
**WORKING OUT OF POVERTY PROGRAMME
EXTERNAL MID-TERM EVALUATION**

FINAL REPORT

by

Thomaz K. Chianca
&
Hélder Nhamaze

MAPUTO, APRIL 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
ACRONYMS	5
I. BACKGROUND AND PROGRAMME'S FRAMEWORK.....	6
II. MID-TERM EVALUATION	10
II.1. PURPOSE.....	10
II.2. METHODOLOGY	10
III. FINDINGS	13
III.1. REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION.....	13
III.2. RELEVANCE AND STRATEGIC FIT.....	14
III.3. VALIDITY OF PROGRAMME DESIGN	15
III.4. PROGRAMME PROGRESS AND EFFECTIVENESS	18
III.5. EFFICIENCY OF RESOURCE USE.....	19
III.6. EFFECTIVENESS OF MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS.....	19
III.7. IMPACT ORIENTATION AND SUSTAINABILITY.....	20
IV. CONCLUSIONS	21
VII. RECOMMENDATIONS	23
VIII. LESSONS LEARNT	26
ANNEX: LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED	27

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Working Out Of Poverty (WOOP) Programme was designed to contribute to the implementation of Mozambique's Employment and Vocational Training Strategy (EVTS) and to operationalize ILO's Decent Work Agenda at national and local levels. Its main development objective was to contribute for poverty reduction through the creation of self-employment opportunities for youth, women and people with disabilities in three provinces of Mozambique: Maputo, Nampula and Sofala. The Programme is funded by a three million dollar grant from the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs as part of Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCP), a larger grant to ILO/Geneva to support the implementation of similar initiatives in ten countries, including four in Africa. In Mozambique, the project has been run by a local ILO office under the ILO's area office in Lusaka. The main stakeholders for WOOP include representatives from the government—especially the Ministry of Labour (MoL) and its National Institute of Employment and Professional Training (INEFP), workers' organizations (OTM and CONSILMO) and employers' organizations (CTA). This mid-term evaluation included interviews with 65 key stakeholders of the Programme from many government, workers and employers agencies in the three provinces, besides ILO staff in Mozambique, Lusaka and Pretoria. The evaluators' data collection took place between 7 and 20 of March, 2009. The following are the main conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation team.

WOOP is clearly relevant to and aligned with the country's needs and the government priorities. The Programme has developed several activities since its inception and achieved some positive results, including some benefits to the target population and opening doors for ILO to increase and consolidate its operations in Mozambique. WOOP has, however, been challenged in terms of implementation and the results achieved are limited.

WOOP's design was too ambitious. In trying to tackle all the gaps identified in the needs assessment conducted at the planning stage, the programme Logframe became too broad. There were too many experts involved in the process trying to mainstream as much as possible their specific areas into the programme plan. The validation of the Programme design with the main stakeholders had problems due to time limitations and language barriers, even though efforts were made to translate the document into Portuguese. Only very few people, besides the ILO staff, seemed to have understood the programme in the way it was originally intended.

There are clear differences in perception between ILO staff and representatives of partner agencies, especially the MoL, on how the programme should be managed and implemented. Those differences were never properly addressed and, as the time passed, a major climate of mistrust got installed that resulted in the programme becoming practically stalled a little less than one year after its inception. The problem has technical and interpersonal components. On the technical side, the Programme partners, especially the MoL, expected WOOP funds to be managed by them (or by INEFP) while ILO, in accordance with the agreement with the donor (Netherlands Government), always planned to directly manage the Programme resources. Furthermore, local partners wanted to see WOOP activities reaching directly the target population while ILO designed a more complex and ambitious intervention based on providing technical assistance to strengthen organizations. There were three main interpersonal issues influencing the Programme's climate of mistrust: (i) the counterpart from the MoL to WOOP was reported to start

undermining the Programme after his expectation of financial compensation was not met; (ii) the members of the SC became bitter about WOOP for not feeling valued and for not being compensated for their time dedicated to the Programme; and (iii) a problematic relationship that had been developing between the Minister of Labour and the ILO/LO Director due to language differences and a number of incomplete, distorted communications (miscommunications) became increasingly difficult as the differences in perspectives about WOOP were not resolved.

Lack of local control from the ILO/Maputo office of WOOP's financial resources created a major challenge for its implementation, becoming a serious source of frustration for many Programme partners. The Programme's CTA had good technical expertise and was essential for WOOP to achieve its results. He was, however, unable to bring the different partners together to resolve the differences in perspectives on how the Programme should be managed and implemented.

This complex web of problems has prevented the Programme to properly spend its resources and to be implemented in a way that will increase the possibilities for producing its expected impacts. It has also negatively influenced the sustainability of WOOP's results.

The evaluators consider that it is still worth making a final effort to resolve the problems and find a way to make good use of the available remaining resources. The evaluator's conclusion is based on reports from key stakeholders indicating their willingness to come to a new agreement and the fact that Mozambicans would be greatest loser if WOOP comes to a complete cessation. The three possible scenarios considered by the evaluators are:

- (i) Focus WOOP on youth self-employment promotion; hold a two to three-day retreat with key stakeholders to realign WOOP's strategies and management structure facilitated by an external specialist in conflict resolution; creation of two provincial offices in charge of dynamizing and coordinating Programme's implementation and monitoring in the provinces of Nampula and Sofala; hiring a new CTA with proper qualities including political ability to bring together different individuals and groups to collaborate; establish specific attributions into the job description for the MoL counterpart to WOOP and indicate a new person to play this role.
- (ii) End WOOP as it is and invest its remaining resources in existing programmes supported by ILO in Mozambique that are aligned with WOOP's priorities and that seem to be producing better results; the decision about which programme(s) to receive WOOP's fund should be made by the primary stakeholders and taking into account the level of current and future success of the existing options; transferring WOOP's resources to a joint UN initiative could be seen as ILO's major contribution to the One-UN programme in Mozambique.
- (iii) Close down WOOP and transfer its remaining resources to fund programmes in other countries that are having better success in implementing ILO's DWA and reducing poverty through the creation of job or self-employment opportunities for disadvantaged groups. This is probably the most radical option, but still quite possible given the difficult political situation within WOOP. It is also the least desirable scenario given the fact that Mozambicans will be the ones who will bear the greatest losses.

ACRONYMS

ADEL	Agência de Desenvolvimento da Economia Local
AfDB	African Development Bank
BDS	Business Development Services
CDF	Community Development Foundation
CONSILMO	Confederação Nacional dos Sindicatos Independentes e Livres de Moçambique
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
CTA	Confederation of Trade Associations in Mozambique
DFID	UK's Department for International Development
DWA	Decent Work Agenda
DWCP	Decent Work Country Programme
ECoSIDA	Empresários Contra o SIDA
EU	European Union
EVTS	Employment and Vocational Training Strategy
GTZ	Gesellschaft fuer Technische Zusammenarbeit
HIV/AIDS	Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
INEFP	Instituto Nacional do Emprego e Formação Profissional
ILO	International Labour Organization
KAB	Know About Your Business
LMI	Labour Market Information
OTM	Organização dos Trabalhadores de Mozambique
MFI	Micro Finance Institutions
MMAS	Ministério da Mulher e Acção Social
MoL	Ministry of Labour
MSME	Micro-, Small-, and Medium-scale Enterprises
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
NAC	National AIDS Council
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
NPO	National Programme Officer
PARPA	Plano de Acção para a Redução da Pobreza Absoluta
PNAD	National Plan of Action on Disability
PWD	People With Disabilities
SC	WOOP's Steering Committee
SIDA	Swedish International Development Agency
SIYB	Start and Improve Your Business
SNV	Netherlands Development Organization
STEP	Strategies and Tools against Social Exclusion and Poverty
TC-RAM	Technical Cooperation – Resource Allocation Mechanism
ToT	Training of Trainers
UNAIDS	United Nations Joint Programme on HIV/AIDS
UNCDF	United Nations Capital Development Fund
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Education, Science and Culture Organization
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
UNIFEM	United Nations Development Fund for Women
UNJP	United Nations Joint Programme
WHO	World Health Organization
WOOP	Working Out of Poverty

I. BACKGROUND AND PROGRAMME'S FRAMEWORK

The *Working Out of Poverty* (WOOP) Programme was conceived as a response to specific development challenges identified in the Mozambican context. After a civil war and persistent occurrence of natural disasters the country has been enjoying a steady track of economic growth. However, some features still could pose a threat to full blown development achievement. The overwhelming majority of economically active Mozambicans do not have jobs in the formal economy, particularly among first-time labour market entrants below 25 years of age living in urban areas.

This high unemployment rate was influenced by the privatization of state companies and restructuring programmes in large companies, besides insignificant direct impact of mega-projects of job creation. Another factor that explains the so-called "jobless growth" was the inadequacy of skills and qualifications among job seekers. In a country where illiteracy mounts to above 50% and professional training opportunities were not available, young people turned to self-employment as the most available option. Research conducted at the time of Programme WOOP's inception revealed that 75% of economically active population engaged in informal income generating activities.

Apart from an ever growing preponderance of the informal sector, exclusion of certain groups was also a feature of the employment sector. In the competition for work, women were perceived to be particularly disadvantaged. Illiteracy rates among female citizens were high enough to overshadow the general (women and men) improvement on that indicator. Culturally based gender roles in Mozambique determined that women's primary responsibility was to maintain the household and raise the children, and not to work or access to the labour market. Another disadvantaged group was the one comprised of people with disabilities (PWD). Even though an Action Plan on Disability had been put forward by the Ministry of Women and Social Welfare, there was little evidence that support was being provided to enable PWD to enter and succeed in the labour market, one of the Plan's landmarks.

The overwhelming predominance of the informal sector led to a wide array of consequences. There were no protection mechanisms or safety nets to rely on, no social security system was guaranteed, and exposure to all sorts of health risks (including diseases such as HIV and AIDS) was a fact. While HIV and AIDS posed a major threat to the Mozambican society at large, very little evidence of workplace interventions were taking place in the informal sector. Also access of informal activities to advice and support through the business development services (BDS) was considered limited and underdeveloped. Furthermore the latter services did pay attention to registered companies only and had no capacity to scale up their service delivery portfolio both geographically and in terms of the target group(s).

In that scenario very little progress was made from informality to formalization. There was government's recognition of the importance of the informal sector to the poorest strata, and the need to eventually integrate it into the formal economy. But the Plan of Action for the Reduction of Absolute Poverty 2006-2009 (PARPA II) referred to slow developments in that regard. The pre-Programme WOOP's assessment also pointed out the weaknesses and lack of resources of workers and employers organizations, local resistance to economic decentralization efforts and

lack of information regarding the employment sector in the midst of such important economic growth by the country.

Programme WOOP's priorities were established taking into account the above mentioned development challenges and as a main strategy to implement ILO's Decent Work Agenda (DWA) in Mozambique. Based on the application of the ILO's global DWA to the Mozambican context, ILO's constituents identified the priority area that will constitute a Mozambican Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP). These are:

- The promotion and realization of universally applicable standards, fundamental principles and rights at work;
- The creation of greater opportunities for women and men to secure decent employment;
- The enhancement of the coverage and effectiveness of social protection for all, including people living with HIV and AIDS;
- Strengthening of tripartism and social dialogue.

The main expected outcomes of the DWCP for Mozambique were:

- ✓ Policies, legislation, action plans, strategies and resources facilitating the creation of decent employment or self-employment opportunities for youth, women and people with disabilities in place;
- ✓ In association with other key national and international development partners and ILO's social partners, HIV and AIDS workplace policies and programmes catering for both the formal and informal workplaces prepared, adopted and implemented by businesses;
- ✓ An effective and functioning Labour Market Information (LMI) System;
- ✓ Increased utilization of social dialogue as a mechanism for decision making and conflict resolution.

Programme WOOP overall development objective was to “contribute to poverty reduction in Mozambique by promoting decent employment and income-generating opportunities for the designated target groups (young women and men, women, and people with disabilities)”. Grounded on the agreed priorities set for Mozambique's DWCP, WOOP emphasized the following main intervention points for technical support:

- Working with the Ministry of Labour (MoL) to support specific aspects of implementing the Employment and Vocational Training Strategy (EVTS);
- Working with the Ministry of Women and Social Action (MMAS) to contribute to implementing other national policies and programmes (the National Plan of Action on Disability—PNAD, the National Gender Policy, etc.);
- Working with other relevant ministries (including MoL, Ministry of Industry and Commerce, Ministry of Planning and Development, Ministry of Finance, MMAS, etc.) and facilitating a more coherent and conducive policy, legal and regulatory environment for employment creation and the development of informal and Micro-, Small-, and Medium-scale Enterprises (MSME), and promote their integration in the formal economy, through strengthening the policy planning and implementation capacity of government at all levels, with a special emphasis on district-level government;

-
- Working with and through social partners and building their capacities for effective implementing roles in the WOOP programme, with particular reference to their outreach and inclusion for young persons, women and PWD;
 - In association with the other technical cooperation and resource allocation mechanism (TC-RAM) projects on building capacities of employers' and workers' organizations and promoting social dialogue, enhancing the capacities and profiles of workers' and employers' organizations to expand their membership base and service delivery capacity to represent the voice of businesses and their workers in the policy planning and implementation processes at local level;
 - Partnering with and working through UN agencies (UNDP, UNFPA, UNIDO, WHO UNAIDS, UNESCO, UNHCR, UNCTAD, and UNIFEM), including the Spain-UN support for "One UN in Mozambique", cooperating partners (SNV, SIDA, DFID, NORAD, GTZ, Irish Aid, EU, AfDB, the World Bank, etc.), and key national players (e.g. NAC, ECoSIDA, CDF);
 - Focusing on three pilot provinces (namely Maputo, Sofala and Nampula) where the local construction and manufacturing base and the service sectors of the informal economy are comparatively more developed, and offer fertile ground for employment creation;
 - In association with the TC-RAM project on gender mainstreaming, building capacities (e.g. with MoL), and promoting gender equality and mainstreaming the needs of youth, women and vulnerable sub-groups such as people with disabilities into WOOP;
 - Promoting micro, small and medium scale enterprise development, and the expansion of the formal economy, as the means of bringing (self-)employment to the target groups;
 - Nurturing a culture of entrepreneurship among the target groups to consider self-employment and entrepreneurship as attractive livelihood options;
 - Promoting income generation and micro-enterprise activities, thereby contributing to poverty reduction and decreasing the likelihood of children being victims of child labour;
 - Assessing the demand for new non-financial Business Development Services (BDS) products, including mass-media based training services, that are cost-effective, tailor-made to micro-entrepreneurs, reach out to large numbers of clients at a time, and bridge geographical distances;
 - Assessing the demand for better access to micro-finance for informal businesses, and strengthening the technical capacity of selected local micro-finance institutions (MFIs) to link them to new customer segments;
 - Identifying sectors (such as basic social services) with the potential for employment creation, self-employment and MSME development for the target groups;
 - Boosting employment opportunities in the infrastructure/construction sector, "cultural" and creative industries, and selected service businesses that are employment-intensive, and that lend themselves to engaging community-based enterprises and piloting innovative business models (e.g. public-private partnerships);

-
- Developing strategic linkages with key organizations for upgrading the technical/vocational and functional and economic literacy skills of the target groups to improve their chances of integrating in the labour market, through employment or starting small businesses;
 - Mitigating the risks of HIV and AIDS for workers and informal business operators, in particular through training in low-cost/no-cost HIV and AIDS workplace initiatives;
 - Promoting synergies between employment and income-generating activities and social protection in order to enhance social inclusion, particularly within the framework of local economic development.

Interventions should lead to the achievement of five (5) immediate objectives:

1. The creation of quality jobs for young people, women and people with disabilities in particular;
2. Practical workplace initiatives to mitigate the risk of HIV and AIDS;
3. Strengthened capacity of Government and workers' and employers' organizations and national tripartite mechanisms to formulate and implement policies on job creation, gender equality and HIV and AIDS prevention and mitigation;
4. Improved mechanisms for capturing, analysis and dissemination of labour market information on the WOOP Programme;
5. Greater attention and support provided by the UN and cooperating partners to contribute to the Employment and Vocational Training Strategy (EVTS).

Using that approach Programme WOOP was supposed to create linkages and synergies with Mozambique's strategic documents (PARPA, PNAD, EVTS, etc) as well as with the main pillars of the UN system intervention in the country, outlined in the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF). The Programme started to be implemented in the second semester of 2007 and its life span goes up to 2010. At this stage a Mid Term Evaluation was envisaged.

II. MID-TERM EVALUATION

The WOOP Programme Mid Term Evaluation is undertaken in accordance with the Programme work plan and in line with ILO Evaluation Policy adopted by the Governing Body in November 2005. The policy provides for systematic evaluation of programmes and projects in order to improve quality, accountability and transparency of the ILO's work, strengthen the decision-making process and support constituents in forwarding decent work and social justice.

The evaluation is also intended to provide information to guide the decision on the future of the Programme, i.e. whether it shall be carried forward or not, and if so, on which conditions. The expected outcome of the evaluation is a report with recommendations concerning the future management of the Programme.

II.1. PURPOSE

The purpose of WOOP Programme Mid Term Evaluation is to:

- a) Determine if the programme is making progress towards the achievement of its stated outcomes and explain why/why not;
- b) Provide recommendations, based on the Programme Document and implementation of the Programme so far, on how to improve programme performance and further implementation. The evaluation should also determine whether it is feasible to continue the implementation of the Programme, and on what conditions. Additionally, an assessment of the relevance of WOOP to fostering coherence and synergy in the national Decent Work programming framework shall be conducted;
- c) Where necessary, identify the possible need to refine the Programme's strategy.

The Evaluation process covered the whole programme implemented. The findings of this evaluation will be to the benefit of national implementing partners, the Government of Mozambique (mainly but not exclusively through the Ministry of Labour), the employers' and workers' organizations, the ILO and the Government of Netherlands. Members of the UN Country Team and other cooperating partners are likely to be interested in the findings.

II.2. METHODOLOGY

The methodology followed a comprehensive approach, relying greatly on the involvement of every relevant stakeholder of the WOOP Programme. Interviews, review of several documents, debriefings with Programme staff, field visits, and group discussions were the means employed for data collection.

The first step was the review and analysis of documentation. The Lusaka ILO Office electronically submitted the following documents to the evaluation team: documents that concerned the

Evaluation itself, namely the Terms of Reference and Evaluation Guidelines; WOOP Programme background materials, specifically the Programme Document and the Programme Outline, Work Plans, Progress Reports, May 2008 Evaluation Report, Mission Reports. Other documents to help understanding the context in which the Programme operated, included the concept paper presenting the preliminarily identified DWCP priorities by the constituents, PARPA II, EVTS, UNDAF, Agenda 2025 and UN Joint Programs' Programme Documents. Altogether, there were more than 60 documents made available to the evaluation team.

Meetings were held with 65 Programme stakeholders representing several agencies: ILO, MoL, INEFP, workers' organizations, employers' organizations, Ministry of Youth and Sports (MJD), youth organizations, local development agencies, PWD organizations, and the Dutch Embassy for Mozambique (see full list of interviewed people in annex). On his trip to the country, the international external evaluator had a meeting with WOOP's technical back stopper, based in Pretoria. Upon his arrival to Mozambique the international evaluator was joined by a national external evaluator and they had a planning meeting with the relevant ILO staff in Maputo for WOOP. After the planning session, some changes to the agenda were introduced and meetings re-arranged. From the more than 40 scheduled meetings, only three did not take place: (i) the Minister of Labour, (ii) the former CTA for WOOP, and (iii) a consultant who conducted an initial evaluation of the Programme.

According to the MoL counterpart, the Minister cancelled the meeting because she wanted to talk to the evaluators at the end of their visit to Mozambique; however, she was out of the country when the evaluators returned to Maputo and the interview could not take place. The evaluators were told that the Minister felt her views about the Programme were adequately conveyed by the MoL's Permanent Secretary during his interview with the evaluators.

WOOP's former CTA declined the invitation indicating that he was not interested in meeting with the evaluators. The consultant who conducted the first external evaluation of WOOP, in May 2008, was in the Netherlands during the time the evaluators conducted the interviews in Mozambique. It was indicated to the evaluators that this first external evaluation of WOOP was commissioned by the ILO at the request from the Minister. She advised that the work of the CTA and of WOOP should be evaluated before the CTA left Mozambique by the end of June, 2008. The evaluation report, however, was never jointly discussed between the ILO/LO Director and the Minister, or among the members of the Programme's steering committee, even though many attempts to schedule such meetings were reported to have been made by the ILO/LO director.

The last meeting held by the external evaluators in Mozambique was a debriefing with ILO's Director for Malawi, Mozambique and Zambia.

The evaluation team benefitted from the flexibility, cooperation and frankness from the contacted persons. Trying to manage a tight schedule, prepared in a very short period of time, it was possible for the team to make last minute re-arrangements in Maputo, Nampula and Sofala thanks to the high level of cooperation demonstrated by the contact persons. Ms. Salmina Merique and Ms. Raquel Malunga, from the ILO office in Maputo, played an essential role in putting together the evaluation schedule and making most of the local arrangements for the external evaluators to successfully conduct their work.

The questions asked during the evaluation followed the standard evaluation criteria, also referred to in the “Planning and Managing Project Evaluations” document. Respondents were asked to first debrief about their knowledge/contact with the Programme from its inception to the most recent event they could recall. Then, they were asked about WOOP’s relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. Furthermore, the evaluation team also looked into the level of gender and tripartism mainstreaming in the Programme, its impact on the UN reform process in Mozambique, the main issues faced by WOOP (their roots and consequences) and possible solutions to overcome problems and increase Programme’s results.

III. FINDINGS

The evaluation findings will be presented based on the seven main headings suggested at the ILO Evaluation Guidance (2006): (i) review of implementation, (ii) relevance and strategic fit, (iii) validity of programme design, (iv) programme progress and effectiveness, (v) efficiency of resource use, (vi) effectiveness of management arrangements, and (vii) impact orientation and sustainability.

III.1. REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION

The Programme was launched in September 2007 by the Minister of Labour in the city of Nampula attracting large attention from the local and national media. According to several individuals interviewed by the evaluators, WOOP created great expectations on organizations and citizens in general. The programme motto—“Working Out Of Poverty”—was in line with mainstreamed government discourse to reduce poverty in the country, and the largely publicized budget of three million dollars could do nothing but to boost hopes. People expected the Programme to be a major driver in reducing poverty in the three target provinces (Maputo, Nampula and Sofala) through the creation of new self-employment opportunities for youth, women and people with disabilities (PWD).

Since its inception the Programme has been challenged in terms of implementation. Even though several activities have been put in place, the WOOP's progress towards producing its main expected results has been limited. Differences in perception between ILO staff and representatives of partner agencies, especially the MoL, on how the Programme should be managed and implemented have been the main cause for this situation. Those differences have not been resolved; on the contrary, they have scaled up to a major problem that has caused the Programme to be practically stalled since June 2008.

Nonetheless, WOOP has developed some important activities since its inception. Within the first semester of implementation (Jul-Dec 2007), WOOP, in partnership with other ILO projects and joint UN programmes, has been reported to have produced the following results:

- Training of trainers (ToT) seminars for professionals from 15 partner organizations on the Start and Improve Your Own Business (SIYB) package in the three provinces covered by WOOP.
- Those 15 organizations, on their turn, provided training on SIYB for 85 youth in the three provinces.
- Training on the Know About Business (KAB) package was conducted for ILO staff and educators from the MoL as a pilot-test to assess the feasibility of adopting the KAB package as part of the WOOP training activities.
- Representatives from two agencies working with PWD were trained to use the SIYB and to design follow-up training to the individuals attended by their organizations.
- In coordination with ILO/AIDS projects and in collaboration with a workers' organization (OTM), WOOP supported training activities for 172 workers on HIV/AIDS mitigation strategies, 152 on peer education training, and 50 on project design.

In 2008, the following were the main results reported as being achieved with the support from WOOP through activities carried out by the Programme's partner organizations:

- Two training of trainers on SIYB for 20 trainees and on KAB for 15 trainees were implemented by WOOP.
- ADEL-Sofala, one of the WOOP partners, held a ToT seminar on SIYB for 20 representatives of ILO social partners and a national NGO working with PWD.
- One training seminar on KAB for representatives from seven private technical schools.
- In coordination with the UN Youth Employment Joint Programme (ILO/UNESCO/UNDP) WOOP has supported:
 - ToT for 30 youth on SIYB in Maputo.
 - Promotion of self-employment opportunities in the three provinces as part of the "Community Phone Operators" project. In collaboration with INEFP, Ministry of Youth and Sports, local governments, the National Youth Council, and the private sector; this initiative was reported to involve 650 youth, including PWD.
 - Representatives from eight agencies working with youth, women, and PWD were trained on "project cycle".
- Study to identify existing funds to finance youth employment initiatives in Mozambique to advocate and promote links with the youth self-employment initiatives supported by ILO (draft report delivered in Dec 2008).
- Study to determine employment situation/needs among rural youth, the Rural Youth Study.
- Collaboration with other two HIV/AIDS stakeholders' programmes (ECoSIDA and NAC) to raise awareness and put in place mitigation initiatives in the workplace.
- In collaboration with ILO Gender Bureau, development of two ToT training on Gender Audit for workers' organization (OTM) and MoL educators from INEFP.
- ToT on Gender Audit was also provided to UNCT staff in Mozambique.
- Printing 250 copies of the Gender Audit training manual in Portuguese.
- Translation and adaptation of the Gender and Entrepreneurship Together (GET Ahead) training materials into Portuguese to be used in training activities for women entrepreneurs.
- Training on "social dialogue and negotiation skills" for representatives from youth and PWD organizations (35 participants) from the three provinces (the training took place in Maputo).

Even though WOOP has been practically idle since mid-2008, activities are still taking place, especially the ones that are carried out by the partner organizations. For instance, the evaluators were told in Beira that the Ministry of Youth and Sports had just conducted a training session on SIYB for 35 representatives of youth organizations in the province of Sofala at the beginning of March 2009. The training was conducted by an educator from INEFP; WOOP provided financial support to cover coffee-breaks, the trainer's time and the rental for the room where the training took place.

III.2. RELEVANCE AND STRATEGIC FIT

WOOP is clearly aligned with country's needs for reducing poverty through the creation of self-employment opportunities to marginalized populations in the country (youth, women and PWD). Even though Mozambique has improved its economic situation in the past several years, more than one-half of its population still live below the national poverty line, especially the women.

Furthermore, 95% of Mozambican workers do not have formal jobs, and unemployment among the youth has been a major socio-economic-political problem for the country.¹

The Programme is also fully aligned with the government's strategic development goals expressed in the Plan of Action for the Reduction of Absolute Poverty 2006-2009 (PARPA II) and with the Employment and Vocational Training Strategy (EVTS)—adopted by the MoL to make PARPA II priorities actionable and developed with contributions from ILO and UNDP inspired in ILO's Decent Work agenda.

All interviewees were unanimous in stating that WOOP's aims were still very relevant and entirely aligned with the country's needs and strategic priorities.

III.3. VALIDITY OF PROGRAMME DESIGN

WOOP was designed by a group of recognized international experts from ILO in the areas related to the four dimensions of the Decent Work agenda: rights of work, social protection, promotion of employment, and social dialogue. A comprehensive Logical Framework (Logframe) was developed for the Programme with five immediate objectives, 12 outputs and 57 activities.

During the interviews conducted by the evaluators, many ILO staff and government representatives considered the Logframe too ambitious. The general perception was that in trying to tackle all the gaps identified in the needs assessment conducted at the planning stage, the design of the Programme became too broad. Also, they thought there were too many experts involved in the process; each one tried to mainstream as much as possible their specific areas into WOOP's plan.

Even though there was an effort to validate the Logframe with some key Programme constituents, not many changes were introduced to its final version. Limited time for the validation process due to pressure from ILO's implementation schedule for the Decent Work Country Programme in 10 "pilot" countries worldwide was reported as a main reason for this fact. Also, there were important language barriers, since most constituents did not speak English and the document needed to be translated to Portuguese—which proved to be a long process and the quality of the final product was questionable. It was indicated that the Logframe was felt as being somehow locked, i.e., the original developers were not prone to allow any significant changes to their Logframe. Finally, ILO representatives pointed out that there were changes in the people representing MoL and social partners in the design phase of the Programme. They indicated that the new representatives were not adequately briefed by their predecessors which contributed to their misconceptions or misunderstanding of WOOP's management and implementation strategies.

As it turned out, only very few people, besides the ILO staff, seemed to have understood the Programme in the way it was originally intended. This fact became evident during the initial meetings of WOOP's Steering Committee (SC), comprised of the key WOOP partners². ILO staff and the other SC members (particularly the government representatives) showed significantly

¹ WOOP Programme Document (16 February 2007)

² Government of Mozambique (MoL and INEFP), OTM, CONSILMO, CTA, Dutch Embassy, and ILO (ILO/BIT, and WOOP-ILO/BIT Mozambique)

different views about how the Programme should be managed and implemented. Those differences were never properly resolved and, as the time passed, a major climate of mistrust got installed that resulted in the Programme becoming practically stalled a little less than one year after its inception. The problem lasts until today and can be considered as having technical and interpersonal relationships components.

On the technical side, the way WOOP was going to be managed and implemented was seen fundamentally differently by ILO and the other partners. As far as the management, government officials expected Programme funds to have been allocated to the MoL or to its National Institute of Employment and Professional Training (INEFP). On their view, having greater control over the funds would have ensured not only autonomy for the Programme to respond to the specific perceived needs by the government, but also to strengthen INEFP—a key MoL institution that has always struggled with limited funding. Leaving something “tangible” for INEFP as part of WOOP implementation was repeatedly indicated as a major concern by different interviewees. On the other hand, ILO, in accordance with the global partnership agreement between the ILO and the donor, had always planned to directly manage the resources from their area office in Lusaka in collaboration with ILO’s local office in Maputo to attend WOOP’s needs.

Another important management issue raised by many member of the SC was the allocation of resources within the Programme’s expense lines. They thought the allocation was quite unbalanced since about 60% of the budget was apparently being used to cover administrative costs and only about 20% was used for training which, in their view, is the main strategy for WOOP to produce its ultimate outcomes. ILO representatives indicated that they tried to explain this apparent contradiction to the members of the SC, without much success, by bringing to their attention that the 60% was not for “administrative costs”, but included the salaries of a technical team of three 3 persons who were expected to deliver many of the Programme services. They also clarified that the donor was very particular about the need to have the greater percentage of resources being utilised for programme activities and the budget was claimed to have been prepared with this important aspect in mind. This issue brings us to the different views regarding the Programme implementation strategies.

MoL representatives wanted to see WOOP’s activities reaching directly the target population. They were keen to have the Programme not only providing training but also helping youth, women and PWD groups to start or introduce significant improvements to their own micro/small businesses. This would include the provision of basic equipment, tools, and/or access to a “jump start” micro-credit. Furthermore, the evaluators collected reports that within INEFP local agencies (e.g., INEFP Province of Maputo) and other partner organizations (e.g., ADEL Sofala), there were already professionals who had been trained in the methods proposed by ILO such as SIYB. This fact contributed to increase the level of frustration of the partners about WOOP’s lead strategy of providing ToT since it was not very relevant for them considering that they already had that capacity. A better needs assessment should have been done to this effect.

ILO, on the other hand, had in mind a more complex and ambitious intervention based on providing technical assistance to strengthen partner organizations. Those organizations were seen as the main players in influencing the increase of decent employment and income-generating activities by implementing direct interventions to the target population and/or fostering policy changes at the national, provincial and local levels. ILO’s idea also included several other initiatives such as

promoting capacity building on social dialogue, combating HIV/AIDS in the work place, mainstreaming gender and disability concerns in employment promotion, and advocacy of ILO conventions. Clearly most interviewees for this evaluation never grasped what the latter aspects meant or did not agree these aspects had any relevance to their agencies/country. ILO representatives brought to the attention of the evaluators that this problem might have been mitigated if MoL and social partners have fulfilled their commitment to conclude the DWCP for Mozambique, which is still considered as a draft proposal.

It is important to note that ILO has extensive experience in the area of training individuals and fostering the development of micro/small businesses—this is actually the area of expertise of the ILO/LO Director. According to their experience, providing “kits” or credit to groups after receiving training as a blanket strategy to foster self-employment opportunities is not an effective measure to ensure sustainable self-employment. Even in Mozambique there is extensive history of graduate from professional training programmes selling their kits or not repaying their loans. According to ILO, to become successful entrepreneurs, individuals need to be motivated and already have had the initiative of starting some small business in their area of interest/experience.

Unmet expectations regarding WOOP’s management and implementation led to some degree of frustration from both parts. This frustration was also fostered by some personal and group interests that ended up fostering bitter relationships among Programme partners.

In this arena, one main issue was that the person appointed by the Minister to represent MoL at WOOP wanted to receive compensation, in addition to his salary paid by MoL, to perform his job. He wanted his net salary to be compatible with the one paid by ILO for a National Programme Officer (NPO). Since ILO never indicated any intension of meeting, to any extent, his compensatory expectations, a number of interviewees indicated that this professional became an opponent of the Programme. It was also indicated that given his close connection to the Minister³, he might have undermined WOOP by influencing negatively the Minister’s perception about the Programme. This unfortunate situation was openly addressed in previous assessments of the Programme⁴ and suggestions on how to address the issue were proposed, including a pragmatic solution within ILO’s rules to match the representative’s salary with a payment corresponding to the net salary of a ILO NPO. However, at this point, the evaluators consider that the situation has escalated to a level of friction and mistrust that will hardly be recuperated and, if WOOP is to continue its work, another formula for solving this issue needs to be identified (see specific suggestions on the recommendation section of this report). It is important to mention that a job description with the specific attributions into the job description for the MoL counterpart has never been agreed upon by MoL or ILO—representatives from ILO indicated that they developed such job description but never received a formal response of acceptance by MoL.

The issue of compensation has also reached WOOP’s major governance body when members of the SC asked to have their time dedicated to the Programme covered by WOOP funds. Once

³ Reported to be achieved by an important role he played in helping MoL resolve a long-standing political issue that had lasted for three previous ministers related to retirement funds for Mozambicans who worked in Eastern Germany.

⁴ - Klemmer, A. (2008). “Mission Report” Mozambique 19 to 21 May 2008.

- Azevedo, J. (2008). “Streamlining of WOOP Project Document and Logframe: Draft Report”. Maputo, June 2008.

again, ILO's reaction was to promptly dismiss their request based on the organization's general rules that do not allow direct payments for members of programme governing bodies. ILO representatives indicated that the United Nations organizations in Mozambique do not pay allowances to steering committee members. As a member of the United Nations Country Team, the ILO is obliged to be consistent with UN Policy on such matters. Some of the interviewees for this evaluation indicated that the frustration from SC members started with the lack of proper treatment of the group. Simple things such as providing refreshments during meetings and, once in a while, holding their encounters in proper venues outside Maputo (as suggested by Klemmer on his May 2008 report) could have helped create a better atmosphere among SC members and probably prevented some of the observed grievances.

Another issue raised by a number of people interviewed by the evaluators, was a climate of mistrust and serious communication problems between the ILO/LO Director and the Minister of Labour. Clearly the differences in perspectives about the way the Programme should be managed and implemented played a role in the situation. It was mentioned that the Minister was quite frustrated with the inflexibility demonstrated by the ILO/LO Director in addressing their concerns and for the language/culture barrier—she always had to use an interpreter to communicate with the Director and might have felt somehow disturbed by that situation. Also, it was mentioned that the MoL counterpart did not contribute to easing this situation. On the other hand, the ILO/LO Director was frustrated with the requests for payment by the Minister's counterpart and by the lack of support by the Minister to WOOP. The frequent transfer or demotion of those MoL staff involved with WOOP was another main issue raised by ILO staff which made it difficult to having continuity in the relations between ILO and MoL at level below the Minister. An interesting fact that was brought to the evaluators' attention that the Director has been working with other ministers in Mozambique and has never encountered any problems to interact with any of them, regardless of the language barriers and any possible cultural differences. This is clearly a very sensitive problem that needs to be addressed if the Programme is to survive.

III.4. PROGRAMME PROGRESS AND EFFECTIVENESS

Monitoring activities of the WOOP Programme were reported to be consistently implemented until June 2008, when the person responsible for this area resigned. WOOP's management team reported to have full monitoring information about the number and type of people trained and about the activities implemented as part of the Programme. It would be naïve to think that WOOP could have produced any significant expected change given its short existence and given all the major implementation issues faced so far. However, no impact studies have been planned or conducted so far. Consequently, it can't be expected that the Programme will generate any consistent evidence of its effectiveness on achieving the expected outcomes overtime.

As part of the mid-term evaluation, the evaluators have systematically inquired all 65 people interviewed about possible results or outcomes produced so far by WOOP. A few interviewees were able to present concrete examples of results produced by the Programme at the level of the target population. The following are some of the main results mentioned by the interviewees:

- A number of youth groups (including men, women and PWD) have started community phone businesses in rural districts within the three provinces covered by the program, after receiving

training on the SIYB from WOOP partners that had participated in ToT training offered by the Programme. There were, however, reports of problems with the delivery of the equipment after the training; in some instances the trainers were not the ones distributing the equipment which resulted in delivering the equipments to youth that had not participated in the training. Furthermore, it is not clear whether there were/are any consistent follow-up measures to ensure the new businesses were progressing.

- A local development agency in Nampula (ADELNA) trained 16 of their member agencies on the SIYB method; two of those agencies (a building company and a building materials' production shop) were reported to have considerably improved their businesses by applying the new knowledge and, as a result, have expanded their operations to other provinces.
- On a more strategic level for ILO, probably one of the main outcomes produced by the Programme was opening doors for ILO to work in Mozambique. WOOP was the largest Programme supported by ILO in the region in a country without local ILO office. Currently ILO is involved with five projects in Mozambique.

It is worth noticing that there was a general feeling of frustration among many of the people interviewed as part of this external evaluation, especially representatives from the government, and workers' and employers' organizations. They think WOOP has yet to produce anything significant to achieve its ultimate goal. Furthermore, they think the way it is designed will not contribute to reduce poverty through the creation of self-employment opportunities for the youth, women and PWD.

III.5. EFFICIENCY OF RESOURCE USE

Given the political problem faced by the Programme that caused it to become stalled since June 2008, the use of the financial resources has been quite delayed. The evaluators did not have access, until the moment of writing this report, to the exact amount of the Programme's original budget that had been spent. One of the interviewees indicated that this amount should not surpass one-third of the total budget. With WOOP's conclusion set for 30 March 2010, it looks very unlikely that the Programme's resources will be fully spent by then.

III.6. EFFECTIVENESS OF MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

There were reports of serious problems with the arrangements made for managing the Programme. One of the leading issues was the way the financial resources were handled. Since the ILO office in Mozambique did not have autonomy, all disbursement had to be approved by the Lusaka office and the approved expenditures had to be paid through the UNDP office in Mozambique—an extra load to an already busy office with UNDP's regular operations.

The evaluators heard several complaints from different partners (including ILO staff) about the extremely slow process for approving expenses and for making payments or, even worse, reimbursements of resources invested in advance by the local partners to develop planned activities. INEFP City of Maputo reported having to wait more than six months to obtain

reimbursement for expenses they incurred to develop a WOOP activity. It was indicated that some INEFP staff had to pay out of their own pockets to recompose their agency's budget at the end of the fiscal year since WOOP had not reimbursed them until that moment.

The good news released by the ILO/LO Director was that the ILO Mozambique office will soon gain the status of a "hub" which will grant them greater autonomy to manage their programmes' finances. This new scenario, when implemented, will certainly help improve this very unsatisfactory situation.

Another important aspect to discuss under the management arrangements' heading is the role played by WOOP's Chief Technical Assistant (CTA). There were reports from interviewees recognizing the CTA's knowledge and technical expertise on the content areas covered by the Programme. They have also acknowledged the important role played by the CTA in achieving WOOP's observed results. However, his management style and results achieved were, at a minimum, controversial. The main critique heard repeatedly by the evaluators was that he ran the programme as if it was being planned and implemented by an NGO—too many small activities going on simultaneously in different place and little attention or lack of political skills to bring together the different partners, especially the government, around the main Programme aims. He was also reported to have an unreasonably tight control of the budget, not allowing some expenses that could have made partners feel more welcomed and/or valued. For instance, participants of the SC's meetings were only offered water—no refreshments or snacks.

III.7. IMPACT ORIENTATION AND SUSTAINABILITY

WOOP works under the logic that its ultimate impact, i.e., poverty reduction through the creation of new job or self-employment opportunities for youth, women and PWD, will be achieved through strengthening partner organizations that work directly with the target population or that can establish/improve policies related to (self-) employment of those groups. This approach poses significant challenges for measuring the expected impact and to make direct attributions of observed changes to the Programme's interventions. Given this situation, it is essential to put in place a robust monitoring system to closely track and document WOOP's activities and possible changes produced by those activities. However, as mentioned earlier, there is not a follow-up system of WOOP's efforts in place to permit a systematic determination of its impacts in the long run.

In terms of sustainability, if the Programme is successful in strengthening organizations serving directly the target population it would be possible to expect long-term continuity of the Programme's results, since the training and support for starting and strengthening new businesses would occur independently from the direct intervention of WOOP. However, experience indicates that in order for such results to happen, WOOP needs to establish a strategy to provide follow-up support to those agencies. Also, sustainable outcomes will only be ensured if the partner organizations start providing more consistent support to the target population, going beyond the initial training. During the site visits, the evaluators found very little evidence that partners had any strategies in place to follow-up with individuals or groups after the training. The current climate of mistrust among Programme stakeholders, however, indicates a not so positive scenario in general for ensuring WOOP's future impacts.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

- WOOP is clearly relevant to and aligned with the country's needs and the government priorities.
- The Programme has developed several activities since its inception and achieved some positive results, including some benefits to the target population and opening doors for ILO to increase and consolidate its operations in Mozambique. WOOP has, however, been challenged in terms of implementation and the results achieved are limited.
- WOOP's design was too ambitious. In trying to tackle all the gaps identified in the needs assessment conducted at the planning stage, the programme Logframe became too broad. There were too many experts involved in the process trying to mainstream as much as possible their specific areas into the programme plan.
- The validation of the Programme design with the main stakeholders had problems due to time limitations and language barriers.
- Only very few people, besides the ILO staff, seemed to have understood the programme in the way it was originally intended.
- There are clear differences in perception between ILO staff and representatives of partner agencies, especially the MoL, on how the programme should be managed and implemented. Those differences were never properly addressed and, as the time passed, a major climate of mistrust got installed that resulted in the programme becoming practically stalled a little less than one year after its inception.
- The problem has technical and interpersonal components. On the technical side, the Programme partners, especially the MoL, expected WOOP funds to be managed by them (or by INEFP) while ILO always planned to directly manage the Programme resources. Furthermore, local partners wanted to see WOOP activities reaching directly the target population while ILO designed a more complex and ambitious intervention based on providing technical assistance to strengthen organizations.
- There were three main interpersonal issues influencing the current problem: (i) the counterpart from the MoL to WOOP was reported to start undermining the Programme after his expectation of financial compensation was not met; (ii) the members of the SC became bitter about WOOP for not feeling valued and for not being compensated for their time dedicated to the Programme; and (iii) a climate of mistrust and serious communication problems between the Minister of Labor and the ILO/LO Director started to grow as the differences in perspectives about WOOP were not resolved.
- Lack of local control from the ILO/Maputo office of WOOP's financial resources created major challenge for its implementation, becoming a serious source of frustration for many Programme partners.

-
- The Programme's CTA had good technical expertise and was essential for WOOP to achieve its results. He was, however, unable to bring the different partners together to resolve the differences in perspectives on how the Programme should be managed and implemented.
 - This complex web of problems has prevented the Programme to properly spend its resources and to be implemented in a way that will increase the possibilities for producing its expected impacts. It has also negatively influenced the sustainability of WOOP's results.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on all the data collected by the evaluators, WOOP is clearly having serious problems of implementation and the current climate of mistrust does not provide a positive scenario for the future. With this in mind, the evaluators have identified three possible scenarios for the future of the Programme. It is important to stress that those scenarios need to be carefully assessed and further improved by WOOP's primary stakeholders.

The first two scenarios are based on the idea that it is possible to make a final attempt to resolve the pending issues so the Programme can produce its important intended effects. The evaluators believe those are the most preferable options for at least two important reasons: (i) Mozambique clearly needs an intervention such as WOOP and the people of Mozambique would suffer the greatest loss if the Programme closes down, and (ii) the main players (especially ILO and MoL representatives) have expressed their willingness and interest to find ways to overcome the current problems and make good use of the available resources.

Scenario 1:

- WOOP should focus in the area of youth self-employment promotion as proposed by Andreas Klemmer on his 2008 report:
 - *The WOOP strategy should be focused on the pursuit of the second and fourth programme objective related to youth (self)employment promotion, while objectives 3 and 5 related to capacity building for social dialogue and combating HIV and AIDS in the SME workplace should be cancelled. This revision would not compromise technical support for national constituents because activities 2.2.2.-2.2.4. or 2.5.3.-2.5.4. still offer ample entry routes for capacity building interventions. Also, this revision would not compromise ILO support for local stakeholders in their fight against HIV and AIDS since (there are already three fully operational ILO HIV and AIDS projects on the ground)*
 - *Activities 2.2.1. 2.3.1., 2.4.1., and 2.5.1. which all deal with advocacy of ILO conventions should be cancelled, bearing in mind the fact that WOOP has no in-house technical capacity to implement or at least backstop interventions in this field; in turn, these activities might be retained PROVIDED the incoming CTA commands at least some technical expertise on the subject matter*
 - *Activities 2.4.4.-2.4.5. and 2.5.6. that deal with mainstreaming gender and disability concerns into the employment promotion through enterprise development policy framework should be cancelled, again bearing in mind limited resources and in-house capacity of the WOOP programme, and also in the light of the fact that at least two ILO projects due to be launched in 2008 have an exclusive focus on women entrepreneurship development... (p. 6)*
- A two to three-day retreat outside Maputo should be conducted with a team from ILO and from the key partner organizations (MoL, workers' and employers' organizations) to realign WOOP's strategies and management structure for the remaining term. The retreat can also serve to increase understanding about ILO's mode of operation, and its singularity among UN agencies. The Minister of Labour and the ILO/LO Director should be present at least for the final day of the retreat to ensure representativeness and credibility to the final decisions. A main output for the retreat should be a clear redefinition of the WOOP's objectives, strategies, and clarity on

stakeholders' roles. The process should be facilitated by an external consultant with extensive experience in conflict resolution.

- Creation of two provincial offices in charge of dynamizing and coordinating Programme's implementation and monitoring in the provinces of Nampula and Sofala. Those provincial offices should be located within the local INEFP buildings with the idea of strengthening those agencies. The new offices should be properly staffed and equipped.
- Hiring a new CTA with: (i) the proper technical expertise to lead the Programme, (ii) adequate language and cultural skills to work in Mozambique, and (iii) the political ability to bring together different individuals and groups to collaborate.
- Establishment of consistent strategies to follow-up individuals and groups after they are trained, providing the necessary support for them to progress towards success and to monitor the changes and outcomes achieved. Long term impact studies should be planned.
- Agree upon a job description for a MoL counterpart to the Programme with clear and specific attributions. Due to the serious friction with the current counterpart, identify a new person to play this role.

ILO staff indicated that a version of this scenario has been on the table since the end of the WOOP external assessment conducted in May 2008. They claimed the findings from that evaluation were shared with MoL representatives and with the social partners; however, the efforts ILO made to bring people together to discuss some of those ideas were unfruitful. This fact can be an indication that there is limited willingness from the part of MoL and social partners to explore the continued implementation of WOOP on those terms.

Scenario 2:

- Programme WOOP is finalized and its resources are invested to strengthen some of the existing programmes supported by ILO in Mozambique that are aligned with WOOP's priorities.

Some clear candidates would be: (i) the Youth Employment Promotion component of the One-UN programme; (ii) Strategies and Tools against Social Exclusion and Poverty (STEP); (iii) ILO's HIV/AIDS programmes; (iv) SIDA's HIV/AIDS programme; and (v) EU's Promoting Women Entrepreneurs.

The definition of the best candidate(s) to receive WOOP remaining resources should be decided as part of a thorough discussion among the primary Programme stakeholders taking into account existing evidence of current and future success of the above mentioned interventions and others that might not be included in that list.

The advantage of this scenario over scenario 1 is that it would provide a completely new start to the initiative, leaving behind the main conflicts and investing in activities that seem to be working better.

An ILO representative indicated a few additional positive aspects associated with this scenario. First, it was mentioned the fact that MoL chairs the Joint UN Programme on Youth Employment which also has the social partners as members which could facilitate its acceptance. Second, this option could foster greater alignment of donor-assisted projects (e.g. WOOP) with existing national frameworks, rather than creating a new Programme Implementation Unit outside of existing structures. Finally, it will avoid unnecessary duplication and transaction costs for those actors engaged in both the United Nations Joint Programme on Youth Employment and WOOP's SC.

Another ILO staff pointed out an important challenge associated to this scenario. It is likely that the Dutch government might agree to a reallocation of the Programme funds but only provided ILO can provide strong evidence the new strategy will increase the agency's capacity to implement the Decent Work Country Programme for Mozambique. Given the very slow pace of the negotiations for defining and implementing the DWCP (discussions have lasted for more than two years) providing this evidence to the donor will be tough.

Scenario 3:

- Close down WOOP and transfer its remaining resources to fund programmes in other countries that seem to be having more success in implementing ILO's DWA and reducing poverty through the creation of job or self-employment opportunities for disadvantaged groups.

This is probably the most radical option, but still quite possible given the difficult political situation within WOOP which might make primary stakeholders decide that the two previous scenarios are not feasible or desirable. Some ILO staff stressed the fact that if this option is undertaken it would certainly "compromise Mozambique of donor funding, but at the same time translate into an important "lose-lose" learning lesson for all parties and thus hopefully clear the air for a more cautious approach to collaboration in other development cooperation initiatives."

It is important to point out that this scenario is clearly not the most desirable one, given the fact that Mozambicans will be the ones who will bear the greatest losses.

VIII. LESSONS LEARNT

- Important to have the ILO coordinator for the region speaking the official languages of the countries she/he will be responsible for. Even though this measure would not, of course, prevent or resolve some interpersonal problems that might arise between individuals, it would probably help diminish them.
- Pay attention to Programme timing when there is the need to translate basic documents to the local language. To ensure full participation of some key stakeholders it is necessary to budget enough time especially in the planning phase.
- When there are several experts involved in planning a programme, it is essential to provide adequate time and specific procedures to ensure that key stakeholders fully understand what is being proposed and actually have a real opportunity to have their concerns and ideas being addressed comprehensively by the planning team.

ANNEX: LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED

1. Gerry Finnegan, director ILO Lusaka
2. Dennis Zulu, head programming section, ILO Lusaka
3. Johanna Silvander, ILO Lusaka
4. Andreas Klemmer, Senior Enterprise Specialist
5. Salmina Merique, WOOP programme officer
6. Nuno Cunha, ILO-STEP programme officer
7. Gaia Segola, ILO consultant
8. Celeste Guambe, ILO-UNDP liaison officer
9. Rotafina Donco, former WOOP programme officer
10. Francisco Moises, MoL delegate to WOOP
11. Tomás Bernardino, MoL permanent secretary
12. Francisco Manuse, INEFP former director for professional training
13. Justino Chemane, CTA, former focal point for WOOP
14. Antonio Muchibe, INEFP head of the placement department
15. Rafael Dava, OTM-national
16. Francisco Macoio, OTM-national
17. Alexandre Munguambe, OTM-national
18. Angelo Chilaerle, CONSILMO-national
19. Fabian Mañaza, CONSILMO-national
20. Abiba Tamele, INEFP national director
21. Mamane Kará, CTA-national
22. Edgar Baloi, CTA-national
23. Filomena dos Santos, MoL-Nampula
24. Rita Jemusse, INEFP-Nampula
25. Francisco Mangaia, ACIAMA-Nampula
26. Antonio Momade, ACIAMA-Nampula
27. Jordão Mateus, OTM-Nampula
28. Ali José Essimela, CONSIMO-Nampula
29. Cardoso Lourenço, CONSILMO-Nampula
30. Carlos Nicolau, CONSIMO-Nampula
31. Pedro Max, Youth Association Nampula
32. Fatima Godfire, Youth Association Nampula
33. Oswaldo Custódio, ADEMO Nampula
34. Paulino Roroge, GAPI Nampula
35. Nazir Karin, GAPI Nampula
36. Antonio Mogerene, ADELNA
37. Ernesto Bertón, ADELNA
38. Honório Monoca, ADELNA
39. Jeronimo Mahoque, MoL international relations
40. Jordão Sechene, OTM Sofala
41. José Mazine, OTM Sofala
42. Augusto Chicala, CONSILMO Sofala
43. Luisa Floriana, OTM Sofala
44. Simonine Louia, FUSA Sofala

-
45. Hamide Tayob, ADEL Sofala
 46. Lino Domingos, ADEL Sofala
 47. Stelio Matusse, CPJ Sofala
 48. Arlindo Mentira, CPJ Sofala
 49. Rita Jabanite, Ministry of Youth and Sports Sofala
 50. Gilda Silvestre, Ministry of Youth and Sports Sofala
 51. Augustinto Gomes, Youth Organization Sofala
 52. Manuel Dacarza, CADE Sofala
 53. Luisa Jemuca, Ministry of Youth and Sports Sofala
 54. Issufo Aly, Ministry of Youth and Sports Sofala
 55. Elsa da Barca, INEFP Sofala
 56. Emma Tangle, ACIS Sofala
 57. Marjon Durang, Dutch Embassy for Mozambique
 58. Elias Manjate, INEFP City of Maputo
 59. Rita Machana, INEFP Province of Maputo
 60. Irene Tomás, National Youth Council Maputo
 61. Angela Reane, Ministry of Youth and Sports Maputo
 62. Lúcio Pitocapossa, CADE Maputo
 63. Abel Machavate, ADEMO Maputo
 64. Paulo Romão, ILO HIV/AIDS Programme
 65. Alfredo Munguambe, ILO HIV/AIDS Programme