RMI- Inter-Agency Cooperation Department) and Malcolm Johnstone (MJO- Shelter Department)
- 15 February-** Arrival RMI/MJO in Maputo  
First discussions with CVM/FACT about functioning of SCCT in Mozambique  
Message from Ms. Margareta Wahlstrom, Officer-in-Charge of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs/New York, announcing Cluster activation for Mozambique, and designating IFRC/CVM "cluster lead" for shelter
- 16 February-** IFRC Launches Emergency Appeal Mozambique: Floods ([press release](#)).  
Head of Shelter Department, Graham Saunders, arrives Maputo
- 18 February-** Shelter meeting convened in Caia led by MJO (RC/RC participants only)
- 22 February-** Cyclone Favio makes landfall near Vilanculos
- 24 February-** Shelter meeting, Maputo  
Arrival Martin Fisher (MFI- Shelter Coordinator)
- 25 February-** Arrival Anna-Maria Selleri (AMS- Shelter Technical Advisor)  
Howard Arfin (HAR- Shelter Information Manager)  
Dita Anngraeni (DAN- Shelter Mapping Advisor)  
Head of Shelter Department, Graham Saunders, departs for Harare
- 26 February-** MJO, AMS travel to Caia  
Planned overflight of cyclone affected area cancelled due to weather
- 27 February-** Head of Shelter suggests (email) two options for future of Shelter Cluster in Mozambique to HoRD Harare and FACT Team Leader- either SCCT continues to lead, or IFRC/CVM inform UN RC that we wish to pass role to another agency  
HAR and DAN travel to Caia via Beira  
Second Shelter meeting convened in Caia
- 28 February-** MJO returns to Maputo
- 01 March-** MJO departs for Geneva

AMS participates to CVM Planning Meeting in Beira  
Arrival of new FACT Team Leader (Farid Aiywar/IFRC  
Harare)  
**03 March** HAR and DAN return to Maputo  
**06 March-** IFRC formally announced transfer of SWG leadership to UN-  
HABITAT  
**13 March-** HABITAT assumed leadership of SWG  
IFRC SCCT departed Mozambique  
**02-14 April** Review of MSWG

Some notes from this chronology:

- o There were further efforts and discussions preceding the decision- and deployment- of the SCCT, notably the *ad hoc* deployment of Halvor Lauritzen (co-author of the [Humanitarian Response Review](#)) as Deputy FACT team leader, who apparently was engaged in informal discussions around the adoption of the Clusters system for Mozambique.
- o Shelter Coordination Team deployment in Mozambique was for a **total of 26 days**, with a **dedicated coordinator and support team for 17 days**;
- o 12 days after deployment, the decision to have deployed the SCCT was still (in theory) under discussion;
- o There was a renewed effort to bring the SCCT closer to the RC/RC in Mozambique with the arrival and handover to the incoming FACT Team leader (10 days before departure of SCCT);
- o It is difficult to date the decision of the SWG to handover to UN-HABITAT- there was the formal announcement on 06 March, but when was the decision to depart by 13 March actually taken?;
- o Participation to the SWG meetings never exceeded 8 participants,<sup>4</sup> and on only three occasions there was a sole representative from the government (public works);
- o No comprehensive field assessment was undertaken by the SCCT, the Coordinator made no field visits to affected provinces due to time and security constraints; and,
- o There was no equivalent Shelter Cluster at the level of affected provinces, where shelter was ultimately coordinated by government structures.

### **III Findings**

The reviewer took a certain liberty in re-structuring the objectives, scope and key issues defined by the [TOR](#). This re-structuring was undertaken to find a means to *measure* the success of the SWG in Mozambique. Given the absence of clear benchmarks or outcomes against which to measure the MSWG's success, the requirements of the TOR were re-grouped as a *series of hypotheses*. Each of these hypothetical statements frames the 'expected' outcomes of the SWG. The outcomes themselves are an interpretation what the SWG should achieve, derived from the Terms of Reference (generic) that exist for the positions of Coordinator, Information Manager and Technical Advisor, and the (draft) Shelter Manual. The expectations

---

<sup>4</sup> The shelter response was largely made by 5 agencies, not all of whom were present in Maputo.

also reflect the findings of the online survey, and from interviews with key stakeholders.

As such, the findings of the review process can be seen as a means of supporting or refuting what might have been expected from the MSWG, and lead to potential recommendations that would allow the IFRC in future to meet these expectations.

## **Challenging Critical Hypotheses**

### **1. The SWG was appropriately equipped and funded.**

The SWG for Mozambique was conceived of as a 'stand-alone' structure, independent at least in spirit from the rest of the Movement. For the Maputo-based Shelter Working Group coordination, the SCCT was appropriately equipped.

The SCCT was physically ill equipped to undertake field assessment missions (field gear, admin, translators, etc.) without the complete support of the FACT/CVM- support which it did not receive. The cash advance with which the SCCT deployed was insufficient, and members were relying on cash advances taken from personal credit cards to finance the final week of the team's presence in Maputo. Though this administrative issue might appear insignificant, it was nonetheless used to excuse the limited field presence of the SCCT, and even as an underlying cause for the precipitated departure of the SCCT.

Funding was not seen or considered as a constraint for the MSWG in the course of the review. Given that the field deployment of a SCCT is funded as part of the Global Programme Shelter Appeal it has to be assumed that funding of the SCCT is a factor involved in the decision to accept/refuse a SWG deployment for Cluster activation.

#### *Recommendations:*

- o Consider organizing financial/administrative support via the FACT Team, or deploy with a larger cash advance.
- o Find a way to take advantage of FACT/PNS/Delegation/Regional Delegation resources, particularly to have shelter technical advisors integrated or supporting RC/RC assessment teams in the field.
- o Creating deployment kits for SCCTs might be a solution to the question of ensuring equipped SCCTs, but risks duplicating the myriad of other kits that already exist in the RC/RC system; consultants could be contractually obliged to ensure appropriately equipped deployment (laptop, GSM phone, GPS, necessary field equipment, etc.)

### **2. The support and staffing of the SWG by the Secretariat was timely, relevant, appropriate and effective.**

The support provided to the SWG by the Secretariat was timely. Of the total 7 personnel deployed over the 26 days SWG lifespan, 4 were permanent Secretariat staff. Initial support was immediately deployed, though the bulk of the team- and the shelter coordinator- arrived only after 9 days, for total 17 days of mission. The

obligation to assemble a 'pick-up team' for such responses is an unavoidable one, as the IFRC cannot be expected to maintain a standby team. That said, there is no reason that deployments- and end of missions- cannot be staggered, according to the situation. While the deployment of the Inter-Agency Coordinator was a means of ensuring senior IFRC representation for the early days of the Cluster rollout, an experienced Shelter Coordinator would have been the preferred deployment. Shelter Coordination Team members in general had varying levels of IFRC or RC/RC levels of experience and training, which was seen as a weakness by some RC/RC personnel.

Effectiveness is dependent upon the intended outcome. The decision to have deployed did not seem to have taken into account the available IFRC shelter department human resources (limited), did not take strongly enough into account the shelter expectations of the Region and the CVM (modest, technical support), and the deployment was for too short a time period to be truly effective, nor leave a sustainable residue (e.g. having built capacity with CVM, a Movement well-equipped to contribute in shelter, clusters, etc.). The overall relevance of the Cluster approach to Mozambique was somewhat doubtful, and poorly attended overall- this is beyond the purview of IFRC and it was impossible to have an impact on these broader constraints.

*Recommendations:*

- o The immediate deployment should include a coordinator with the requisite 'P5 level/10 years experience' (defined in the Shelter Manual) who can assess the needs and propose an operational and advocacy plan for the potential IFRC SWG.
- o Maintaining a Shelter Coordinator on retainer- or ensuring that the Shelter Department has permanent staff that fit this P5 profile- would facilitate emergency deployments.
- o Ensure that all SCCT members have completed at least the BTC and preferably the FACT course to promote understanding, credibility and compatibility.
- o Leading an operational cluster and advocating for improvements in the Cluster approach at the IASC level are distinct activities that should be handled by separate groups in the Secretariat.
- o While speed is a necessary quality for the SCCT deployment, more time should be taken to assess the real needs for Clusters in general, the Shelter Cluster in particular and the specific concerns of the regional delegation and national society.

**3. The Shelter Coordination role was understood and supported in Mozambique, the regional delegation and by the Secretariat.**

The Secretariat was quick to respond to the request for Shelter Coordination support by CVM/FACT of 14 February, with staff arriving Maputo by 15 February. The deployment of the Inter-Agency Coordinator was a good support to positioning of the Movement in the broader Cluster rollout process, though it was little recognized by the RC/RC stakeholders. While the Shelter Department commitment to the Cluster process was well understood in the Secretariat, there was little emphasis on the broader priorities of the Department.



In the regional delegation and at the field level in Mozambique, the Shelter Coordination role and the implication of the Cluster rollout was initially not understood, and consequently weakly supported. This is not a surprising outcome: Secretariat staff lacked any synthetic or 'at a glance' IFRC-produced material to explain Clusters, Humanitarian Reform, the Shelter Department, nor the IFRC Role in Shelter Cluster Coordination.<sup>5</sup> Attempting to enter into detailed and theoretic discussions on such vast subjects, while field staffs respond to an emergency, is unlikely to succeed. The underlying problem was best summarized with the observation of a SCCT member: '*I say Shelter and they hear Cluster*'- shelter staff are already tasked with having to introduce the RC/RC Movement to a more holistic and technical approach to Shelter, without also having to evangelize on the merits and defaults of the Cluster approach.

In the Mozambique example, the field had certain, very modest expectations of technical and coordination support, with capacity building for the CVM and added value for the FACT team. The robust SCCT, with its consequent focus on the UN-led Cluster system did not necessarily meet these local expectations. This dissatisfaction was compounded by the limited engagement by the CVM/FACT with the UN coordination system. The SCCT and its proximity to the UN system was ultimately seen as a resource that discharged RC/RC respondents from having to participate to other Cluster meetings in the early weeks of the emergency. That said, there were glimpses of RC/RC stakeholders engagement with the Cluster system, beyond the SCCT- the Swiss Logistics ERU found itself participating to the WFP lead logistics cluster.

The lingering misunderstanding around shelter and clusters in Mozambique have had a run-on effect: following the example of the IFRC/CVM Shelter Cluster lead in Mozambique, other PNS in the Southern Africa region proceeded to negotiate their own Shelter Cluster lead in agreements with their national UNCT.

**Recommendations:**

- o Produce Q&A-style documents on Clusters, Humanitarian Reform, the IFRC Role in Emergency Shelter Coordination, and an Introduction to Emergency Shelter.
- o Produce concise, standard PowerPoint presentations on above subjects with clear and complete speaking notes and tailored recommendations for FACT Teams, PNS, ONS and Regional delegations.
- o Consider discharging the Shelter Department of their *de facto* role of introducing, and defending the IFRC commitment to lead the Shelter Cluster.

---

<sup>5</sup> The reference documents being used by the Shelter Department in the field are typically IFRC- UN, Memorandum of Understanding Between IFRC and UN OCHA In Regards to the IFRC Assuming a Leading Role in Emergency Shelter in Natural Disasters, 2005 and the Terms of Reference for the Emergency Shelter Coordinator, Information Manager and Shelter Technical Advisor.

- o Continue efforts to staff a regional shelter delegate position based for the Harare Regional Delegation. This post could represent a new model for the Cluster rollout in the Southern Africa Region in future.
- o More investment is necessary to clarify Movement priorities and capacities to coordinate with UN-led systems.

#### **4. The structure and composition of the SWG was appropriate to the context.**

There seemed to be a very 'monolithic' or 'one size fits all' approach to the IFRC deployment of the SCCT, which did not necessarily correspond to the needs on the ground. The deployment of a full team, based in the capital, seemed very much based on the experience of previous deployments in Pakistan and Yogyakarta.

The structure was only partially adapted to the context. At the level of the capital, the SCCT had a robust capacity to engage shelter stakeholders other clusters and government authorities; at the SWG level, the core audience could often be counted on one hand. At the field level, where other clusters had a presence, or supported their cooperating partners in the role of cluster lead, the SCCT/SWG was not present. As such, the SWG lacked a certain 'ground-truthing' of its coordination efforts taking place in Maputo, and its efforts in IM and technical advice were somewhat frustrated.

The team composition seemed roughly appropriate to the needs on the ground. The lightest footprint would have been the deployment of a coordinator and technical advisor. It is not entirely clear what criteria the Shelter Department employs to decide upon more or less investment. For example, given the extremely limited number of actors in emergency shelter, and the dearth of data on who-what-where, it is doubtful whether the IM capacity truly added value to the SWG. The same could be said of the mapping resource, though CVM appreciated the capacity building (unexpected outcome) that this brought them. Given that no other actor stood up to take the place of the SCCT resources upon their departure, this might question whether the team should have left so abruptly.

The Mozambique example does pose questions about a monolithic approach to the SWG- monolithic in its having been deployed and withdrawn as a group. Alternative options were possible- namely of leaving at least the technical advisor and or IM capacity staying behind to support the SWG after its handover to UN-HABITAT. A number of other combinations might have been possible, but there doesn't appear to have been consultation with shelter stakeholders or RC/RC bodies on what IFRC could have continued to support even after they handed over the Shelter Cluster lead to HABITAT. An underlying issue appears to be that there is little consideration of a shelter team without a coordinator, a possibly erroneous conception.

#### *Recommendations:*

- o Remain open to 'non-linear deployment models'- less concern on deploying a 'one-size-fits-all' SCCT structure, and more

flexibility to stagger/adapt deployments in relation to the needs on the ground, and even in situations where IFRC might not be the lead of the Shelter Cluster.

- o Determine the balance between the ambitious and competing priorities of the Shelter Department: Shelter Coordination, developing capacity of the RC/RC Movement, technical and IM support to the RC/RC and Shelter Stakeholders. By defining the desired capacities, a mapping of available resources and deficiencies can be defined, and solutions and training proposed.
- o Develop clear criteria ('checklist') to determine what capacities are relevant to which situation.
- o Consider testing a deployment model with a 2-coordinator setup to ensure a SWG at capital and field levels.

**5. The SWG was made stronger by the perception and reality of neutrality and independence it achieved *vis-à-vis* the rest of the RC/RC Movement in Mozambique.**

The theory goes that the SCCT needs to maintain operational and financial independence from the RC/RC Movement, in order to nurture confidence amongst the SWG stakeholders that it acts as a neutral and independent lead for the Cluster.<sup>6</sup> Some complaints were leveled against an earlier SWG, where the Shelter Cluster meetings were seen as being dominated by the Cluster lead agency. The IFRC has developed its own terms to reinforce its distinction from the UN-led Clusters. They have adopted the term 'Shelter Working Group' used as the equivalent of- and interchangeably with- 'Shelter Cluster' as part of the preferred vocabulary employed by the IFRC. In addition, the IFRC speaks of 'convening' and not 'coordinating' their Cluster/Working Group. The added value of this linguistic subterfuge is dubious at best, as it only seemed to add to the confusion and misunderstanding of the IFRC role by UN, RC/RC Movement and Cluster stakeholders.

In the case of Mozambique, the SWG was not made stronger by the perception and reality of neutrality and independence it achieved *vis-à-vis* the rest of the RC/RC Movement present in Mozambique. Despite the efforts to 'firewall' the SCCT, the Shelter Working Group was clearly associated with the IFRC and the RC/RC Movement. Stakeholders in the SWG were not clear on the distinctions of 'working group' vs. 'cluster', nor 'convener' vs. 'coordinator'. It was difficult for the RC/RC community to communicate this self-imposed distinction to the outside world. The imposed autonomy and separate reporting/responsibility structure in turn created much of the misunderstanding and conflict with the Movement partners in

---

<sup>6</sup> A further complication: this notion of 'neutrality and independence towards Cluster members' is a confusing interpretation of the Fundamental Principles of Neutrality, Independence for the RC/RC Movement. Much of the early criticism of the IFRC having taken on the Shelter Coordination role was the argument that the IFRC's independence and neutrality (real and perceived) is potentially put at risk through participation to the Cluster Approach, and the closer relation with States and the UN system it implies. These two understandings of the neutrality and independence complicate Movement discussion on Clusters.

Mozambique- where did 'cluster' end and 'shelter' begin?- Or is there a distinction? In light of its extra-Movement functioning, when the SCCT deployed to the field, outside of the Movement's security plan, traveling in rented private vehicles marked with magnetic IFRC emblems, it became increasingly difficult to justify the distinction both inside and outside of the Movement.

The relevance of the 'fire walled' approach should be questioned, particularly given the experience of other clusters. For example, no one refutes or challenges that WFP leads the Logistics Cluster, nor puts into question their neutrality towards stakeholders of their Cluster. On the contrary, WFP is able to play to the strengths of its partnerships, financing its partners to implement field-level clusters, in the event that it lacks the coordination and human resources capacity. In addition, it is expected that WFP will complete the CERF application, from which it will directly benefit, and which will be used to support cooperating partners.

While the IFRC doesn't intend to work in an implementing partner model of the UN, the IFRC Shelter Cluster Coordination Team certainly loses out on the strength of the in-country RC/RC presence, and the eyes and ears of the field-based CVM country-wide. There was some bad blood with agencies that depend on the CERF application for their financing; they could not understand why the IFRC was so insistent upon leading its production when it wouldn't ultimately benefit from the financing.<sup>7</sup>

*Recommendations:*

- o Shelter Department needs to re-visit the language and *de facto* policies that have developed around the SWG concept: re-visit the fire walled model of the SWG from the rest of the Movement, which risks becoming more dogmatic than pragmatic.
- o Reference to Neutrality and Independence should be framed within the definitions found in the Fundamental Principles, and not an esoteric intra-Cluster sense, for sake of clarity.
- o Reconsider whether IFRC must/should be the author and coordinator of the CERF application for Shelter: other UN Agencies/IOM are better adapted to this role, and in any case will be the administrative requesters and recipients of such funding.
- o From a security point of view, the SCCT cannot operate outside of the established RC/RC Movement leadership in country.

**6. The Shelter Working Group had a positive impact on the CVM, IFRC and other Movement members in Mozambique.**

Seen from *outside* of the RC/RC Movement, the UN/Cluster Leads largely saw the IFRC contribution to the SWG positively. Thus, externally, we could state that the SWG had a positive impact on the Movement as a whole. For the Mozambique Government, the SWG was perceived as irrelevant as the Cluster system in general.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> In an ironic twist, the CERF financing, received after month's delay by IOM, who in turn provided financing to the CVM for shelter projects.

<sup>8</sup> It was unclear how the Cluster system took account of the existing- and robust- Mozambique government coordination and response capacities. The

From the perspective of RC/RC respondents, there were only a few instances of perceived added value of the SWG. It was not entirely clear to the CVM that the Cluster system added value to the existing INGC structures, to which they had strong links. The SCCT was seen as a specialized team, little integrated into the efforts of the various RC/RC entities in Mozambique, lacking contextual, cultural and linguistic skills and working with a separate hierarchic link to the Secretariat in Geneva. As time passed, RC/RC members caught increasingly frequent glimpses of the SCCT added value: useful technical advice was integrated into Plans of Action, and an efforts were made by the SCCT to build mapping capacity within the CVM.

This perception of the SWG as being too far-removed from the RC/RC Movement was one that was repeated. That said, criticism of the SCCT was also commentary on the critics themselves. Faced with the unknown of the Cluster system, it was convenient for the Movement to limit the integration and support for the Shelter Cluster Coordination Team, using the debate around the direct reporting line to Geneva as the underlying cause.<sup>9</sup> The eventual 'least contentious' solution chosen had the SCCT focusing on the UN system, and discharging the Movement of its obligation to be more active in coordination with extra-Movement actors. Having relied on the SCCT to deal with the UN system left the remaining Movement members unclear on how to engage with the Cluster system, and with a gap in shelter competency to undertake programs defined in the plan of action. To sum up: responsibility for any weaknesses must be shared. Greater 'integration' (in whatever form that might have taken) of the SWG into the Movement effort in Mozambique would have implied a greater contribution, Movement-wide, to the Cluster system as whole. It was doubtful that this was a priority.

*Recommendations:*

- o In order to satisfy the needs and expectations of Movement members nationally and regionally, there needs to be a field-level negotiation of the TOR and roles and responsibilities at the outset, and also clear indicators of success, handover and timing. The creation of a clear, written operational plan (for example a *Shelter Appeal*) would be a valuable tool to keep all stakeholders informed about the priorities, expected outcomes, resources and timelines of the IFRC Shelter support.
- o Consider new models for how the SCCT could hierarchically and functionally be integrated into RC/RC presence in country, allowing it to benefit from the Movement's resources, assessments and support, and in supporting the Movement's understanding of a changing UN landscape.

---

Clusters were perceived as annexes to the Government's structures, the sectors were not compatible, and often the Government and Cluster leads would hold meetings separately, but simultaneously. In the time constraints of the Review, it was not possible to research further how this was perceived in other clusters. Survey respondents disagreed that the Cluster Approach took into account existing capacities in Mozambique.

<sup>9</sup> This risk over-simplifying the problem, as personality issues also played an important role.

**7. There was a clear exit and handover strategy, discussed and clarified from the arrival of the SCCT with their early recovery partner, UN-HABITAT. Special emphasis was made by the IFRC on the transition from meeting emergency shelter needs to permanent housing and resettlement.**

The relatively short IFRC commitment to lead the Shelter Cluster was seemingly understood by UN-HABITAT. The *Handover Note on the Transfer of Responsibilities* (March 2007) put forth the following rationale for the SCCT departure: *'...with the focus in Mozambique now moving on from the provision of "survival" or "rapid response" inputs to more longer term solutions, responsibility for leading the shelter partners also changes.'* While this was partly the case, the more important criteria for handover appeared to be IFRC human resource constraints. It is difficult to suggest that the IFRC accompanied the transition in any concrete way. The real problems of land-tenure issues, resettlement, reconstruction, better building practice, risk reduction, etc. were issues for the coming months, and as such not dealt with by the IFRC.

The decision to withdraw the SCCT knowingly left needs amongst shelter stakeholders, notably RC/RC. There seemed to have been no discussion about alternative means of withdrawal by the SCCT. Alternatives might have included handing over the Coordination, but continued support in mapping or IM; maintaining in-country the Technical Advisor, even if only to benefit RC/RC partners; focusing on capacity building with the CVM to ensure they can better respond to Cluster and shelter challenges in future.

Cluster stakeholders admitted to having been informed of the SCCT handover and departure, but their opinions and feedback were never actively sought on the question. The 26-day contribution (17 with a Coordinator and full team) was perceived as too short. Those shelter agencies that remained had either ended their programs (MSF) or were simply doing what they could to move on. The Googlegroup is an interesting glimpse of the IFRC contribution and handover: *'That website thing was a really great idea, it's just a shame that no one has a clue how to use it.'*<sup>10</sup>

To balance out the findings for this hypothesis, the challenge in Mozambique was the capacity and resources of the early recovery partner to make a robust contribution to their leadership of the SWG. While UN-HABITAT was well-equipped to engage in a mid-term commitment to resettlement, and offer advice on technical shelter issues, they were facing difficulties mobilizing human or financial resources to undertake the SWG coordination commitment.

*Recommendations:*

- o Consider more flexible models for the handover, particularly changing the perception of the handover as the end of the IFRC Shelter commitment to the SWG.

---

<sup>10</sup> As proof positive, the Googlegroup has fallen into all but disuse since the IFRC handover.

- o Further debriefings, reviews and evaluations should inform if there should be a minimum deployment period as a criterion for deployment.
- o While the IFRC-OCHA MoU gives the Federation the right to decide on criteria for deployment/withdrawal, more emphasis needs to be made on capacity building and transition to the early recovery partner in future SCCT deployments.
- o The Googlegroup (a beta service) has the functionality that is appreciated by users, but doesn't seem to be simple and reliable enough for professional use.

#### **8. The SCCT ensured effective and professional links with other Clusters, the UN system and the Mozambique Government.**

The management of the SWG was complemented by its users who found the structured meetings and succinct minutes that followed as being very professional. The contribution and participation to Cluster Leads meetings was seen as constructive, timely and consistent. There was in general relatively little Cross-cluster debate in Mozambique.

The contribution and participation to INGC meetings, either daily briefings or the working group on Accommodation, Livelihoods and Infrastructure, was inconsistent by the SCCT. This was largely due to language barriers and the lack of a SCCT translator, and also varying perceptions of the meetings' relevance. There was inconsistent participation by government representatives to the SWG, likely linked to the perception by the government that the Clusters were an irrelevant annex to their coordination structure.

#### *Recommendations:*

- o Either deploy staff with relevant language skills, or ensure that the SCCT equips itself with the necessary capacity.
- o The relevance of the Cluster approach to the existing capacities in-country should form part of the IFRC assessment and decision on whether to deploy a SCCT at all.

#### **9. The IFRC, as an IASC member, actively participated to the Cluster Activation process (according to the OCHA Guidance Note), in which the contextual and historic experiences of the CVM were integrated into the adapted cluster rollout, which complemented the in-country capacities in an adapted and appropriate manner.**

It is difficult to confirm this hypothesis. The Cluster approach was something that Mozambique stakeholders had vaguely heard of, but never considered its implementation or relevance before the floods. The first discussion for the Cluster rollout was an *ad hoc* meeting called by the UN RC on 12 February, where an OCHA support from Geneva provided a fairly mechanical Powerpoint presentation on 'what are clusters'. From there he immediately proceeded to attempt to tag agencies to lead the given clusters, including demanding that the Red Cross take responsibility for the 'Shelter and Protection

Cluster'.<sup>11</sup> The FACT Team leader and CVM asked for some time to reflect and seek guidance from the IFRC in Geneva. Seemingly the discussions continued amongst UN agencies, and also at the Geneva-level; the next concrete discussions in Maputo would have taken 13/14 February, where the Movement still did not have a concrete response. The note sent by OCHA New York on 15 February, nominating IFRC and CVM as the lead for Shelter, was in fact never seen by the CVM. The decision to deploy the SCCT was taken during a 14 February teleconference between CVM/FACT and Secretariat, while the Head of the Shelter Department was traveling.

Thus, as an IASC member, the IFRC participated in the rollout, but had limited influence on the decision itself. In terms of the OCHA Guidance Note (and the spirit of Humanitarian Reform), there seems to be no adaptation of the Clusters to the existing capacities of government and agencies. Clusters were rolled out as a one-size-fits-all product. Not only did the Clusters not complement in-country capacities, but given their inflexibility, they proved somewhat counter-productive and in competition with government coordination that was seen as functioning relatively well. While the Movement was aware and sensitive to the contextual and historic experiences of the CVM, it could not be said that this was able to inform the Cluster activation process in any concrete way.

In the form of broader commentary, it seems inevitable that the UN system will deploy the Cluster approach for the majority of future crises, whatever the scale or relevance. To their credit in Mozambique, rather than consider at what point to shut down the clusters, they had by mid-March already drafted a plan to make the Clusters a permanent preparedness structure of the UN country team.

*Recommendations:*

- o The Secretariat needs to lead on educating National Societies on Humanitarian Reform, Clusters and the IFRC commitment in convening the Emergency Shelter Cluster as a priority preparedness activity (see recommendations for 3.)
- o Consider defining minimum conditions for Cluster activation and SCCT deployments (checklist).
- o Regional delegations need to undertake a pro-active discussion with PNS, Governments and Resident Coordinators on how- if?- eventual Cluster rollouts would be undertaken.
- o Advocacy on the broader strategic issues of Cluster deployment need to be informed by the field experiences, but conducted by the Inter-Agency Cooperation Department. The IFRC needs to decide how critical of the Cluster process and approach it intends to be; focused research might be necessary if a stronger position is intended.

---

<sup>11</sup> The OCHA staffer called later to apologize for the confusion created and clarified the IFRC-led Cluster as being the Shelter Cluster.



## IV Survey Results

An [online survey](#) was created to take a snapshot of how the IFRC's role in convening the SWG was perceived and appreciated. The raw output is captured in [Annex 5](#).

This section can be seen as a complement to section III, trying to put some statistics to the achievements of the Shelter Working Group, as measured by its users. The results provide only a partial glimpse of the SWG's achievement, as there were only 9 respondents. That said, the number is a decent indicator of overall participation to the SWG, even if the 5 respondents from the Movement is disproportionate.

**Demographics:** In terms of how respondents interacted with the SWG, 4 were members of the SWG, 1 from a shelter meeting in Caia, 2 from Cluster Leads Meetings, 2 were subscribers to the Googlegroup and 3 were SCCT members. All respondents considered participation to the SWG as a priority of their organization.

**Stakeholder expectations of the Shelter Cluster:** functions of the SWG were ranked in importance as follows (most to least): IM, Coordination/Application of Standards, Technical Advice, Technical Standards, Cross-cluster issues, Advocacy/Strategy/Identify partners and Capacity building.

*Comments:* Interesting that Information management was identified as the first priority; equally interesting that advocacy and resource mobilization/strategy development scored so low as potential priorities. The last-place ranking of capacity building stands in contrast to much of the RC/RC commentary from interviews.

**Stakeholder rating of SWG performance:** performance by function are ranked in descending order of satisfaction: IM, Coordination/Technical Advice, Identifying partners, Standards/Cross-cluster issues, Advocacy, Technical standards, Capacity building/Strategy development.

*Comments:* Performance overall was rated roughly one grade below expectations. The top 3 functions were roughly consistent between expectations and satisfaction. The harshest critics were RC/RC respondents.<sup>12</sup>

**Overall satisfaction:** respondents were divided on the question. Out of 7 responses, 3 were satisfied with the IFRC contribution, 3 were neutral and only 1 dissatisfied.

**Perceptions of the RC/RC Movement:** do stakeholders understand the intended distinction between the Movement at large and the SCCT/SWG? 1 respondent replied that the distinctions were clear (RC

---

<sup>12</sup> As a reference, the ranking by RC respondents was the following: Coordination/Technical advice, IM, Identifying partners, Cross-cluster issues, Advocacy, Standards, Strategy, Capacity building.

respondent). 62.5% observed some overlap between Movement bodies, or were simply unclear about the intended distinction (this included 3 RC respondents). 25% considered it unimportant. 8 of 9 felt that the IFRC participation to the Cluster approach did not compromise the independence and neutrality of the RC/RC Movement.

**Distinction between emergency and return/resettlement focus:**

stakeholders were roughly in agreement with the statement that a clear distinction between emergency and resettlement should be respected. 62% agreed, 37.5% disagreed/neutral (25% of this latter figure were Movement respondents).

**Cluster activation:** 50% considered the activation to be transparent and logical; 37.5% felt that the Cluster activation took into account existing in-country capacity. Ultimately, 62.5% felt their interests were represented by the Cluster approach in Mozambique.

**An overall 'snapshot' of the Mozambique SWG:**

*The Shelter Cluster in Mozambique is seen to be priority forum for its stakeholders. Stakeholders were reserved in their satisfaction with the SWG: their expectations were certainly higher than their levels of satisfaction. In both performance and expectations, the SWG is valued for its contribution to IM, Coordination, and Technical Advice/Standards. It is not seen as a venue for Advocacy and Resource Mobilization or for Strategy Development. Most agreed that the distinction between emergency shelter and resettlement/reconstruction is a useful one.*

*The neutrality and independence of the Movement is not jeopardized by the IFRC contribution to the UN-led Cluster approach; despite efforts to the contrary, stakeholders have great difficulty distinguishing amongst RC/RC bodies, to the point of confusion.*

*In terms of the Cluster Activation Process, opinions are divided. Half of respondents considered the process to be transparent and logical, and fewer believed that the Cluster activation took into account existing, in-country capacities. A slim majority felt their interests were well represented by the Cluster approach.*

## **V Conclusions and Recommendations**

The conclusions of this review attempt to take a step back from the findings and survey results, and make more global comments on the Mozambique Floods experience that can inform the development of the Shelter Department and its policies. The recommendations found in section III provide more detailed recommendations in response to the TOR's objectives. The following provide some broad strokes commentary on core issues of the review.

**Did the IFRC-convened Shelter Working Group contribute to the effective provision of emergency shelter?**

Overall, the IFRC SWG globally contributed to effective shelter provision, but the degree of this contribution is debateable. From the figures that the IFRC SCCT managed to collate by the time of its departure, it was estimated that there was a level of 66.95% coverage of emergency shelter needs for the flood affected population, and a coverage rate (actual and planned) of around 48.89% for the cyclone affected population. A considerable number of families in the urban areas and surroundings had rebuilt or repaired their own houses with materials available. These results are certainly respectable, given the scale of the emergency. *Can this success be directly attributable to the contribution of the IFRC SCCT?*

To some extent, yes. The IFRC contributed to shaping the coordination, information sharing and management and ensuring the links to other Clusters. It provided some technical advice and contributed to issues of technical standards. The SWG kept focus on the emergency shelter needs, while the early recovery partner prepared for the transition. External constraints limited the effectiveness of Shelter Coordination- lack of quality data, few actors, shelter stakeholders not represented in the capital, doubtful relevance of the Cluster approach compared to the Governments existing structures, etc.

That said the successes in shelter would likely have occurred without the IFRC contribution. It is unlikely that more external actors intervened as a result of the Shelter Cluster. The government was in fact leading the field-level shelter response. Shelter stakeholders' participation to the Cluster was most likely linked to their organization's priorities. Participants did not see SWG as a strategic forum, nor as a means of enhancing advocacy and mobilization efforts. Given that the relief operation was launched before the Cluster rollout, and the contribution of the SCCT was for 17 days, it seems unfair to associate coverage levels with the SWG. The weak links with government coordination ran counter to the intent of the Cluster's *raison d'être*. Given the limited amount of participants to the SWG (less than 5 key organizations), that the Government maintained its own robust and tested structure for managing the disaster, then the degree to which the IFRC influenced this success is somewhat debateable.

**'What did we need Clusters for?'- IFRC advocacy on the Shelter Cluster**

*Who polices compliance with the Guidance Note on Using the Cluster Approach to Strengthen Humanitarian Assistance? Should the IFRC assess the relevance of the Cluster rollout on a case-by-case basis? Is the Shelter Department ultimately responsible for the success of the broader Cluster rollout?*

The rationale to deploy the Cluster system in Mozambique was not subject to a critical debate, and the employment of the Cluster activation process was opaque, with the guidelines largely ignored. The Mozambique government was seemingly little consulted and their existing coordination system rendered the Cluster approach as somewhat incongruous and incompatible counter-part, which didn't

adapt to the national system. At its worst, Clusters would hold their meetings at the same time as the INGC held their working group meetings, and Clusters were not adapted to align with the Government's existing working group compositions. Stakeholders in the Shelter Working Group appreciated the efforts made by IFRC to 'deliver some good' in light of these larger issues, and appreciated the basic services of formal meetings, minutes of meeting and a shelter counterpart that could be reached for discussion.

While the IFRC, as an IASC member, participated in the rollout of the Clusters, it had limited influence on the rollout decision itself. The decision to deploy seemed to precipitate a necessary assessment of the relevance of Clusters in Mozambique, the contribution the IFRC could make, and the integration of the experience and perspectives of the regional delegation and the CVM. The IFRC simply did its best to ensure a speedy rollout to meet their obligation to lead the Shelter Cluster.

There is a genuine concern of 'guilt by association' for the IFRC contribution to Clusters. While the Secretariat and Shelter Department are not responsible for the success of the broader Cluster rollout, it is impossible to dissociate the IFRC from the perceived successes and failures of the process. While speed has been identified as a key factor in SCCT deployments, the IFRC should put more emphasis on assessing the needs and developing a clear plan, with outcomes for the Shelter Working Group it deploys. In the Mozambique case study it was unclear if the decision to deploy a SCCT took into account the human resource constraints the Shelter Department faced.

In the form of broader commentary, it seems inevitable that the UN system will deploy the Cluster approach for the majority of future crises, whatever the scale or relevance of the deployment. To their credit in Mozambique, rather than consider at what point to shut down the clusters, they had by mid-March already drafted a plan to make the Clusters a permanent preparedness and response structure of the UN country team. Will the Movement be obliged to participate to this permanent process? Will this become a permanent feature? Will participation to this forum be the roll of national societies or the IFRC regional delegations?

**'I say Shelter, and they hear Cluster'- views of the SWG from within the RC/RC Movement**

*Has the Movement embraced the IFRC commitment to Clusters and the Global Programme Shelter? What needs to be done to improve understanding and integration?*

This quote was used by a member of the SCCT, and captures well the confusion in the Movement as concerns the IFRC commitment to lead the Shelter Cluster and the Global Programme Shelter. The priorities of the Shelter Department are vast, and many prefer the shorthand of limiting understanding to simply 'Clusters'. RC/RC respondents seem to consider understanding the UN Humanitarian Reform process and the IFRC commitment to the Shelter Cluster as being something of a secondary priority. Trying to introduce these

issues to a Movement engaged with an emergency response, with few foundations for understanding the Humanitarian Reforms having been laid, is simply a challenge. The result that found the SCCT working in relative isolation from the rest of the Movement present in Mozambique is thus not entirely surprising.

The Shelter Cluster Coordination Team (SCCT) by default has to be better equipped to introduce and explain the Cluster concept in an expedient way; at another level, the Secretariat needs to more effectively communicate what it already knows about the evolution of these issues to the Movement in a broader way. The Movement should be credited with having been a quick study, with CVM, Regional Delegation and FACT having ultimately understood the added value of the Shelter Department, and thinking towards future deployments.

Bringing 'Shelter' and 'Cluster' together will likely result from bringing the SCCT closer to the FACT, ONS and IFRC structures in the field. Closer ties will allow better mutual understanding, allowing the Movement to benefit from the SCCT's links to the UN system, and for the SCCT to benefit from the Movement resources, networks and assessments in-country. There should be caution in trying to 'have it both ways'- insisting on a SCCT that is functionally and hierarchically independent from the ONS, FACT and national or regional IFRC structure, while benefiting from the resources of the Movement as a whole. If RC/RC partners in an emergency response are more tightly integrated, this will demand a deeper investment by all partners- it is not simply a matter of the SCCT taking better advantage of RC/RC resources in the field.. The FACT Team Leader, for example will have to further engage with- and profit from- the 'window' of access and understanding of the UN world that the Shelter Coordinator can offer. The Shelter Coordinator will also have to 'pull' RC/RC representatives to participate in ALL of the appropriate clusters. The Shelter Coordinator and their team are not a convenient means to 'outsource' participation to the UN system; it should be seen as a means to *improve* the IFRC and RC/RC Movement engagement with UN-led coordination systems.

The external IFRC advocacy on the Cluster issue needs to be dissociated from the Shelter Department. The Inter-agency Cooperation Department might perhaps be better placed to make interventions on the successes and failings of the Cluster process at the IASC level, from the perspective of IFRC. If the Cluster experience is not meeting the expectations and standards of the IFRC, more research, advocacy and policy work should be considered, using the *inputs from the Shelter Department* as its basis. This dissociation might help the Movement hear Shelter Cluster, and not only Shelter or Cluster.

This review was disproportionately focused on the interaction between the RC/RC Movement and the SCCT. This was inevitable, as personality issues clouded the early stages of the deployment, and it took time to refine a more productive relationship. Given the extremely short period of deployment, the SCCT departure seemed precipitous and in the succeeding weeks the various RC/RC participants had come to digest the Shelter Cluster experience.

Finally, there has to be some caution in how the Mozambique case study is used. On the one hand, it would be all too easy to discard the experience as being a poor example of the Cluster rollout, an emergency of a scale that did not merit Clusters, or an example that doesn't fit with the coordination capacity that the Shelter department is constructing. On the other hand, the Mozambique example cannot be seen as the exception compared to the 'Perfect Storms' of the South Asia earthquake, and the Yogyakarta. In all likelihood, the UN will rollout the Cluster approach with increasing frequency, and for small-scale emergencies where the relevance of Clusters is less clear. The risk is that Mozambique is an indication of how 85% of Cluster rollouts will look like in future, and that Pakistan and Yogyakarta represent the exception. How can/do the existing thinking and experiences of the Shelter department adapt to Mozambique-like examples with a handful of international participants and relatively little government, donor- and media-interest?

**The mechanics of the SWG- developing 'triggers' and criteria for deployment**

*When does the IFRC decide to deploy a Shelter Coordination Team? What are the basic criteria for such deployments? At what point should this responsibility be handed over to UN-HABITAT? Under what conditions would IFRC refuse to deploy a SCCT? What kind of models and structures should be considered?*

The *ad hoc* nature of deployment and decision-making is not helping the cause of the Shelter Department. While the speed of the IFRC Shelter Cluster deployment to the Mozambique rollout was applauded by the UN system, it was difficult to develop a clear chronology of why the team was deployed, nor when the decision was taken to handover. Despite what seemed an unclear assessment for a Cluster rollout in Mozambique, the Secretariat chose to deploy a team. The mobilizing of a team, that team's composition and handover date were not clearly defined for the RC/RC stakeholders nationally and regionally. While the intent of the IFRC SWG contribution seems to have been to be good and fast, the initiative was ultimately not sustainable.

The Shelter Department, in discussion with its partners and stakeholders, must develop a clear, simple and concise checklist of factors that need to be considered in deploying a Shelter Coordination Team. It should be clear why- or why not- the Secretariat responds, with what kind of team, and for how long. The deployment of a Coordinator with the appropriate P5/10 years experience to do an initial assessment would allow the Shelter Department the time to fully consider the needs and realities, and would permit the drafting of an operational plan with financial and human resources needs, and timelines for deployment and handover.

The Mozambique example offers some interesting suggestions for new approaches. There is the clear interest of the regional delegation and CVM to engage in shelter and coordination capacity building and preparedness. A regional shelter delegate position could help support this, and support a more sustainable shelter approach.

**Focussing future learning**

*What was the intent? The output? Impact? How is it measured?*

To date the Shelter Department has commissioned reviews of its SWGs. While this is a fast way of getting structured feedback, the next steps should be more comprehensive. With the introduction of evaluation criteria and benchmarks, and perhaps in implementing some recommendations from this review, the IFRC will have a better basis (i.e. measurable) for evaluating the impact and success of its contribution to the provision of emergency shelter.

## ***Annex 1- Methodology***

The methodology of this review included the following elements:

**Clarification** of the review's objectives in discussion with Head, Shelter Department and key stakeholders in Geneva and Maputo;

**Desk review** of available and relevant documents ([Bibliography](#));

**Interviews** with key stakeholders in Mozambique and IFRC Secretariat ([Annex 3](#)), with some interviews being conducted by telephone (Harare, etc.);

In addition, an anonymous [online survey](#) was employed to collect perceptions of the IFRC's service in coordinating the shelter cluster ([Annex 5](#)); and,

**Field visit** to Maputo, took place 08-13 April, 2007 and allowed for interviews with key stakeholders based in Maputo.

While it might have been useful to conduct a field visit to the affected provinces, time constraints (length of time available, Easter holidays) did not permit. It was thus not feasible to conduct interviews with beneficiaries regarding the extent to which the shelter response and cluster approach is fulfilling their needs, and their satisfaction with their involvement in the planning processes. The ongoing OCHA-led Real Time Evaluation (RTE) of the Cluster Response to the Mozambique Floods/Cyclone should be considered as the complement to this report.



## ***Annex 2- Bibliography***

Adinolfi, Costanza , David S. Bassiouni, Halvor Fossum Lauritzsen and Roy Williams. *Humanitarian Response Review*. 06 July 2005.

Bolanos, Daniel. *End of Mission Report (FACT DTL with IT and Telecom Functions)*.

B3 Associates. *Field Coordination in Emergencies: Standard Operating Procedures, Emergency Shelter Cluster* [Draft 1]. November, 2006.

Email exchanges (selected) provided to consultant:

13 February- first email from Shelter Department to FACT Team Leader/Maputo

22 February- discussion FACT Team Leader- HoRD Harare- ongoing issues

27 February- Head of Shelter Department suggesting two options for the way forward

*FACT Team Collective Debriefing- Mozambique Floods and Cyclone Operation 2007*. Geneva, 26 March 2007.

IASC, *Guidance Note on Using the Cluster Approach to Strengthen Humanitarian Assistance*, 24 November 2006.

IFRC, *Appeal- Global Shelter Programme 2007 - 2008*, November 2006.

IFRC- UN, *Memorandum of Understanding Between IFRC and UN OCHA In Regards to the IFRC Assuming a Leading Role in Emergency Shelter in Natural Disasters*, 2005.

[Google Groups, Shelter Working Group - Mozambique Floods.](#)

Schmuck, Hanna. *End of Mission Report- Mozambique Floods and Cyclone Operation 2007*.

Terms of Reference for Shelter Coordination Team Members:

*Emergency Shelter Coordinator Philippines- Typhoon Durian Response Terms of Reference*

*Emergency Shelter Information Manager- Typhoon Durian Response Terms of Reference*

*Emergency Shelter Technical Advisor- Typhoon Durian Response Terms of Reference*

*Various Appeals documents produced by IFRC, UN Agencies, NGOs, etc.*

### **Annex 3- List of Interviewees**

#### **Government**

[Joao Ribeiro](#) - Deputy Director INGC (National Institute for Disaster Management)

#### **UN System**

[Ndolamb Ngokwey](#) - UN Resident Coordinator, Maputo

[Jamie Comiche](#) - UN Habitat Maputo

[Mathias Spaliviero](#) - UN Habitat Maputo

[Mark Hefferman](#) - IOM Maputo

[John Cosgave](#) - RTE Team Leader (Interworks Europe Ltd)

[Sune Gunitz](#) - OCHA Humanitarian Reform Support Unit (HRSU)

#### **Movement**

[Fernanda Teixeira](#) - Secretary General, Mozambique Red Cross

[Ataide Sacramento](#) - CVM Shelter Focal Point

[Robert Przedpelski](#) - Head of Operations

[Robert Kwesiga](#) - Deputy Head of Regional Delegation, Harare

[Hanna Schmuck](#) - FACT Leader

[Farid Aiywar](#) - Replacement FACT Leader

[Alex Claudon](#) - FACT Relief Officer

[John Roche](#) - Desk Officer, Secretariat

[Niels Scott](#) - Operations Coordinator, Secretariat

[Dorothy Francis](#) - FACT Officer

[Robert Mister](#) - Coordinator, Inter Agency Cooperation Department

[Sune Gudnitz](#) - OCHA Coordinator in Mozambique (now in Geneva)

[Martin Fisher](#) - IFRC Shelter Working Group Coordinator

[Malcolm Johnstone](#) - IFRC Shelter Working Group Coordinator  
(Start-up)

[Anna Maria Selleri](#) - Technical Advisor, Shelter Working Group

[Howard Arfin](#) - Information Manager, Shelter Working Group

[Graham Saunders](#) - Head, Shelter Department, Geneva Secretariat

#### **NGO**

[Fabio Fussi](#) - Emergency Coordinator, OXFAM Intermon

[Stephanie Gerteiser](#) - German Agro Action

[Alain Kassa](#) - MSF Luxembourg

(Unavailable during review period)

## **Annex 4 - TOR**

### **Terms of Reference for: A Review of the Mozambique Floods Response Shelter Working Group**

#### **Background to the Mozambique Shelter Working Group Review**

Under the terms of a Memorandum of Understanding between IFRC and UN OCHA,

"subject to available resources, constitutional limits, and the rules and regulations of the Federation, the Federation will assume a coordination role for emergency shelter in specific emergency operations within an agreed coordination system".

Since December 2006, torrential rains throughout southern Africa region (from Angola in the west to Mozambique in the east with Malawi, Zambia and Zimbabwe in between) have led to overflowing of rivers and pressure on dams, resulting in wide spread flooding in central and southern parts of Mozambique. The Zambezi River, a flood plain river that crosses the Africa continent - with three major dams, burst its banks and its tributaries flowed into Cahora Bassa hydroelectric dam in north-western Mozambique. These heavy rains and storms have subsequently caused destruction of houses, schools, health centres and crops, forcing the affected populations to leave their homes in search of safer grounds. The four most affected provinces re Sofala, Zambezia, Manica and Tete. According to the National Institute for Disaster Management (INGC<sup>13</sup>), 163,045 people have been displaced from their homes by the floods. A total of 107,534 of the displaced people have been sheltered in accommodations centres, while 55,511 others are in resettlements centres that were established by the government after the 2001 floods. INGC had previously anticipated that 285,000 people could be affected, but the water levels are receding and the number of people relocating to accommodation centres has reduced. The government of Mozambique has maintained airlift operations on an isolated "island" in order to continue monitoring the situation, and has down-graded the alert from red to yellow, which means the flooded areas are no longer in an emergency phase.

To further aggravate the situation, on 22 February 2007, Mozambique experienced an intense tropical cyclone, known as cyclone Favio, which caused nine deaths and affected 133,670 people in Vilanculos, Inhassoro, Govuro and Masinga districts in Inhambane Province, and destroyed 20,800 hectares of crops. In Vilanculos District, approximately 6,000 houses built from local materials such as wooden polls, mud and grass were destroyed by the cyclone. As a result of heavy rains generated by the cyclone and overflowing rivers, some flooded areas in Buzy District affected about 20,000 people. In response, the government has set up two accommodations centres for

---

<sup>13</sup> In Potruguese: Instituto Nacional de Gestão de Calamidades (INGC)

the affected families. However, only 74 people are in the camp so far, as the majority opted to stay in their roofless houses. More people could have lost their lives had it not been for the alert that was sent out through the early warning system (EWS) and community based disaster management programmes implemented by Mozambique Red Cross Society (CVM). Cyclone Favio also caused destruction of infrastructure and public facilities such as schools and health centres. The rural hospital of Vilanculos was seriously damaged, especially the maternity, surgical operation theatre and the HIV and AIDS section where antiretroviral drugs were destroyed. In the neighbouring villages of Vilanculos, seven health centres have also been partially or totally damaged.

Lead by the office of the UN RC in Mozambique with the support of an OCHA advisor sent from Geneva, a decision was taken to recommend that the cluster process be activated. On 15<sup>th</sup> February 2007, a message was sent by Ms. Margareta Wahlstrom, Officer-in-Charge of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, designating IFRC/Mozambique Red Cross as "cluster lead" for shelter. It should be noted that the Mozambique Red Cross is the lead relief and shelter agency for the Mozambique Government.

An IFRC Shelter Coordinator was deployed on 15<sup>th</sup> February 2007 in Mozambique to establish the Shelter Working Group. A Coordinator from the Inter Agency Cooperation Department within the Secretariat in Geneva was also deployed for a period of one week to raise the awareness of the Mozambique Red Cross and the International Federation FACT in country of the cluster process and to support the setting up of the Shelter Working Group. The Mozambique Red Cross acknowledged that they did not have the capacity to undertake this role in addition to the relief operations, although a counterpart for the Shelter Working Group Coordinator was nominated.

A Shelter Technical Advisor, Information Manager and Mapping Advisor arrived in country to support the shelter cluster on 24<sup>th</sup> March 2007, along with a replacement Shelter Coordinator. Shelter Working Groups were established in Maputo and the centre of the flood response operations in Caia. The IFRC Shelter Working Group Coordinator also represented the Shelter Working Group in cluster leads meetings convened by UN OCHA, and in liaison with the Government.

At the outset of the response, the International Federation formally requested UN Habitat to take on the role of focal agency for return and resettlement within the Shelter Working Group, and for IOM to take on the role of focal agency for camps and camp-type situations. The Government initiated the first meetings on the return and resettlement process on 23<sup>rd</sup> February. With the increasing focus of the Government and hence the supporting Shelter Working Group on the return and resettlement process in addition to supporting the ongoing provision of emergency shelter, the International Federation formally handed over the coordination of the Shelter Working Group to UN Habitat on 13<sup>th</sup> March 2007.

It should be noted that deployment of such a co-ordination team is not an arrangement foreseen in the rules and regulations for international Red Cross / Red Crescent activities. The rules and

regulations that have been agreed within the International Federation assume that all activities are centred on supporting the National Society's operational activities or, as the case might be, supplementing the efforts of the National Society. The co-ordination teams, in contrast, are meant to provide a service to the overall humanitarian community - a service which in the context of other aspects of an international response the International Federation receives from others.

### **Objective of the Mozambique Shelter Working Group (MSWG) Review**

The objectives of the MSWG review are to:

5. review and analyse the experience of the International Federation with respect to the establishment and operation of the MSWG, with a particular emphasis on lessons to be learnt for future operations;
6. provide a foundation for establishing policy and guidelines for emergency shelter coordination (cluster) leadership at a national level, including identification of the appropriate mechanisms and procedures to support shelter leadership at the national level within the Secretariat;
7. provide recommendations with regard to the International Federation's leadership of future emergency shelter coordination (cluster) activities both at global and at national levels.
8. examine if there were aspects of the Federation's cluster leadership which potentially might have or actually did compromise the mandate and principles of the Red Cross/Red Crescent.

### **Scope of the Review**

The review will encompass, but not be limited to, the following areas:

1. The activation of the cluster process and the extent of involvement and influence of the Federation, as an IASC member, in the decision-making process;
2. the understanding and support of the Federation's shelter coordination role within the in country delegation, the region and Geneva;
3. the impact of the MSWG on the Federation Delegation and the Mozambique Red Cross;
4. the design and implementation of the MSWG, including factors and determinants which provided the MSWG's strengths and weaknesses;
5. the value of linking and/or separating the MSWG and the Red Cross relief operation;
6. the design and implementation of the exit/handover strategy;
7. relations with other clusters, the UN system and the Government;
8. the staffing of the MSWG and the support provided from the Secretariat;
9. the equipping and funding of the MSWG;
10. the involvement of the MSWG in the transition from meeting emergency shelter needs to permanent housing and resettlement;
11. issues with regard to visibility for the International Federation and the Red Cross.

Key issues that should be addressed include:

1. The cluster activation process, the involvement of the International Federation as an IASC member in this process, and the extent to which this activation was in accordance with the activation process as stated in the OCHA Guidance Note.
2. The extent to which the UN RC and UN OCHA considered the established Government coordination mechanism and how more tailored support from the cluster lead agencies rather than the full cluster process could have been more appropriate.
3. The role of OCHA as the cluster coordinator, including OCHA's role in the activation of the cluster process with reference to the Guidance Notes, OCHA's liaison with the Government on behalf of the cluster lead agencies including ensuring the cluster process was in support of Government coordination mechanisms, and OCHA's addressing of cross-cluster issues.
4. The role of the MSWG in addressing all shelter issues from the outset i.e. emergency and return/resettlement, the sharing of that responsibility between appropriate agencies within the MSWG (especially between the International Federation and UN Habitat respectively), and the resulting handover of the coordination role from the International Federation to UN Habitat.

### **Methodology**

The methodology employed by the reviewer/s in gathering and assessing information should include:

- A field visit to Maputo;
- Review of available documented materials relating to the start-up, planning, implementation, and impact of the MSWG (reference to the MSWG Google/email group and website);
- Interviews with key internal stakeholders within the Secretariat in Geneva, (by 'phone) with Regional Delegation in Harare, and the Mozambique Red Cross;
- Interviews with other key stakeholders, in particular INGC;
- Interviews with UN OCHA and the UN RC's office;
- Interviews with shelter agencies participating in the MSWG, and in particular UN Habitat;
- If feasible, interviews with beneficiaries (beneficiary perceptions regarding the extent to which the shelter response and the cluster approach is fulfilling their needs, and their satisfaction with their involvement in planning processes).

Note: A suggested list of interviewees is attached.

### **Proposed Timeline**

The exercise will be implemented over a period from April 2nd to April 12, 2007, with the first day spent in Geneva with Secretariat interviews.

### **Outputs**

1. Concise, written document with key recommendations and supporting information. This document should be of use for discussing the IFRC experiences of the cluster process internally and also with key donors and other stakeholders.
2. Additional notes, summaries of interviews etc. as appropriate, or supporting documentation.

3. Summary of review activities undertaken, including interviews, visits, documents reviewed etc.

Key reference documents provided:

1. IFRC-UN OCHA Shelter MoU
2. IFRC Shelter Working Group Coordination Team ToRs
3. All documents (meeting minutes, strategy documents etc.) from the MSWG website.

## Annex 5- Survey Output

SurveyMonkey.com – The easiest way to create online surveys.

05/17/2007 12:30 AM

1. My organization would be defined as:

	Response Percent	Response Total
Government	0%	0
United Nations	25%	2
International Organization	0%	0
<b>Red Cross Movement</b>	<b>62.5%</b>	<b>5</b>
Non-Governmental Organization (NGO)	12.5%	1
Other (please specify)	0%	0
<b>Total Respondents</b>	<b>8</b>	
(skipped this question)		0

2. Our relationship and experience with the IFRC coordination role in the Shelter Cluster included:

	Response Percent	Response Total
<b>Member of SWG in Maputo</b>	<b>44.4%</b>	<b>4</b>
Member of SWG in Caia	11.1%	1
Cluster Leads Meetings	22.2%	2
Subscribed to Googlegroups	22.2%	2
Other (please specify)	33.3%	3
<b>Total Respondents</b>	<b>9</b>	
(skipped this question)		0

3. In considering the potential roles of the Shelter Cluster, please rank how important you consider each function to be:

	No Importance	Little Importance	Neutral	Important	Very Important	Response Average
Advocacy and Resource Mobilization	14% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	<b>71% (5)</b>	14% (1)	<b>3.71</b>
Application/Development of Standards	12% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	12% (1)	<b>75% (6)</b>	<b>4.38</b>
Capacity Building and Training	14% (1)	0% (0)	14% (1)	<b>71% (5)</b>	0% (0)	<b>3.43</b>
Coordination	0% (0)	12% (1)	0% (0)	25% (2)	<b>62% (5)</b>	<b>4.38</b>
Cross-Cluster Issues	0% (0)	14% (1)	0% (0)	<b>57% (4)</b>	29% (2)	<b>4.00</b>
Identifying Partners	14% (1)	0% (0)	14% (1)	<b>43% (3)</b>	29% (2)	<b>3.71</b>

file:///Users/gunz/Desktop/Summary.html

Page 1 of 4



Information Management	0% (0)	0% (0)	14% (1)	29% (2)	<b>57% (4)</b>	<b>4.43</b>
Strategy Development	14% (1)	0% (0)	14% (1)	<b>43% (3)</b>	29% (2)	<b>3.71</b>
Technical Advice	0% (0)	14% (1)	0% (0)	29% (2)	<b>57% (4)</b>	<b>4.29</b>
Technical Standards	0% (0)	12% (1)	0% (0)	38% (3)	<b>50% (4)</b>	<b>4.25</b>
<b>Total Respondents</b>						<b>8</b>
(skipped this question)						<b>1</b>

4. Please evaluate the following statement: My organization considers participation in the Shelter Cluster/Working Group to be one of our priorities.

	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Total</b>
<b>Agree</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>7</b>
Neutral	0%	0
Disagree	0%	0
<b>Total Respondents</b>		<b>7</b>
(skipped this question)		<b>1</b>

5. In Mozambique, the Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement is represented by the Mozambique Red Cross (CVM), a Field Assessment and Coordination Team (FACT) of the IFRC and (until 13 March 2007) the Shelter Coordination team of the IFRC. How did you perceive the distinction between these different members of the RC/RC Movement?

	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Total</b>
Distinct bodies, with clear roles and mandates	12.5%	1
<b>There seemed to be some overlap</b>	<b>37.5%</b>	<b>3</b>
No difference	0%	0
Unclear	25%	2
Unimportant	25%	2
<b>Total Respondents</b>		<b>8</b>
(skipped this question)		<b>1</b>

6. In your opinion, did IFRC participation to the Mozambique Cluster Approach compromise the independence and neutrality of the Red Cross Movement?

	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Total</b>
<b>Yes</b>	<b>11.1%</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>88.9%</b>	<b>8</b>
Other (please specify)	0%	0



**Total Respondents** **9**  
**(skipped this question)** **0**

7. How would you evaluate the IFRC's contribution to the success of the following functions to the Sheltering Working Group/Shelter Cluster?

	No Value	Little Value	Indifferent	Useful	Very Useful	Response Average
Advocacy and Resource Mobilization	17% (1)	17% (1)	17% (1)	<b>50% (3)</b>	0% (0)	<b>3.00</b>
Application/Development of Standards	20% (1)	0% (0)	<b>40% (2)</b>	20% (1)	20% (1)	<b>3.20</b>
Capacity Building and Training	20% (1)	20% (1)	<b>60% (3)</b>	0% (0)	0% (0)	<b>2.40</b>
Coordination	0% (0)	0% (0)	<b>50% (3)</b>	33% (2)	17% (1)	<b>3.67</b>
Cross-Cluster Issues	20% (1)	0% (0)	<b>40% (2)</b>	20% (1)	20% (1)	<b>3.20</b>
Identifying Partners	0% (0)	0% (0)	40% (2)	<b>60% (3)</b>	0% (0)	<b>3.60</b>
Information Management	0% (0)	0% (0)	29% (2)	<b>71% (5)</b>	0% (0)	<b>3.71</b>
Strategy Development	20% (1)	20% (1)	<b>60% (3)</b>	0% (0)	0% (0)	<b>2.40</b>
Technical Advice	0% (0)	17% (1)	0% (0)	<b>83% (5)</b>	0% (0)	<b>3.67</b>
Technical Standards	20% (1)	20% (1)	<b>40% (2)</b>	20% (1)	0% (0)	<b>2.60</b>

**Total Respondents** **7**  
**(skipped this question)** **2**

8. Please evaluate the following statement: My organization is satisfied with the IFRC contribution to the Shelter Working Group/Cluster.




	Response Percent	Response Total
<b>Agree</b> 	<b>42.9%</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Neutral</b> 	<b>42.9%</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Disagree</b> 	14.3%	1
<b>Total Respondents</b>	<b>7</b>	
<b>(skipped this question)</b>	<b>2</b>	

9. Please evaluate the following statement: It is important to maintain a distinction between Emergency Shelter (IFRC focus) and Return/Resettlements (UN-HABITAT focus).




	Response Percent	Response Total
<b>Agree</b> 	<b>62.5%</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Neutral</b> 	12.5%	1

Disagree		25%	2
<b>Total Respondents</b>			<b>8</b>
<b>(skipped this question)</b>			<b>1</b>



10. Please evaluate the following statement: For my organization, the Cluster Activation process was logical and transparent.

		<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Total</b>
Agree		50%	4
Neutral		37.5%	3
Disagree		12.5%	1
<b>Total Respondents</b>			<b>8</b>
<b>(skipped this question)</b>			<b>1</b>

11. Please evaluate the following statement: The decision to implement the Cluster Approach took into account existing Governmental and non-governmental capacities in Mozambique.

		<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Total</b>
Agree		37.5%	3
Neutral		50%	4
Disagree		12.5%	1
<b>Total Respondents</b>			<b>8</b>
<b>(skipped this question)</b>			<b>1</b>

12. Please evaluate the following statement: My organizations felt its interests were well represented by the Cluster Approach in Mozambique.

		<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Total</b>
Agree		62.5%	5
Neutral		37.5%	3
Disagree		0%	0
<b>Total Respondents</b>			<b>8</b>
<b>(skipped this question)</b>			<b>1</b>