

CENTRO DE ESTUDOS AFRICANOS – ISCTE-IUL
CENTRE OF AFRICAN STUDIES – ISCTE-LUI

**FINAL REPORT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE INDICATIVE
COOPERATION PROGRAMME PORTUGAL-MOZAMBIQUE (2007-2010)**
Executive Summary

October 2010



IPAD
Instituto Português
de Apoio ao Desenvolvimento, I.P.

Title: Evaluation of the Indicative Cooperation Programme Portugal-Mozambique (2007-2010)

Procuring entity: Instituto Português de Apoio ao Desenvolvimento, IP

Executing entity: Centro de Estudos Africanos – ISCTE-IUL

Centre of African Studies – ISCTE-LUI

Avenida das Forças Armadas, 1649-026 Lisboa, Portugal

Evaluation team: Cristina Udelsmann Rodrigues, Ana Bénard da Costa, Ana Larcher Carvalho, Diogo Brito de Mesquita (CEA-ISCTE-IUL); Isabel Casimiro (Cruzeiro do Sul, Maputo).

October 2010

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The evaluation of the Indicative Cooperation Programme of Portugal-Mozambique, 2007-2010 was commissioned by IPAD and carried out by an external evaluation team during the last year of the Programme's execution. The main objectives were to evaluate the performance of the Portuguese Cooperation (PC) in Mozambique, assessing its relevance, logic and coherence, as well as the results achieved. The evaluation aims to give the Portuguese and Mozambican governments a basis for deciding on possible changes to its cooperation strategy. It focuses, therefore, in identifying the lessons learned and formulating a set of recommendations for the preparation of the new cooperation program.

Context

Mozambique has changed in the last decades, showing positive and sustained rates of economic growth over several years, as well as progresses in reducing poverty without, however, being outside of the group of the world's poorest countries. However, this downward trend in poverty observed between 1996 and 2003 may be reversing as indicated by preliminary data from the last survey (2008/9). Some important factors continue to contribute to the difficulty of achieving the goals set by the MDGs, such as natural disasters and the prevalence of HIV-AIDS and malaria. It is expected that the next PARPA (2011-2014) is closer to the Five Year Plan of the Mozambican government, giving greater focus to economic growth as a basis for sustaining development.

The Mozambican government based its strategy to combat poverty in the Action Plan for the Reduction of Absolute Poverty (currently in effect PARPA II, 2006-2010), which establishes as priority areas for action Governance, Human Capital and Economic Development. Mozambique has become extremely dependent on international aid that is, since 2004, attributed mainly through the Programme Aid and currently represents 90% of total international assistance received by the country. Portugal participates in the Programme Aid Partnership (PAP) and the amounts made available for this support are included in the PIC.

The Indicative Cooperation Programme (ICP) 2007-2009 governs cooperation between Portugal and Mozambique in the period under review, which is the guidance document for cooperation with Mozambique. This document is geared, among others, by the Strategic Vision for Portuguese Cooperation (2005) and is aligned to the PARPA in Mozambique, having even been extended until the end of 2010 to coincide with the period of the Mozambican document. The overall objective of the ICP is to contribute to poverty reduction, through an integrated medium-term approach and to achieve three objectives (1) support the process of good governance and institutional capacity building, (2) contribute to improve the education system, and (3) support decentralization through socio-communitarian development and the cooperation *cluster*. The PC is embodied in projects organized around Axes and Intervention Areas. Besides IPAD, the coordinating body, sectorial ministries and other public bodies, universities, NGOs and other multilateral donors are involved in planning, financing and implementing these projects.

One important aspect of the ICP was the increased participation of Portugal in Budget Support and the consolidation of the intervention area of Mozambique Island Cluster. From a geographic perspective, the ICP focused on three provinces – Maputo, Sofala and Nampula. Three main Priority Strategic Axis were defined as follows: Axis I – Capacity Building, which aims to support the strengthening of government institutions in Mozambique with a view of consolidating the state, through training of human resources and institutional capacity building; Axis II – Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction, which aims to contribute to economic development and improvement of living conditions of populations; and Axis III – Mozambique Island Cluster, which is based on the existence of a set of projects implemented by various institutions in the same geographic area with a common framework.

The ICP includes 70 projects, most of them concentrated in Axis II. The ICP has an indicative financial allocation for 2007-2009 of 42 million Euros, distributed through the three priority axes: Axis I (30%), Axis II (60%), Axis III (10%). From 2007 to 2009, 36.8 million Euros were spent. Including the year 2010, the total estimate is close to 50 million Euros.

Results

Relevance: The assessment sought to understand to what extent the ICP meets the needs of the poor, whether it is consistent with the priorities of the Mozambican and Portuguese governments and European policies. On this criterion, the evaluation concluded that the ICP is increasingly a document aligned with the policies and priorities of Mozambique, to the guidelines of the Portuguese Cooperation (notably the *Strategic Vision*) and in terms of European cooperation. For the strategy to respond to the needs of the poorest, the ICP was aligned with the PARPA. Nevertheless, there are some specific projects that do not fit entirely in the broad guidelines of the ICP and the priority areas identified in each axis. Though with occasional exceptions, the document and the projects are discussed and reviewed by Portugal and Mozambique, which contributes to ensuring their relevance.

Effectiveness: By this criterion, the evaluation assessed the extent to which program results were achieved and to what extent these results achieved the desired objectives. Apart from the financial performance data, which give an indication of generally positive rates, higher than in the previous ICP, the projects do not produce sufficient comparable data that relate the objectives of the projects to the activities implemented. Based on case studies (22 projects), the assessment highlights the diversity of results achieved by the various projects. In some cases, the results were not the expected and in others, the results have exceeded expectations. As success factors for achieving the goals, stand out a long-term engagement based on trust and in the presence of some representatives of the Portuguese Cooperation on the ground; the recognized existence of close bilateral relations between counterpart ministries and of close personal contacts and the integration of projects in government policies and sector specific plans. Among the constraints, the evaluation stresses the dispersion, which remains a fact, in terms of areas and types of projects, affecting the impacts that the outcomes may have. Moreover, the institutional relations between the Portuguese Cooperation actors are not strong and there is little sharing of information and little joint reflection. Finally, the report emphasizes that the projects of the PC are less substantial in financial terms in relation to other donors.

The difficulty of gauging the results of cooperation with Mozambique is directly related to the weak systems of monitoring and assessment. Although the annual reports of projects recognise the progress toward results, this data are not compiled to provide an overview of the fulfilment of activities of the various projects. Another problem concerns the definition of the objectives, which is unclear in the Intervention Framework of the ICP. The progress made over the previous program cycle, and in particular, the introduction of standards for the presentation of projects, which improved the information available about the expected goals, is evident. However, there are still projects that do not follow these rules and do not have clearly defined targets and indicators.

Efficiency: The assessment of this criterion refers to the analysis of resources and instruments mobilised for cooperation. Between 2007 and 2010, efforts were made in terms of reallocation of resources, restructuring of intervention axes of cooperation and development of management tools and support activities. However, the dispersion of responsibilities among various departments in IPAD and the need to ensure the presence of more technicians on the ground that can monitor more closely the activities and participate more in meetings of the Program Aid Partnership, are limitations in terms of human resources. The number of projects and their diversity makes the technicians responsible for diverse areas dealing with very different issues. Portugal, on the other hand, still has little capacity to mobilize financial resources, being a weaker donor, both in the Budget Support or at project level. The concentration on key areas such as Education and Capacity Building allowed better management of limited resources. In terms of the instruments, a major effort was made to create mechanisms for cooperation and management activities. However, they are not yet sufficiently clear and require greater disclosure among stakeholders.

Impact: The evaluation aimed to report on the impacts recorded in Mozambican society. The assessment of impacts of the PC is complicated because there are no aggregate data on the outcomes and impacts of the various projects. Neither at project level or globally, information about the transformations that PC is causing in Mozambique is being collected, except under the Programme Aid Partnership. Nevertheless, although the partial information obtained from the projects, allows the identification of some positive impacts of the PC in Mozambique. In relation to the overall objective of the ICP (contribute to poverty reduction), it can be said that there was progress in Mozambique in

terms of various indicators, witnessed by recent surveys, although these have not been as many as projected by the government and a trend towards increasing social disparities is recorded. The tensions that have occurred since 2009 at the Programme Aid Partnership between donors and government, due to criticism of certain aspects of political and economic governance in Mozambique, also questioned somewhat the progress made by the country.

The field research and analysis of case studies enabled identifying at project level positive impacts. These are most evident in cases of projects that concentrate greater financial resources and that last already for a considerable period of time. For example, in the case of Technical Police Cooperation, the range of results allows inferring that the program contributed to changes in the organization of institutions with the adoption of different procedures or to the creation of new units. In the education sector, the projects contributed to the improvement of training. Regarding the Project of Technical and Vocational Training, it is recognized that there are positive developments of the rates of the conclusions of the courses, a valuation of learning, higher quality of training and demand for trained technicians. The inter-university cooperation has led to the qualification of the teachers in several key areas for Mozambique, allowing Mozambican universities to conduct training courses with progressive autonomy. With respect to culture, a positive impact of cultural centres that attract a number of relevant public stands out, with multiplier effects in cultural life. In the integrated development projects, positive impacts were found, both in terms of population adhesion and in terms of awareness of environmental issues.

Sustainability: The evaluation aimed to examine the measures taken to ensure the sustainability of activities, the appropriateness of the methodologies and technologies to foster ownership by the Mozambican actors and the development of local capacities. Although financial sustainability is far from sought, several instruments regarding ownership and capacity development have been introduced in the design of projects. In projects in the areas of capacity building, education and training, the possibilities of replicating the results in the long term are widely recognized, while in shorter-term projects less potential for sustainability stands out.

Coordination and complementarity: The analysis of complementarity and cooperation focused on the various actors of the PC and the linkage with other donors, notably the EU. Key findings focus on the diversity of actors of the Portuguese Cooperation and the difficult combination of their efforts, highlighting the uneven application of legal requirements that confer the IPAD a role on decisions binding of the PC and the degree of development of mechanisms for dissemination, information and communication.

Key recommendations

The main recommendations are in order to (1) Improve the planning instruments of PC, (2) Increase coordination among stakeholders, (3) Improve the system for monitoring and evaluation, (4) Improve communication of results and discussion of international cooperation, and (5) Improve organizational aspects.

(1) Improving the planning instruments of CP

Regarding the preparation of the new strategic document, the new ICP, this evaluation recommends a thorough analysis of new challenges ahead for Mozambique in terms of development, paying particular attention to the latest data on poverty and the priorities set by the Mozambican government. It is recommended that qualitative changes are made to the document itself in order to provide guidelines for formulation of projects and a clear indication of the expected results. This evaluation also recommends the elaboration of various documents, supplementary to the PIC, to provide those involved in the PC with guidelines for the identification, development and implementation of projects. Among these, it is recommended the preparation of “detail plans” that detail the requirements for a particular sector or geographical area in Mozambique as well as other policy documents and sector policies to allow for better planning of projects.

To ensure policy coherence, it is recommended that there is coordination with the IPAD regarding Concessional Credit Lines and project selection. It is further recommended that studies are carried out

on the potential impacts of the Credit Lines in the economic and social development, taking into account the large sums involved.

(2) Increase coordination between actors

The first of the recommendations in this set is towards increasing coordination amongst actors in PC by strengthening the coordinating role of IPAD. First of all, the legal instruments (which stipulate the need for prior binding opinion of the IPAD) must be enforced. Secondly other mechanisms to ensure that the IPAD can fulfil its coordinating mission must be strengthened. As internationally recognized, it is only through coordinated action that positive impacts of development projects can be guaranteed. This recommendation goes to the various stakeholders of the PC to strengthen coordination efforts with the IPAD.

Moreover, this report recommends the establishment of mechanisms for joint planning and evaluation of the ICP in order to create a truly inclusive process that can enhance the contribution of each of the entities. This process can be facilitated by the establishment of sub-groups, organized by area of intervention, that would allow a more focused discussion on common problems, creating synergies and developing common strategies.

Regarding the Mozambican partners, and given the large number of projects of the PC, it is recommended that compiled information is made available to the relevant ministries in Mozambique. This recommendation is especially valid in the area of Education. Efforts should also be linked with the efforts of other donors, through a detailed mapping of donor and policies and the increase of the Portuguese participation in the structures of international cooperation, not so much in financial terms but in terms of valuing the work in the area of development and timely complying with the commitments in terms of disbursements.

(3) Improve the monitoring and evaluation system

This set of recommendations aims at improving the monitoring and evaluation systems of the CP. A monitoring system comprises several building blocks which have all to be developed. This system will allow the systematic collection and analyses of information on the PC projects which will be the basis for evaluation. At present, these components are not all created and as such, the recommendations made here concern the development of each of these components. One of the main system components to be improved is the ICP Intervention Framework, which has to define clear objectives for each strategic axes and priority areas of intervention as well as indicators. The monitoring system should also define who collects information, which sources are used and when this is done. A Logical Framework (or similar instrument) must be prepared for all projects, in harmony with the Intervention Framework of the ICP so that their objectives contribute to the objectives of the intervention area, the axis and the ICP (*cascade planning*).

The evaluation stresses, nevertheless, the importance of striking a balance between monitoring requirements and effectiveness, without prejudice of the latter: a rigid monitoring system can result in increased bureaucracy, contributing to a subordination of the project objectives to evaluation and accountability requirements. This evaluation suggests the development of a soft system, adapted to the realities on the ground, based on qualitative indicators and developed in a participatory manner with all stakeholders. It is only through the participation of stakeholders that meaningful indicators to gather relevant information for impact evaluation can be developed.

The report equally recommends that the monitoring processes (reviews, missions, or others) are documented in order to provide information for evaluation. The information thus produced should be systematically analyzed and organized. This task requires a commitment from all stakeholders in the PC in Mozambique. Finally, the report recommends the evaluation of specific projects for which constraints have been identified.

(4) Improve communication of results and a discussion on international cooperation

A communication policy for accountability “publish what you fund” must be defined, identifying the good practices of the PC. Accountability policies should follow the same principles of the evaluation, i.e., creating balanced systems, without compromising effectiveness. This requires improvements in

the IPAD website, producing reports and their dissemination (particularly those relating to evaluations), and a more active communications strategy, leveraging existing mechanisms like the *Development Days*.

Another recommendation is to increase the dialogue between stakeholders, reflection and research on the Portuguese cooperation based on the valuable experience acquired in the field in Mozambique, in particular with regard to budget support vs. project approach, aid effectiveness, the division of labour, among others. Several suggestions on how to quick start dialogue are provided.

(5) Improve organizational aspects

The evaluation recommends that, in order to improve concentration and division of labour, the new ICP should take into account the findings of the task force's work in Mozambique on the division of labour and Mozambique's aid policy. This would entail an effort to redefine some of the areas of intervention of the CP and reduce their number (more detail is provided in the document). This strategy would also facilitate coordination between actors within the same area. It is recommended also that other concentration mechanisms are examined, such as delegated cooperation and that there is a participation of Portugal in the coordination of technical assistance within the G19.

In terms of human resources, the evaluation recommends the strengthening of human resources in the field, while ensuring their autonomy. This recommendation is for greater investment in the presence of officials and technicians on the ground and greater autonomy in terms of decision on the projects, processes and the implementation of systems and follow-up evaluation. It should be ensured a greater capacity to technicians to act and/or promptly reformulating certain characteristics, given the proximity and possibility of monitoring have on the ground.

The recommendations are also in the sense of promoting better links between the various parties responsible in the IPAD for the cooperation with Mozambique – geographic distribution (by country), sector (grants) or by type of cooperation actor – at the same time stimulating the creation of information sharing systems to detect duplication of activities or enhance, through their aggregation, scattered results of projects. The mapping of actions and their results and sharing of internal information compiled (and its constant updating) would allow a clearer view of projects underway and of the responsible areas.

In terms of procedures for project development, financing and implementation, it is recommended the publication of clearer rules and timetable for submitting projects as well as information on projects undertaken by various ministries. This requires a re-organization of the IPAD website.

Moreover, it is recommended that greater efforts be made to pass the management of funds for the Mozambican institutions, continuing with the Budget Support and Common Funds in view of the recognized advantages of this type of support in terms of efficiency and sustainability. Still within a logic of transfer of skills and capabilities, the evaluation highlights the need for the Mozambican partner institutions to make available qualified personnel to work directly with technicians of the PC.