



ILO EVALUATION

Master version

- **Evaluation Title:** **Final evaluation of the project “Decent Work for a Sustainable and Inclusive transformation in Mozambique (Moztrabalha)”**
- **ILO TC/SYMBOL:** **MOZ/16/01/SWE**
- **Type of Evaluation:** **Independent Final**
- **Country(ies) :** **Mozambique**
- **P&B outcome(s):** **Outcomes 1, 4, 6 and 10 (P&B 2016-17)**
Outcomes 1, 5, 6, 10 (P&B 2018-19)
Outcomes 1, 3 and 6 (P&B 2020-21)
- **SDG(s):** **SDG 1, SDG 5 and SDG 8**
- **Date of the evaluation:** **September-November 2021**
- **Name of consultant(s):** **Jose Maria Alvarez (team leader) and Fernando de los Rios (national consultant)**
- **ILO Administrative Office:** **CO Lusaka**
- **ILO Technical Backstopping:** **EMPLOYMENT; ENTERPRISES, SKILLS, DEVINVEST, ITC-LO; WORKQUALITY, ACT/RAV, ACT/EMP, GENDER**
- **Other agencies involved in joint evaluation:** **None**
- **Date project ends:** **March, 31st, 2022**
- **Donor: country and budget US\$:** **Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) US\$ 10,678, 930**
- **Evaluation Manager:** **Ricardo Furman, Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist ILO Regional Office for Africa**
- **Evaluation Budget:** **US\$ 22,810**
- **Key Words:** **Employment Creation, Public Employment Programmes, Employment-Intensive Investment Approach, Capacity development, Decent Work, Mozambique, Market system development, National Employment Policy**

This evaluation has been conducted according to ILO’s evaluation policies and procedures. It has not been professionally edited, but has undergone quality control by the ILO Evaluation Office

Content

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| <u>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</u> | <u>5</u> |
| <u>SECTION I: INTRODUCTION</u> | <u>11</u> |
| 1.1. Background and description of the Project..... | 11 |
| 1.2. Purpose, scope and methodology applied in this evaluation..... | 14 |
| 1.2.1. Presentation of the Evaluation Study | 14 |
| 1.2.2. Purpose of the evaluation | 15 |
| 1.2.3. Scope of the evaluation | 15 |
| 1.2.4. Evaluation questions and criteria..... | 16 |
| 1.2.5. Methodology applied | 18 |
| 1.3. Limitations and conditions facing the evaluation. | 20 |
| <u>SECTION II: ANALYSIS BY EVALUATION CRITERIA</u> | <u>21</u> |
| 2.1. Relevance and strategic fit. | 21 |
| 2.2. Validity of the design | 25 |
| 2.3. Project effectiveness..... | 31 |
| 2.3. Efficiency | 43 |
| 2.5. Impact orientation and sustainability | 45 |
| 2.6. Gender equality and non-discrimination..... | 48 |
| 2.7. Status of follow up actions concerning the MTE recommendations..... | 50 |
| <u>SECTION III: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</u> | <u>51</u> |
| 3 Conclusions..... | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 4. Recommendations | 54 |
| 4.1 Recommendations for the ILO and SIDA | 54 |
| 4.2 Recommendations for the ILO | 54 |
| 4.3 Recommendations for the ILO and its constituents | 55 |
| 4.4 Recommendations for the Government of Mozambique. | 56 |
| <u>SECTION IV: LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES.....</u> | <u>56</u> |
| 5. Lessons learned | 56 |
| 6. Good Practices..... | 57 |
| <u>ANNEX I – TERMS OF REFERENCE.....</u> | <u>58</u> |
| <u>ANNEX II – MATRIX WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS</u> | <u>75</u> |
| <u>ANNEX III - DATA COLLECTION TOOL FOR THE INTERVIEWS</u> | <u>85</u> |
| <u>ANNEX IV – ONLINE MINI-SURVEYS TOOL</u> | <u>92</u> |
| <u>ANNEX V- ITINERARY AND LIST OF PEOPLE CONTACTED.....</u> | <u>107</u> |
| <u>ANNEX VI: SUMMARY OF ACHIEVEMENTS AGAINST THE LOGFRAME INDICATORS</u> | <u>110</u> |
| <u>ANNEX VII – LIST OF DOCUMENTS CONSULTED.....</u> | <u>118</u> |

ACRONYMS:

| | |
|----------|---|
| AfDB | African Development Bank |
| AMOPSI | Association of Informal Sector Operators and Workers of Mozambique |
| AP | Action plan |
| CCT | Labour Advisory Committee |
| COMAL | Labour Mediation and Arbitration Commission |
| CONSILMO | National Confederation of Free and Independent of Mozambique |
| CTA | Confederation of Employers' Associations |
| C&V | Communication and Visibility |
| DCED | Donor Committee Enterprise Development |
| DNOMT | National Directorate of Labour Market Observation |
| DWCP | Decent Work Country Program |
| EESE | Enabling the Environment for Sustainable Enterprises |
| EII | Employment Intensive Investments |
| EIM | Employment Intensive Methods |
| ET | Evaluation team |
| GoMz | Government of Mozambique |
| GREPOC | Cabinet of Reconstruction Post-Cyclones |
| IFPELAC | Institute of Vocational Training and Labour Studies Alberto Cássimo |
| ILO | International Labour Organization |
| IOM | International Organization for Migration |
| INEP | National Institute for Employment |
| IPEME | Institute for the Promotion of Small and Medium Enterprises |
| LMO | Labour Market Observatory |
| MASA | Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security |
| MEF | Ministry of Finance |
| MIC | Ministry of Industry and Commerce |
| MITESS | Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Security |
| MJD | Ministry of Youth and Sport |
| MOPHRH | Ministry of Public Works, Habitation and Rural Development |
| MTE | Mid-Term Evaluation |
| MSA | Market system analysis |
| MSD | Market system development |
| NEP | National Employment Policy |
| OHS | Occupational Health and Safety |

| | |
|--------|--|
| OTM | Mozambique Workers' Organization |
| PAPE | Employment Policy Action Plan |
| P&B | Program and Budget (ILO) |
| SADC | Souther African Development Community |
| SDG | Sustainable Development Goals |
| SIDA | Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency |
| SIYB | Start and Improve your Business |
| ToC | Theory of Change |
| UNDAF | United Development Assistance Framework |
| UNSDCF | United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Program |
| UNICEF | United Nations Children's Fund |
| UNIDO | United Nations Industrial Development Organization |
| WB | World Bank |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Background and context

Summary of the project purpose, logic and structure

Moztrabalha responds to the priorities identified in the **National Employment Policy (NEP)** and aims at creating employment opportunities for the most vulnerable and disadvantaged groups, particularly women and young people across the country. The project also addresses pertinent issues related to labour rights and social dialogue.

The Moztrabalha project **has three objectives**:

1. Strengthen national policy and institutional environment leadings to increased promotion of decent employment and sustainable economic transformation.
2. Sectors are stimulated to create decent, sustainable and green employment opportunities for Mozambican women and men, in particular youth and those living in rural areas.
3. Resilient workers and enterprises to mitigate the socio-economic impact of COVID-19 in Mozambique (added as COVID-19 response).

Actions related to the strengthening of the policy framework have had national scope whereas those directed to the creation of employment opportunities and response to the COVID-19 pandemic have covered three provinces: Maputo, Sofala and Inhambane. A Project Steering Committee (CPA) has provided strategic guidance to the implementation of the project comprising highest government officials from Ministry of Labour & Social and Social Security (MTSS), The Secretariat for Youth and Employment (SEJE) as well social partners.

Present situation of the project.

The implementation of Moztrabalha started in December 2016 with the Inception Phase. The implementation took place under difficult circumstances (natural disasters, political instability, economic downturn, COVID-19) that required several adjustments and adaptations from ILO and its partners.

Despite several constraints, the project has managed to deliver key products and services. The formulation and approval by the cabinet of the second National Employment Policy Implementation Plan (PAPE) is one of the main milestones concerning the strengthening of the policy and institutional framework. Moztrabalha completed Market Systems Analyses of three value chains and undertook the promotion of two of them (alternative construction materials and horticulture). Various EIIP pilots for works were also completed with collaboration with different partners. Outcome 3 was added upon the COVID-19 outbreak in 2020 and enabled the project to deliver various analysis and studies related to Occupational Health and Safety (OHS) and pro-employment proposals.

Some lines of actions are still to be completed during the remaining four months of the implementation period and both the Swedish Government and the ILO has expressed a preliminary interest in undertaking a second phase to consolidate and expand the accomplishment of the first phase.

Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation.

The evaluation responds to the accountability and learning needs of the different parties involved. Specifically, the evaluation had the following objectives: (i) Establish the relevance of the project design and implementation strategy in relation to the ILO, UN and

national development frameworks and final beneficiaries needs; (ii) Assess the extent to which the project has achieved its stated objectives and expected results, while identifying the supporting factors and constraints that have led to them; (iii) Identify unexpected positive and negative results; (iv) Assess the level of implementation efficiency; (v) Review the institutional set-up, capacity for project implementation, coordination mechanisms and the use and usefulness of management tools including the project monitoring tools and work plans; (vi) Assess the extent to which the project outcomes will be sustainable; (vii) Analyze the project impact at institutional level as well at the level of the final men and women beneficiaries; (viii) Identify specific lessons learned and potential good practices for the key stakeholders and (ix) Provide strategic recommendations for the different key stakeholders to promote sustainability and support further development of the project outcomes.

The primary clients of the evaluation are the ILO, its constituents and the donor. These include at national level the Government of Mozambique across its different Ministries and branches, as well as the social partners, the ILO project technical unit, the ILO DWT Office in Pretoria, the ILO Regional Office for Africa (ROAF), and the relevant technical units in ILO Headquarter and the donor, the Swedish Government.

Methodology of evaluation

Taking into consideration the mixed nature of the Moztrabalha's objectives and the time and resources available for the evaluation, it was decided to use predominantly a qualitative approach, building at the same time on existing quantitative and qualitative data sources. An evaluation matrix was established to link the evaluation questions with information needs and specific data collection instruments.

The methodology included the application of the following data collection tools: document review, remote interviews with stallholders (donor, ILO, government, social partners, service providers and beneficiaries), web-based survey, and a stakeholder's workshop. Field visits were not carried out due to COVID-19 restrictions. This has, somehow, conditioned the contact and interaction with the project stakeholders. Eventually, a flexible approach to data collection, the extensive use of secondary data and the focusing of the data collection process on primary project recipients, allowed for the evaluation team to successfully address all limitations, and arrive at valid and reliable evaluation findings.

2. Main findings and conclusions.

2.1 Relevance and strategic fit

Moztrabalha is a highly relevant project to address the structural problems of the labour market in Mozambique. The project represents a very positive initiative to address the structural and long-standing problems that hamper employment creation and the proper functioning of the Mozambican labour market. It adequately addresses the specific needs of the target groups and it is consistent with national policies, as well as with the strategies of the donor and the ILO. Moztrabalha has served to elevate the profile of the tripartite model in the country. This model is perceived by the national stakeholders as one of the ILO's main added values together with the emphasis placed on the rights-based approach

2.2. Validity of the design

The design is based on an exhaustive analysis of the problems and there is a broad consensus around the appropriateness of the components selected, their underlying

rationale and the consistency of the vertical logic, although some questions can be raised regarding the scale and capacity of some outputs to attain the expected outcomes.

There are also some issues regarding how this sound analysis has been translated into a realistic and workable package of interventions. The project seeks to carry out many, very relevant work streams across different technical areas, which when brought together without duly considering the implications on time and resources might result in very complex interventions that are not always easy to manage and take forward.

Some controversies have emerged as well concerning the use of the MSD approach. ILO respondents have raised some concerns regarding the complexity that it brings about particularly if it is combined with other non-MSD approaches under the same project. The Swedish Cooperation (SIDA) understands, however, that the MSD was not properly applied due to the limited capacity of the ILO team and therefore there is not enough basis to rule out the MSD as a valid methodology. This remains as an outstanding issue requiring further discussion between SIDA and ILO.

2.3. Effectiveness.

Moztrabalha has made significant contributions to the development of the policy framework and institutional environment in Mozambique and there are evidences of national institutions being more capable to implement policies. The Action Plan of the NEP (PAPE), the EESE diagnosis, and the various types of the technical support provided to COMAL, INEP, IPEME, the LMO among others have been successful in strengthening these institutions and their programs. There remain challenges regarding the funding and monitoring of the PAPE, but the main stakeholders still confirm that it has served to raise the profile of employment on the political agenda, and the NEP remains an active policy five years after its adoption.

In relation to the generation of employment opportunities, results have not reached a significant scale. Pilot models have been put into practice in two value chains, but it is not clear how these models could be scaled-up and replicated by other economic players into the wider market. EIIP initiatives have equally attracted attention from public institutions and development partners. The project team made a notable effort to stimulate their replication, but at time of conducting this evaluation examples of this replica have been very limited. The generation of green employment opportunities was a component initially planned, but eventually set aside due to the difficulties found by the team cope with all the front lines open.

Moztrabalha has also been able to deliver several quality products to tackle the effects of COVID 19 in the labour market and improve the implementation of COVID-19 OHS safety protocols in the workplace. This component was also an opportunity to generate job opportunities in the informal economy.

2.4. Efficiency.

The project is implemented through a complex structure involving a wide range of actors and institutions. Assembling the different pieces of the implementation machinery has been challenging at times and caused situations of impasse and/or delays. The implementation was affected by different internal and external factors:

Internal: (i); Insufficient familiarity with the MSD approach by the ILO team during the early stages of the implementation; (iii) Absence of an ILO country office in Mozambique,

which according to various respondents placed additional demands on project staff at times diverting them away from project implementation as their core responsibility.

External: (i) Uneven engagement and expectations of national partners. (ii) Institutional reforms such as the creation of the Secretariat for Youth and Employment (SEJE) as a separate structure from the MTSS (iii). Difficulties in hiring qualified expertise in-country. (iv) The occurrence of frequent natural disasters. (v) The financial crisis. (vi) the Islamic insurgency in the northern regions and (vii) the COVID-19 crisis

Despite the above constraining factors, the project team has shown the ability to introduce adaptations accordingly. Moztrabalha, especially during the second half of its implementation, has been generally able to regain the implementation pace and deliver an extensive list of products and services. It's noteworthy as well, the capacity of reaction shown to cope with the effects of the Coronavirus pandemic and the natural disasters.

No major issues can be raised with regard to the allocation of resources, although, some respondents have argued that the human resources, in particular the size and composition of the project team, should have been reinforced in order to better cope with the many diverse project components and ambitious workplan.

2.5. Impact Orientation and sustainability

As it has been said the project has been able to influence policies in the employment sector. The PAPE contains a very detailed list of actions structured around eight pillars. Representatives of the different sectors consulted by the evaluation team have argued that the Action Plan has given direction and guidance to 21 Ministries and governmental offices currently involved in its implementation

Many of the dynamics initiated by the project have self-replicating potential, especially those that have to do with capacity development, awareness raising, social dialogue, etc. They can continue as part of institutional routines. There are also examples of processes being continued (or can be continued) by other international cooperation partners: JICA, GIZ, Italian Cooperation. Budget allocation and monitoring of plans aimed at job creation is still a challenge in those Ministries with responsibilities under the NEP. Other processes, such as those affecting the value chains, need to gain scale to be consolidated.

2.6. Gender equality and non-discrimination.

Gender equality has received significant attention from Moztrabalha. The project has delivered a series of key products such as the “analysis of the labour market from a gender perspective” that represents a very valuable input for the national institutions to take this process forward. The application of gender criteria during the implementation have equally served to challenge conventional gender stereotypes in the workplace. Various training processes targeting partners and stakeholders have been also conducted and the theme that has triggered discussions and reflection, both internally among the members of the team and externally with the project's partners.

There are, however, still many challenges ahead concerning the effective mainstreaming of gender equality into the policies and its prioritization in the social dialogue. Various accounts from stakeholders pointed towards the prevalence of attitudes of denial and underestimation of the extent that gender inequality impacts the labour market.

The principle of Non-discrimination has also been incorporated in many of the project activities, especially those aimed at the informal economy: markets, domestic work, public

works, care economy. The focus has been mainly given to supporting poor and vulnerable groups making the transition into the formal labor market. It's been observed that the mainstreaming and operationalization of the non-discrimination principle into the labour market might require further support in terms of analysis, norms and guidelines to materialize it.

3. Recommendations

Recommendations to ILO and SIDA

1.- Reassess the conditions deemed necessary for the successful application of the Market System Development (MSD) approach. ILO and SIDA should jointly carried out and in-depth analysis of the pros and cons of using the MSD and the conditions and / or adaptations that might be required to take it to fruition. It is considered important to determine the added value it can bring to the project, how it could be applied and what other systemic alternative methodologies could be used instead. The recommendation is made also with respect to the selection of the Monitoring of Results and Management System which could be adapted and/or even replaced by a more practical and workable model. *High priority; Level of resources: Low; Timeline: Medium.*

2.- A potential second phase of Moztrabalha would require a thorough appraisal of the design to ensure aspects such as the right combination of components, the feasibility of the targets and the presence of the minimum premises and conditions for its implementation. A potential phase two should ensure that the breath and scope of the different components are realistic and the conditions for a smooth implementation are in place. Issues such as the ownership and commitment from partners, capabilities of the target groups; agreement around the terms and conditions of the implementation; presence, role and capabilities required from the ILO; among other aspects, should be carefully assess during the design phase. Regarding the value chains component, ILO should consider relying more on delegate agreements with third parties who could take over the bulk of the implementation while ILO remains in the backstopping role. *High priority; Level of resources: Low; Timeline: Medium*

Recommendations to ILO

3.- Revisit the ToCs applied for enterprise promotion and employment generation, particularly regarding their scalability and potential to grow. The pilots tested have shown their ability to be profitable, but the project has not clearly identified how to scale them up and create jobs on a significant extend. ILO should consider other options involving stakeholders with stronger positions in the market and bigger impact potential. As for the EIIP, a more refined sustainability strategy seems necessary. It is deemed appropriated for Moztrabalha to collect additional data and information during the remaining period of implementation (March 2020) on the extent that these programs have been embedded into the routines of the targeted organizations. Based on the findings, a decision could be made on the chances of this model to thrive in Mozambique and under which conditions. *High priority; Level of resources: Low; Timeline: Medium*

4.- Consider the development and scale-up of a more comprehensive package of intervention for the informal sector upon the experience develop in peri-urban markets. A social component aimed at preventing and reporting abuse, especially of women, could harmoniously complement the package. *High priority; Level of resources: Medium; Timeline: Medium*

5 - Reassess the different options available to reinstate and strengthen the Just Transition towards an environmentally sustainable economy and society in the context of climate change and thereby the promotion of the green economy, green enterprises and green jobs in a potential new phase of Moztrabalha. This component is considered as of vital importance to support the country in the implementation of its roadmap “Towards a Green Economy” and it is deemed important to explore what a potential second phase could do in this regard. *High priority; Level of resources: Medium; Timeline: Medium*

Recommendations to ILO and its constituents

6.- The social dialogue component should place particular focus on the mainstreaming of gender equality in the agenda of the social partners and influencing the national regulatory framework in line with International Labour Standards. Domestic work and care services, in general, could deserve also more attention in the social dialogue, aiming to enhance the protection of rights in these two domains. *High priority; Level of resources: low; Timeline: Medium*

7.- Redouble efforts to advance in the effective implementation of the National Employment Policy (NEP) its Implementation Plan (PAPE) and the rest of policy products and services delivered by Moztrabalha during this phase such as the EIIP, the EESE and the Pro-employment budgeting. All the improvements accomplished at the policy level have to be materialized at the operational level. In this regards it is deemed important to incorporate the actions foreseen for each sector in their respective Economic and Social Plans (PES), allocate budget and conduct transparent monitoring processes involving the social partners. Monitoring processes should contemplate independent impact assessments conducted over public policies and procurement processes. *High priority; Level of resources: High; Timeline: Sort-Term*

Recommendations to the Government of Mozambique

8.- The Labour Advisory Committee (CCT) should increase its role in the dissemination of labor rights, promotion of social dialogue with special emphasis in the gender perspective. The CCT could also benefit from exploring possible ways to link with the organized civil society and search. *High priority; Level of resources: low ; Timeline: Sort-Term*

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

This document develops the evaluation report of the Project “*Decent Work for a Sustainable and Inclusive Transformation in Mozambique. Moztrabalha*” (thereafter, the Project). It is organized into four sections. The first outlines a description of the project, including the background, context and its intervention logic, followed by a review of the purpose, scope and the methodology applied. The second section contains an analysis of the evaluation criteria and questions set by the ToRs: relevance and strategic fit, validity of design, effectiveness of management arrangements, efficiency, and to conclude the impact orientation and sustainability. In the third section the conclusions and recommendations are presented, and finally the last section draws out the main lessons learnt and the good practices emerging from the project. Other relevant data or information of interest are incorporated as annexes: the ToR, itinerary and list of people contacted, summary of achievements against the indicators of the Logical Framework, list of documents consulted, scripts and guides for the interviews and questionnaire results.

1.1. Background and description of the Project

1.1.1 Background of the issues tackled by the project.

Nearly 50 years after independence, Mozambique is still ranked as one of the poorest countries in the world. The peace agreement signed in 1992 and the multi-party elections celebrated in 1994 enabled the Government of Mozambique (GoMz) to embark on a series of macroeconomic reforms designed to stabilize the economy. These steps combined with donor assistance and political stability have led to significant improvements in the country's economic growth rate.

However, despite the impressive GDP growth figures (average real GDP growth was 7.4% between 1993 and 2013), the country still faces widespread poverty, deep inequalities, high rates of un- and underemployment, as well as a burgeoning youth employment crisis. The country remains dependent on foreign assistance for much of its annual budget (i.e., around 60%), and the majority of the population remains below the poverty line, with per capita income of less than US\$1.90 a day (IAF 2014/15, the WB).

Like most developing countries, Mozambique exhibits a declining share of agriculture in output to GDP, with a fall from 38 per cent to 23 per cent between 1996 and 2018. However, small-scale agriculture continues to employ the vast majority of the country's workforce. Almost 70% of Mozambique's population lives in rural areas and relies on small-scale agriculture for their livelihood. In parallel, the share of industry within output has grown steadily in the past decade (up from 10% to 20%), driven largely by capital-intensive 'mega-projects' particularly in mining, where the majority of the investments have concentrated.

Mozambique's poverty challenges are closely linked to its current employment situation. Capital, rather than labour, has been the main driver of the country's growth. Economic expansion so far has not translated into significant structural transformation. This is evidenced by the consistently high share of the labour force still occupied in the agricultural sector, while the total employment in manufacturing is stagnant despite the growth of the industrial sector as a whole. The natural resources sector has had an immense impact on growth, but its linkages to the local economy and communities has been very limited, creating few jobs or economic opportunities for local Mozambicans. Finally, growth has not gone hand in hand with increases in labour productivity (and thus incomes), which

remains at an extremely low level especially for the 10 million people who are estimated to work in the agricultural sector.

Several of these challenges relate in part to constraints in the enabling environment that does not attract sufficient investment (domestically and internationally, public and private), which is employment-intensive and sustainable. As a result, key elements in the growth/poverty-reduction nexus – i.e. employment creation and sustainability – are deficient. Solutions are required to improve the enabling environment, and to tackle market system bottlenecks more holistically. Mozambique’s policy framework has not been sufficiently successful in delivering on that front, and there is an overall dearth of pro-employment macro-economic and fiscal policies, as well as concrete approaches to induce structural transformation, which would include context and sector-specific solutions.

1.1.2. Description of the Project

In order to address the above challenges and support Mozambican institutions to create decent and inclusive employment for their citizens, the ILO, with support from the Swedish Agency for International Cooperation (SIDA) and in close collaboration with the Ministry of Labour and Social Security¹ (MTSS in Portuguese) and other relevant stakeholders, are implementing a five-year project (extended to 64 months) titled “*Decent Work for sustainable and inclusive transformation in Mozambique*” also known as “*Moztrabalha*”. The total budget of the Project after the addition of the COVID-19 component was set in USD 10,678, 930, but due to the oscillations in exchange rate the final budget available is USD 9,789.666.

The project responds to the priorities identified in the **National Employment Policy (NEP)**, and aims at creating employment opportunities for the most vulnerable and disadvantaged groups, particularly women and young people across the country. The project also addresses pertinent issues related to labour rights and social dialogue mechanisms and structures in Mozambique.

The Moztrabalha project **has three objectives**:

Immediate Objective 1: Strengthen national policy and institutional environment, leading to increased promotion of decent employment and sustainable economic transformation.

Immediate Objective 2: Sectors are stimulated to create decent, sustainable and green employment opportunities for Mozambican women and men, in particular youth and those living in rural areas.

Immediate Objective 3 (added as Covid-19 Response): Resilient workers and enterprises to mitigate the socio-economic impact of COVID-19 in Mozambique

Beyond the upstream work meant to enable the environment and develop the policy and institutional framework (immediate objective 1), the project seeks to directly create and improve employment outcomes in both urban and rural areas, by focusing on: a)

¹ At the inception phase the counterpart Ministry from the GoMz was the Ministry of Labour Employment and Social Security (MITESS), but it was lately split in to Ministries: (i) The Ministry of Labour and Social Security (MTSS) and (ii) the Secretariat for Employment and Youth (SEJE in Portuguese) with more specific responsibilities in employment.

implementation of employment-intensive market infrastructure investments, b) stimulating Green Jobs through SME development and c) creating opportunities and reducing constraints to access productive employment for women and female-headed households (immediate objective 2). Later on, a third immediate objective was added to support workers and businesses, especially in the informal economy, that have been particularly hard hit by the Covid-19 crisis.

The project was designed to pursue a Market Systems Development (MSD) approach as the unifying framework to create employment opportunities in selected value chains.

The key stakeholders of the project are two distinguished target groups; intermediate/direct beneficiaries and ultimate beneficiaries.

1. The intermediate and direct beneficiaries are composed by public and private institutions with a stake in economic growth, employment development and labour related issues: ministries, local governments, employers (organized private sector and individual entrepreneurs) and workers' associations and unions.
2. The ultimate beneficiaries targeted are Mozambican women and men, especially those who live in poverty, and are engaged in various forms of economic activity ranging from highly insecure and vulnerable employment and 'survivalist' activity to more productive and gainful jobs, e.g. in formalized and growth-oriented enterprises.

The project is managed by a Chief Technical Adviser (CTA), responsible for overall project management based in Maputo, Mozambique, and reports to the director of the ILO CO for Malawi, Mozambique and Zambia in ILO Lusaka Office. Along the implementation process, two different persons have performed as CTA.

Initially the Project Management Team comprised also two other, internationally-recruited technical staff (only one performing currently), and three national project officers. The project is technically backstopped by DWT in the ILO Pretoria Office, with several specialists involved in backstopping their technical area of responsibility.

A Project Steering Committee (CPA) has provided strategic guidance to the implementation of the project, comprising highest government officials from Ministry of Labour & Social and Social Security (MTSS), the Secretariat for Youth and Employment (SEJE), the Confederation of Employers' associations (CTA), National Confederation of Free and Independent of Mozambique (CONSILMO Union) and Mozambique Workers' Organization (OTM), and other social partners.

As for the implementation of the activities, ILO relied on agreements and/or contracts with various partners: the National Directorate of Work (DNT) and the National Employment Institute (INEP) under the Ministry of Labour and Social Security (MTSS), the Alberto Cassimo VET institute (IFPELAC) under the Secretary for Youth and Employment (SEJE), the Institute for Small and Medium Enterprises (IPEME) under the Ministry of Industry and Trade (MIC), the National Directorate of Housing and Urbanism under The Ministry of Public Works, Habitation and Rural Development (MOPHRH), Municipalities (Beira, Boane, Maputo, Vilankulos), District Offices (Buzi, Caia, Nhamatanda, Dondo e Guara Guara) workers unions (OTM and CONSILMO), Employers (CTA), local associations (Reencontro, Nhamai, AVIMAS, AMOPSI) as well as private companies (GAPI, Aegrarios and Panavideo).

1.1.3. Brief summary of the main activities undertaken by Moztrabalha

The implementation of Moztrabalha began in December 2016 with the Inception Phase, which included the recruitment of the team, the set-up of the governance structure, the preliminary arrangements with stakeholders, the completion of the analysis and design

components such as the sector selection, the market system analysis, the development of the intervention logic and the fine-tuning of the work-plan. All these tasks required a lot of time and effort from the project team, taking about one year in total. From that moment onwards, the implementation has been conducted in difficult circumstances. After years of strong growth, the country experienced an economic downturn and uncertainty on several domestic fronts: low international commodity prices, natural disasters, political confrontation including violent clashes, security threats in northern provinces, the hidden debt scandal and, last but not least, the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic. All this configured a very complex scenario for the implementation of the project, ultimately requiring several adjustments and adaptations from ILO and its partners.

The project has nevertheless managed to deliver key products and services with respect to the anticipated outcomes. The formulation and approval by the council of ministers of the second National Employment Policy Implementation Plan (PAPE) is perhaps one of the key milestones concerning the strengthening of the policy and institutional framework (Outcome 1). Moztrabalha provided technical assistance, training and research to support the implementation of the NEP and complete the PAPE. The project also has supported the establishment of the newly created Secretary of State for Youth and Employment (SEJE), and promoted the Pro Employment Budgeting, the Employment Intensive Investment Programme (EIIP), and the consolidation and expansion of the Commission for Labour Mediation and Arbitration (COMAL). Moztrabalha also supported the development of the National Institute of Statistics (INEP) strategy for 2020-2024, the SEJE National Employment Institute (INEP) with the launching of two additional Employment Centres, the MIC Institute for the Promotion of SMEs (IPEME) and the Labour Market Observatory (LMO).

With regards to Outcome 2, Moztrabalha completed Market Systems Analyses of three value chains and undertook the promotion of two of them (alternative construction materials and horticulture). Various EIIP pilots for work were also completed in collaboration with different partners.

Outcome 3 was added upon the COVID-19 outbreak in 2020 and enabled the project to deliver various analyses related to Occupational Health and Safety (OHS) and pro-employment proposals. Under this component, a package of support was designed and implemented to support operators in the informal sector, mainly vendors in peri-urban markets.

A Mid-Term Evaluation was conducted between October and December 2019.

1.2. Purpose, scope and methodology applied in this evaluation

1.2.1. Presentation of the Evaluation Study

The Final Independent Evaluation of the project “**Decent work for sustainable and inclusive transformation in Mozambique (MOZTRABALHA)**” has been conducted by a team of two independent evaluators, José Maria Alvarez (Team Leader) and Fernando de los Rios (National Consultant), in coordination with the Project Coordination Team and under the supervision of the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer for the ILO Regional Office for Africa - Regional Program Unit/Abidjan.

The evaluation began on the 13th of September 2021 with the desk study phase, and this was in turn followed by the field phase which began on the 4th of October 2021 and continued until the 19nd of the same month. During the desk and field phases, an extensive list of consultations was conducted, including with managers from ILO at headquarters,

Regional Offices (South Africa) and national level, government representatives at central and local level, managers and technicians from implementing agencies, service providers, representatives of employers and worker's organizations and direct beneficiaries. In total, 65 people were consulted. More details about the number of people consulted in each group can be found under section 3.3 Methodology.

The consultation period culminated with a stakeholders' workshop organized with the aim of presenting and discussing the preliminary results gathered. The workshop was conducted by remote assistance on the 20th of October 2019 with 19 participants. This document constitutes the final version of the draft circulated among the stakeholders.

1.2.2. Purpose of the evaluation

The evaluation responds to the accountability and learning needs of different parties involved – donor, implementing agency, governments and other stakeholders in the project – to obtain an independent perspective regarding the way that the project's actions have evolved, and the impacts that they have had. This general purpose is described in the Terms of Reference (TORs) Annex I, and is represented again below:

1. Establish the relevance of the project design and implementation strategy in relation to the ILO, UN and national development frameworks (i.e. SDGs and UNDAF) and final beneficiaries needs;
2. Assess the extent to which the project has achieved its stated objectives and expected results, while identifying the supporting factors and constraints that have led to them, including strategies and implementation modalities chosen, partnership and arrangements
3. Identify unexpected positive and negative results of the project
4. Assess the level of implementation efficiency of the project.
5. Review the institutional set-up, capacity for project implementation, coordination mechanisms and the use and usefulness of management tools including the project monitoring tools and work plans;
6. Assess the extent to which the project outcomes will be sustainable;
7. Analyze the project impact at institutional level as well at the level of the final men and women beneficiaries
8. Identify specific lessons learned and potential good practices for the key stakeholders.
9. Provide strategic recommendations for the different key stakeholders to promote sustainability and support further development of the project outcomes.

1.2.3. Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will focus on the project, its achievements and its contribution to the overall national efforts to improve the governance and dialogue around labour relations and employment policies. It will focus on the whole implementation period, from December 2016 to March 2022, and do so in two phases. First, a main evaluation section for the period until September 2021, and secondly a desk-review to document updates from findings in the main evaluation process in February-March 2022. The evaluation assesses all the outputs and outcomes that have been delivered and/or achieved by the project, with particular attention to synergies between the components and contribution to national policies and programmes. In terms of geographical scope, it covers the central level and three provinces – namely Maputo, Sofala and Inhambane – where the project eventually carried out its direct interventions. For all practical purposes, ILO Evaluation policies and

guidelines² have been applied, Gender equality and non-discrimination have been integrated as cross-cutting concerns throughout its processes in accordance to EVAL guidance note n° 3.1 of the Pillar 3 (integrating gender equality in monitoring and evaluation projects). Furthermore, the evaluation has paid attention to issues related to social dialogue, tripartism and international labour standards.

1.2.4. Evaluation questions and criteria

The analytical framework of the evaluation derives from criteria and questions established in the ToR. They have been developed upon consultations carried out by the evaluation manager with the project stakeholders and in accordance with the guidance set by Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee (DAC-OECD) criteria and the ILO cross-cutting themes. This resulted in the following combined list of criteria: relevance and strategic fit, validity of the design, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. For each of these criteria, a number of evaluation questions were drafted – 31 in total.

a) Relevance and strategic fit,

- Is the project coherent with the Government objectives, National Development Frameworks, beneficiaries' needs, and does it support the outcomes outlined in the UNDAF/UNSDCF, DWCP, ILO Planning, as well as the SDGs?
- How does the project complement and fit with other on-going ILO programmes and projects in the country?
- What links have been established so far with other activities of the UN or other cooperating partners operating in the Country in the areas of employment, market development and women's empowerment?
- Has the project been able to leverage the ILO contributions, through its comparative advantages (including tripartism, international labour standards, ILO Decent Work Team etc.)?

b) Validity of intervention design

- Does the project address the major causes of unemployment and underemployment in Mozambique?
- Is the project realistic (in terms of expected outputs, outcome and impact) given the time and resources available, including performance and its M&E system, knowledge sharing and communication strategy?
- To what extent has the project integrated ILO cross cutting themes in the design?
- To what extent did the problem analysis identify its differential impact on men and women and on other vulnerable groups (like people with disabilities and others as relevant)?
- Are the indicators of the achievements clearly defined, describing the changes to be brought about? Were the indicators designed and used in a manner that they enabled reporting on progress under specific SDG targets and indicators?
- Is the project Theory of change comprehensive, integrate external factors and is based on systemic analysis?
-

c) Effectiveness:

- To what extent have the overall project objectives/outcomes been achieved?
- Were these results achieved through an integrated implementation of the project or through fragmented implementation of separate project components?
- Has the management and governance structure put in place worked strategically with all key stakeholders and partners in Mozambique, ILO and the donor to achieve project goals and objectives?
- Has the knowledge sharing and communication strategy been effective in raising the profile of the project within the country and among the cooperating partners?
- Is the monitoring and evaluation system results-based and facilitate a project adaptive management?
- Assess how contextual and institutional risks and external factors (positive and negative) have been managed by the project management?
- Was the market system approach successfully implemented as the unifying framework?
- Has the project implementation successfully adapted to changes over time?
- To what extent has the COVID-19 Pandemic influenced project results and effectiveness and how the project have addressed this influence to adapt to changes?
- Does the (adapted) intervention models used in the project suggest an intervention model for similar crisis response?

d) Efficiency of resource use

- Have resources (financial, human, technical support, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve the project outputs and specially outcomes?
- To what extent did the project leverage resources to promote gender equality and non-discrimination; and inclusion of people with disability

e) Impact orientation and sustainability

- What level of influence has the project achieved on the development of employment and other areas on policies and practices at national and subnational levels?
- Which project-supported tools have been, or have the potential to be, institutionalized and/or replicated by partners or external organizations?
- Is the project contributing to expand the knowledge base and build evidence regarding the project outcomes and impacts?
- To which extent are the results of the interventions likely to have a long term, sustainable positive contribution to the country's national development, SDG achievement and relevant targets? (explicitly or implicitly)
- How has the sustainability approach of the project been affected by the COVID-19 situation in context of the national responses and how has the project and stakeholders responded in moving forward the project results appropriation?

f) Gender equality and non-discrimination

- What are so far the key achievements of the project on gender equality and women's empowerment?
- Has the use of resources on women's empowerment activities been sufficient to achieve the expected results?
- To what extent is the M&E data supporting project decision making related to gender?
- Has the project addressed other vulnerable groups, including people living with disabilities?

1.2.5. Methodology applied

Overall approach: The evaluation complied with all of the evaluation norms and standards, and followed all ethical safeguards, as specified in the ILO's evaluation procedures. The ILO adheres to the United Nations Development Group's (UNDG) evaluation norms and standards, as well as their Evaluation Quality Standards. The methodological proposal has been aligned with the **principles and ideas outlined in the TORs**.

As a final evaluation exercise, the focus has not primarily fallen on the identification of adjustments or corrective measures to improve the implementation strategy and enhance the prospects of attaining the foreseen results. The objective is instead to compile those results, drawing lessons and informing possible links with other projects and/or future interventions. The evaluation team has learned that the Government of Sweden is firmly considering a second phase for the project, so that the conclusions of this evaluation are likely to become a key input for the design of the new phase.

It must be pointed out that the Theory of Change (ToC) approach has been taken on as the primary working instrument, with the logframe available serving as the main reference to conduct the analysis of achievements (effectiveness). This approach, however, has not acted as a limitation for the interpretation of other findings or for the analysis of data that go beyond the pre-established criteria and indicators.

Tools and instruments applied: Due to the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic and its impact on the world of work, this evaluation has been conducted in the context of criteria and approaches outlined in the ILO internal guide: *Implications of COVID-19 on evaluations in the ILO: An internal Guide on adapting to the situation* (version March 25, 2020). The team leader was not able to travel to the country during the field phase.

Taking into account the time constraints and resources, it was decided to apply a judicious combination of quantitative and qualitative techniques. In line with this, the tools selected include document reviews, semi-structured individual interviews by remote assistance or phone, group discussions, mini-surveys and the final stakeholders' workshop. The evaluation team considered these to be appropriate and feasibly-applicable tools, particularly as it would allow for information to be obtained and analyzed in relatively short periods of time – a specific requirement of this evaluation. The tools used in each case are included in Annexes III as well as the mini-surveys distributed to the stakeholders in Annex IV.

The phases of the evaluation. As for the sequence of phases and activities carried out, the evaluation has also followed the path anticipated in the TORs:

1st Phase: Inception phase. The inception phase took place between September 13th and September 24th and included: (i) an initial briefing with evaluation manager; (ii) a desk review which included documentary analysis and interviews with representatives of the

donor (SIDA); (iii) elaboration of data collection tools, including the evaluation matrix, guiding notes for interviews, focus groups and mini-surveys (see annex section); (iv) definition itinerary for the field work; (v) contacts between evaluation team members and (vi) preparation and delivery of the inception report.

2nd Phase: Fieldwork. The inception phase was in turn followed by the fieldwork between October 4th and October 18th. It included: (i) remote interviews and focus groups with national stakeholders; (ii) distribution of mini-surveys; (iii) further documentary analysis and (iv) organization of the final stakeholders' workshop on October 20th: a short PowerPoint was presented and followed by a discussion.

3rd Phase Analysis of the data and information collected and preparation of draft report. The evaluation team proceeded to the analysis of the information and the elaboration of the draft report. The analysis of the information was carried out mainly through the comparison of the obtained data and the indicators contained in the matrix of criteria. Some data are objective data that are more or less self-explanatory. Some others require interpretation that can vary given the experience and opinions of the evaluation team. In order to avoid biased interpretations, the evaluation team has pursued in every case the highest possible level of consensus. The draft report was delivered on November 8th.

Immediately afterwards, the team proceeded to draw up the draft report, this version being the first one shared to the evaluation manager, which was further distributed among the different stakeholders. Once the comments and reactions were received, a final version of the evaluation report was elaborated.

It is important to note that throughout its different phases, the evaluation has been managed by the ILO Evaluation Office (EVAL) through the Regional M&E Officer for Africa with oversight of EVAL, an independent office within the ILO structure.

1.2.6. Stakeholders.

In collaboration with ILO, the evaluation team developed the site sampling, confirmed the list of stakeholders to be included, scheduled the key informants' interviews and carried out data analysis and report writing from October 21st to November 5th, 2021. The list of people contacted can be found in Annex VI.

The number of people interviewed by stakeholder group and sex can be seen in the following table:

| Stakeholder Group | Number of persons interviewed | Male | Female |
|---|-------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Project managers and technicians | 10 | 9 | 1 |
| ILO – Decent Country Team Support | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| Donor | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Representatives of employers and unions | 5 | 4 | 1 |
| National Stakeholders: Governmental departments and central and regional level, local authorities, target groups (local associations, NGOs, businesses) and other service providers | 35 | 25 | 11 |
| End beneficiaries | 9 | 2 | 7 |
| TOTAL persons interviewed: | 65 | 40 | 23 |
| TOTAL interviews: | 51 | | |

1.3. Limitations and conditions facing the evaluation.

The findings in this evaluation are based on information collected from project reports and background documents, interviews with project staff, key stakeholders, and project participants. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, there were no site visits; the evaluation team conducted all interviews remotely via telephone or video conferencing platforms. Project staff selected respondents based in part on the selected individuals' ability to connect with the evaluators online or by telephone. The evaluation team made every effort to include a diverse sample of project stakeholders, but it was not possible to conduct focus groups due to COVID-19 gathering restrictions.

Three mini-surveys were conducted targeting three different groups: (i) Public Institutions; (ii) Implementing Partners (private and Civil Society Organizations) and (iii) Social Partners. Since the number surveys completed has been relatively small (5, 3 and 5) its statistical significance is very limited, and therefore the statistics emerging from the surveys will not be presented in this report. They have been, nevertheless, revised by the evaluation team and taken into consideration to deliver the analysis presented further ahead.

This evaluation relied on secondary performance information in annual reports and in available monitoring databases. The evaluation team did not have time or resources to confirm the validity and reliability of performance data. The team correlated stakeholder responses with quantitative data to the extent possible to strengthen the accuracy and reliability of the evaluation.

The limitations presented above were managed in such a way that have not affected the validity of the evaluation, especially triangulation of sources has been key to address COVID 19 limitations.

SECTION II: ANALYSIS BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

2.1. Relevance and strategic fit.

The analysis of this criterion was guided by the following questions:

- Is the project coherent with the Government objectives, National Development Frameworks, beneficiaries' needs, and does it support the outcomes outlined in the UNDAF/UNSDCF, DWCP, ILO Planning, as well as the SDGs?
- How does the project complement and fit with other on-going ILO programmes and projects in the country?
- What links have been established so far with other activities of the UN or other cooperating partners operating in the Country in the areas of employment, market development and women's empowerment?
- Has the project been able to leverage ILO's comparative advantages (including tripartism, international labour standards, ILO Decent Work Team etc.)?

The project deserves a very positive assessment with regard to all the aspects covered by the evaluation questions under this criterion. There is a general consensus that the project constituted a very positive initiative to address the acute problems that hamper employment creation and the proper-functioning of the Mozambican labour market: high rates of unemployment, under-employment, informality, poor working conditions for Mozambicans workers, and labour market stakeholders with very limited capacities to tackle these challenges. The project adequately meets the specific needs of the target groups and stakeholders. It is consistent with national/local policies, as well as with the strategies of the donor and the ILO. Most of the analysis presented in the Mid-Term Evaluation remains valid at this stage. Ahead are some facts that serve to support this assessment.

It is widely accepted across the spectrum of stakeholders that the project represented a key response to unemployment, under-employment and other critical, often structural challenges that characterise the Mozambican labour market³. The document review conducted by the evaluation team confirms this positive view. Some qualified respondents expressed the view that Moztrabalha, through the technical assistance, training and the research provided, made a key contribution in the operationalization of the National

³ The ILO document "ILO at a glance: its work in Mozambique" summarizes the main challenges of the Mozambican labour market as follows:

- High unemployment (estimated at 16%, and much higher among youth) and diverse forms of under-employment (estimated 300,000 workers are covered by Collective Bargaining Agreements - CBAs)
- Burgeoning informal economy and a lack of skilled labour to respond to the needs of industry.
- The national employment rate is 67.2% with a higher participation being men with 68.2% and women with 66.4%
- Among the skilled workforce, the gender gap in employment rate demonstrates more inequality (57.4% for men and 48.7% for women)
- Barely 19% of the population living below the poverty line in Mozambique is covered by basic social protection program

Employment Strategy (NEP), highlighting in this regard its correspondence with the Government strategic priorities.

The Government of Mozambique (GoMz) has pledged to create three million jobs in its political manifesto for the current mandate. The Government's Five-Year Plan (2020-2024) lays out as its foremost priorities boosting economic growth, increasing productivity, and encouraging job creation. The National Employment Policy (NEP) is an expression of this commitment, while a number of other sectoral plans are also contributing to the promotion of employment and employability, among them: (i) The Industrial Policy and Strategy; (ii) The Aquaculture Development Strategy; (iii) The Investment Law Regulation; (iv) The Project "Sustenta", with great impact on agriculture, and (v) a number of youth-focused policies. Stakeholders clearly endorse the alignment of the project with the main policies and plans being implemented in the country. Links and connections with the national strategic priorities can be verified by reviewing the report of the "High Level Meeting on Employment" held in Maputo on 20th May 2021. This report represents a clear endorsement of the Moztrabalha project in this particular regard.

Moztrabalha lends continuity to previous ILO interventions and has served to elevate the profile of the tripartite model in the country, a feature which is perceived as one of the ILO's main added values. The ILO has worked together with the Government of Mozambique for the last decade on social protection issues, providing technical and financial assistance to support national dialogue and key policy reforms. Regarding the employment sector, however, ILO Interventions have been limited to a few small-scale actions, such as: (i) the "More and better Jobs in Cabo Delgado and Nampula" (funded by the Spanish agency AECID), (ii) the "Skills employment and productivity in Low income countries" (funded by the Korean agency KOICA), and (iii) the "Strengthening skills development system to promote access and employability especially of young women and men (funded by Norwegian NORAD). The technical support provided by ILO for the elaboration of the NEP paved the way for a more comprehensive intervention in this line of action. This particular endeavour was made possible by the financial support provided by the Swedish International Cooperation Agency (SIDA). Today, Moztrabalha represents one of the flagships projects of ILO in Mozambique⁴.

The evaluation team has also noted the attention paid by the national stakeholders to the promotion and mainstreaming of decent work, as well as of other key features of ILO's interventions like strengthening social dialogue and the progressive incorporation of international labour standards into the domestic regulatory framework. National

⁴ Other ongoing ILO actions in the Mozambique are:

- ACTION/Portugal (Phase 2): Strengthening of the Social Protection systems of the PALOP – Mozambique;
- United Nations Joint Program on Social Protection in Mozambique (2018 – 2021), jointly implemented with UNICEF and financed by Sweden, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom's Foreign Affairs and Commonwealth Development Office;
- ILO-Irish Aid Project – Southern Africa Component: Inclusive Growth, Social Protection and Jobs;
- Contribution to Improved Quality of Social Protection and Social Welfare Services, jointly implemented with UNICEF and financed by the Embassy of Ireland in Mozambique;
- ILO-Sweden Government Promotion decent work for a sustainable and economic transformation in Mozambique;
- ILO-Brazilian Government promoting decent work in Cotton plantations in Mozambique;
- ILO-Flanders Scaling up the HIV and AIDs Response in the Workplace

stakeholders generally perceive the ILO's main contribution to be its emphasis on the rights-based approach and the judicious combination of economic and social goals. Unlike initiatives promoted by other development partners that mainly seek to boost the economic performance of their target groups, national stakeholders appreciate that ILO projects seek to marry this goal with the consolidation of fundamental rights at work and the progressive incorporation of international labour standards. In this sense, the tripartite model is regarded as a very valuable proposal to facilitate dialogue and enhance participation of the different stakeholders, and through this ensure their engagement and ownership.

Moreover, Moztrabalha has been clearly aligned with the successive ILO P&B: 2016-17; 2018-19 and 2020-21, and with other national, regional and global strategic frameworks. These linkages are well-presented throughout the project documentation. Links with the Mozambique UN Development Assistance Framework 2017 – 2020 (UNDAF) are also evident, for example in Outcome 2 (“Poor people benefit equitably from sustainable economic transformation”), and Outcome 4 (“Disadvantaged women and girls benefit from comprehensive policies, norms and practices that guarantee their human rights”).

At the regional level, Moztrabalha also aligns with priority 4.2 (Poverty Eradication); 4.4 (Gender Equality and Development) and 4.8 (Private Sector of the Regional Indicative Strategy of the Southern African Development Community (SADC)).

The project is closely related to Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) #8, which aims to “Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all”. It also supports SDG #5, which seeks to “Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls”. The project is also aligned with SDG #1 (eradicate poverty), #2 (end hunger), and #10 (reduce inequalities), #12 (sustainable production and consumption), and #13 (climate action).

The table below presents a summary of the national and international priorities supported by the project.

Figure 1 Alignment of Outcomes with UN, ILO and Mozambique’s priorities (National and International)

| UN, ILO and Mozambique’s priorities(National and International) | Outcome 1 | Outcome 2 |
|---|--|---|
| SDGs | SDG 8 and SDG 5 | SDG 1, SDG 5 and SDG 8 |
| UNDAF 2017-2020 | Outcomes 2 and 4 | Outcome 2 and 4 |
| African Union | Malabo Summit (2011) Youth Decade Plan of Action 2009-2018 (Assembly/AU/Decl.1 (XVII). | Malabo Summit (2011) Youth Decade Plan of Action 2009-2018 (Assembly/AU/Decl.1 (XVII). |
| SADC | Implementation of SADC Revised RISDP 2015-2020 and Industrialization Strategy 2015-2063. | Implementation of SADC Revised RISDP 2015-2020 and Industrialization Strategy 2015-2063. |
| 2016-2017 P&B | Outcome 1, 4, 10 | Outcome 1, 4 and 6 |
| 2018-2019 P&B | Outcome 1, 6 and 10 | Outcome 1, 5 |
| 2020-2021 P&B | Outcome 1, and 6 | Outcome 3 |
| CPO | MOZ 101, 103, 152 | MZ101 |
| NEP | Pillar # 2 (Creation of new jobs) and # 5 (Improvement of the Labor Market Information System) Five-Year Government Program for 2015-2019, Strategic Objective (iii) Five-Year Government Program for 2020-2024, Pillar II (Good Governance and de-centarlization) | Pillar 2 and Five-Year Government Program for 2015-2019, Strategic Objective (iii) Priority 2 of the Five-Year Government Program for 2020-2024 (“Drive economic growth, productivity and job creation”) |

Source: Monitoring Results Management (MRM) of the project with added inputs from the evaluation team

Further to the linkages with different strategic frameworks, the project has also presented an opportunity to develop specific partnerships and/or collaborations with other development agencies acting in related domains. Most of the examples collected by the evaluation team refer to experiences with other UN agencies, mainly UN Habitat (in relation to the building materials value chain) and UNDP (regarding the Enabling the Environment for Sustainable Enterprises -ESEE)), although there have also been contacts with UN Women, UNICEF, UNIDO, IOM and UNESCO. Specific collaboration with FAO has not materialized due to the different geographical remits of the agencies. Outside of the UN system, there are examples of synergies and complementarities with the African Development Bank, which is also supporting the Labour Market Observatory (LMO). Actions by the Japanese and the Italian Cooperation Agencies, moreover, have lent continuity to some of the lines of actions started by the project.

Coordination between the different donors and development partners remains challenging. Although national policies such as the NEP act as common structure for all the partners, there remains a need to strengthen the communication and collaboration mechanisms. The evaluation team has learned that under the coordination of the UNFPA an informal group

has recently been set-up (the “Youth Partners Group”) to serve these purposes. Meetings are being held monthly, with both ILO and SIDA participating regularly. According to the testimonies gathered by the evaluation team, the organizations participating in this group have shown genuine interest in consolidating a coordination dynamic, but no specific examples of this interest have yet materialized.

2.2. Validity of the design

The analysis of this criterion was guided by the following questions:

- Does the project address the major causes of unemployment and underemployment in Mozambique?
- Is the project realistic (in terms of expected outputs, outcome and impact) given the time and resources available, including performance and its M&E system, knowledge sharing and communication strategy?
- To what extent has the project integrated ILO cross cutting themes in the design?
- To what extent did the problem analysis identify its differential impact on men and women and on other vulnerable groups (like people with disabilities and others as relevant)?
- Are the indicators of the achievements clearly defined, describing the changes to be brought about? Were the indicators designed and used in a manner that enabled reporting on progress under specific SDG targets and indicators?
- Is the project Theory of Change comprehensive, does it integrate external factors and is it based on systemic analysis?

The project clearly addresses the causes of unemployment and underemployment in Mozambique. It uses a comprehensive approach that covers the following different levels⁵:

The analysis of problems described in the concept note and the Prodoc is consistent and presented in a convincing manner. The analytical framework underpinning the program strategy takes inspiration from systems theory and frames the project action in the context of a people-centred market systems development approach. This means that the target groups to be reached through the programme are analysed in the context of their network of institutional relationships. The model places an emphasis on interaction rather than

-
- ⁵ Meta-level: perceptions and beliefs sets held by actors across system levels, including their notions towards entrepreneurship and gender equality.
 - Macro-level: rules of interaction between the stakeholders along the network, as codified in policies, laws and regulations.
 - Meso-level: institutional capacity and quality of services delivered
 - Micro-level: the exchange of goods and services in the market place, including the exchange of labour as well as financial services.

individual stakeholder capacity. The project has tried to achieve its objectives by influencing those interactions.

No major disagreements have emerged regarding the analysis of problems, its underlying rationale and the selection of the three key outcomes. The decision to act both at the policy/institutional level (Outcome 1) and at the direct-action level by stimulating job-rich sectors (Outcome 2) is judged to be consistent with the analysis of problems and coherent with ILO's mandate and trajectory in the country. The addition in 2020 of a response to the COVID-19 crisis (Outcome 3) is also sufficiently justified by the ensued circumstances. The evaluation team has also been able to establish that a thorough consultation process with the main stakeholders and partners was conducted as part of the design process. These were able to confirm, through the interviews and the mini-survey distributed, that the design was carried out in a participative manner.

The vertical logic between the outputs and outcomes is also deemed to be adequate, although some questions can be raised regarding the scale and capacity of some outputs to attain the expected outcomes (e.g., the set-up of rural cooperatives to introduce soil-cement building materials in the construction sector). Likewise, some issues have been raised in the past regarding the absence of a fully-fledged Theory of Change (ToC) – the underlying logic linking together the project inputs and activities to a set of outcomes.

The assessment of the mid-term evaluation (MTE) was that the project lacked a comprehensive ToC and was instead applying the logical framework approach. This approach basically establishes the logic underpinning the project design, but does not include a clear description of how to fulfil or implement this logic, nor detail how or why the interventions would lead to the expected outcomes and final objectives. The report of the MTE states that the absence of a full ToC might cause some confusion to the implementers: “while in the minds of the designers, the causal relations or the pathways to reach the expected outcomes could be clear, the actual implementers of the project may have some doubts on how to proceed, due to a lack of clarity” (P.48). The report goes on to recommend the further development of a “Theory of Change to support and develop the logical framework”.

In fact, the ToC has not been developed in the conventional manner. The diagram with the hierarchy of outputs and outcomes leading to the expected impact is deemed to be sound and technically well-defined. It also includes a column with the pre-identified risks and assumptions. That said, the narrative that binds together the analysis of conditions to be given, the role of the different stakeholders, the risks and assumptions, the external factors etc. is still absent. It has nevertheless been observed (from the documental analysis and the views gathered via interviews) that, as part of the programming and preparatory activities conducted throughout the inception and implementation phases, the project team has carried out different types of exercises (workshops, consultations, systems analysis, internal discussions, etc.) whose implicit aim was comparable to unpacking the different elements of the ToC. The development of the Monitoring Results Management system (MRM) also included the definition of the so called “results chain”, which plays a similar role to developing a ToC for each specific result.

While the ToC has not been applied in the conventional manner, this does not necessarily reflect the absence of analysis about how to achieve the different objectives. In fact, for a

project that embraces as many lines of action as Moztrabalha, disaggregating the ToC into separate chunks in order to use a more developmental approach is deemed a perfectly reasonable option. Among the project documents, it is for example possible to find a detailed analysis for each of the value chains. While this analysis does not replace the role of a common and all-embracing ToC – particularly with regard to the anticipation of external factors – it can nevertheless serve a useful purpose in establishing a common understanding of the path envisioned for each stakeholder in achieving specific objectives. Taken together, the evaluation team recognizes the project’s use of alternative mechanisms and tools to identify the path towards change.

As it has been said, no major issues have been raised concerning the underlying analysis and the selection of the project’s main components. The evaluation team has found broad consensus among the stakeholders regarding the adequacy of these elements. There are, however, some issues regarding how this analysis (which is deemed sound overall) has been translated into a realistic and workable package of intervention. Specifically, this refers to the selection of some methodologies and the assumptions made for the implementation of such an ambitious and comprehensive endeavor.

As for the methodological aspects, the evaluation team has gathered some contentious issues related to the use of Market System Development (MSD) approach. This methodology is widely regarded as very thorough, robust and comprehensive model, but there are different views about its appropriateness as the overarching analytical framework of Moztrabalha. The discrepancy mainly involves ILO and SIDA stakeholders. No specific views have been collected regarding this point from the national stakeholders. The upcoming paragraphs seek to unpack this discrepancy.

ILO respondents from the RO Pretoria and the HQ have conveyed some doubts about the MSD to the evaluation team. They can be summarized as follows:

1. The MSD can be exceedingly demanding and not realistic for a project like Moztrabalha, whose context is particularly challenging. In order to optimize the potential of the MSD, some conditions have to be given. These relate to the knowledge and expertise available (including the ILO team), the possibility of generating good quality data, and the time available, among others. In the view of some informants, such conditions were not necessarily in place at the start of the project, there were many headwinds to confront something which ultimately caused some frustration to the stakeholders and delays to the implementation process.
2. The MSD enterprise approach at sub-sectoral levels and in value chains is not well suited to the broader enabling environment for employment policy promotion. The combination of an MSD approach with other non-MSD approaches in one and the same project proved difficult to implement. If MSD is implemented, it should be ring-fenced and run independently by an agile and responsive project management with a quick turnaround time.
3. Given those circumstances, the added value that the MSD can bring about is not clear. There are other, more conventional (but still systematic) methods that can deliver good results in light of the time and resources available. The MSD has proven challenging for ILO in other contexts as well (e.g. Rwanda), so that its application might require further reflection from the organization.

Representatives of the Swedish Embassy, meanwhile, uphold the validity of the MSD as a methodology that has delivered good results in very challenging contexts (including Mozambique), therefore evidencing its feasibility in this particular context. Indeed, some conditions have to be given for its successful application, including the clear willingness to fully apply the approach, the adequate knowledge and expertise by the project team and an exercise of context-adaptation. Those three elements were not necessarily in place in this case, so that Moztrabalha ended up applying a ‘downgraded’ version of the MSD that lacked a great deal of its systemic character.

Regarding this difference of opinion, the evaluation team considers that delivering a judgement about the appropriateness of the MSD approach exceeds the scope and possibilities of this evaluation exercise. It seems clear, however, that its application to this particular project would have greatly benefited from a formal prior analysis into its applicability, a sort of checklist to verify that the main conditions were in place: ownership, technical capacities, compatibility with other methods, availability of data and information, specific adaptations to the context – to mention just a few of those relayed by the respondents.

The MSD approach has also determined the characteristics of the monitoring system. The Monitoring Result and Management (MRM) system applied by Moztrabalha is based on the Donor Committee for Enterprise Development (DCED) standard for measuring results in private sector development. It is characterized by the strong emphasis placed on the traceability of the results, resulting in a significant amount of data collection and processing.

The MRM contemplates the follow-up of 14 indicators corresponding to the outcome level and 76 corresponding to the output level. Within such an extensive list, a number of different flaws were identified in relation to the selection of the indicators, the formulation and/or the verification sources. For example:

- Some indicators, such as the “Percent by which coverage of employers’ organizations has been extended to informal business” are repeated in both the outcome and the output level. An the same for the workers’ organizations.
- Inconsistencies in the horizontal logic. For the two indicators just mentioned, quantitative targets have been set (achieving a 20% increase), while the calculation method seems to be a qualitative estimate.
- For several indicators, the target set seems somewhat unrealistic for the project, a miscalculation that can unfairly penalize the project when analyzing its performance. Some examples in this regard include those referring to the number of enterprises or jobs created.
- Other indicators such as “Number of public and private organizations committing to use gender sensitive employment intensive investment approach” (Indicator 2 of Outcome 1) attempt to measure something very difficult to measure such as “commitment”. Proxies would need to be identified, given that commitment *per se* is not measurable.
- In some other cases, the indicator selected does not seem to have clear relation to the output whose achievement it intends to measure, for example, “Number of people successfully placed in employment (target 1.2 million)”, which has been

included as an indicator for Output 1.6: “Labour Market Information System (LMIS) strengthened”.

- The indicator measuring the “number of labour conflicts mediated” (outcome 1) might be misleading when it comes to assessing the progress made by the labour mediation and arbitration services (COMAL). While an increase in the number of cases arbitrated or mediated might certainly be seen as a success in creating alternatives to the judiciary route, COMAL is also offering prevention services whose aim is avoiding the mediation or arbitration stage. Less cases going through mediation or arbitration might be a sign of successful prevention.

In any case, beyond the technical aspects related to the selection and formulation of the indicators, what appears questionable about the MRM is the breath and scope of the indicators, together with the intricacies inherent to the collection and processing of such a vast amount of information. This has derived in a very complex and somehow convoluted system which has been difficult to apply at its full extent. It appears that the lack of context-adaptation of the DCED Standard for Results Measurement might have contributed to this complexity.

It should be noted that for each of the 13 outputs, the MRM contemplates the elaboration of an Intervention Guide (IG) which in turn contains ten sections⁶. This means that the monitoring of each output requires measuring its direct indicators (four or five in each case), on top of much more information which is needed to feed the Intervention Guide. An attempt was made during the early stages of the implementation to design a software platform (Smartsheet) to facilitate this process, but unfortunately this did not perform well according to the testimonies gathered.

The result has been a system which requires the completion and aggregation of around a hundred excel spreadsheets. This has become very onerous for the project team, who have often struggled to pull all the necessary data and information together. Besides, the COVID-19 outbreak made things even more complicated, not only in terms of collecting the information but also with regards to the time available from the Moztrabalha officers to conduct the monitoring tasks as initially planned. Currently, different data and information are available, with which it is possible to obtain a snapshot of the project achievements. Yet in comparison with what was initially anticipated, there are a number of gaps and shortcomings (as will be detailed further ahead, under the effectiveness section).

This pattern of endeavoring to do much more than is realistically achievable can be observed with Moztrabalha as a whole. The project seeks to carry out many, very relevant individual actions. However, when these are brought together without duly considering the implications on time and resources, the result is a very complex intervention to manage and take forward. This seems to have been the case according to the assessment of various respondents.

Two different hypotheses can be put forward to explain the problems experienced by the project in this regard. The first one would be the lack of focus. The mere aggregation of so

⁶(1) title page; (2) Story; (3) Results Chain; (4) Monitoring Plan; (5) Projections and results; (6) Calculations; (7) Attribution/Contribution Method; (8) Infolog and Diary; (10) Results chain updated log; (10) List of stakeholders

many lines of actions, ranging from developing an Action Plan for a National Policy to the coordination of a training process for civil servants, results in an impractical package of intervention, one that is very difficult to streamline into a single project and very challenging to manage by a single team.

The second hypothesis points to the absence of a thorough analysis of the conditions that should be in place to implement such an ambitious workplan (including 58 activities). A number of assumptions about the capacities of the team and the conditions in place were made that precluded a full assessment of the project's inherent complexity. It could be said that the project was effectively set in motion following an incomplete or overly optimistic assessment. In fact, the reality has not been so straight-forward. The roll out of an intervention like this, with so many actors involved at the implementation level, has proven to be a much more complex and problem-laden task than initially considered. Processes and institutional arrangements are usually difficult to identify and articulate. In complex operations like this, there is very often a gap between what is planned and what can be operationalized, so that it is crucial to carefully anticipate the conditions that need to be in place: capacities, commitments, common understanding, roles to be played by the different parties, etc. The development of a general ToC, although not detailed enough to anticipate the path towards change for the respective components, could have helped to anticipate some of these aspects.

That said, it is recognized that the Moztrabalha implementation strategy has followed a flexible and developmental approach, a style that has enabled the project team to introduce corrective measures along the implementation process. The project's ability to maintain and adapt the dynamic has been instrumental not only for the purposes of adjusting the initial design to the pace and conditions of the context, but also to cope with the impact of unexpected external factors, such as the passage of three cyclones (Eloise, Idai and Kenneth) and the COVID-19 pandemic. While the project team in many cases felt overstretched in trying to implement the 58 activities contemplated in the workplan, the team was generally able to adapt and figure out alternatives to move in the desired direction.

Finally, it is confirmed that ILO's cross cutting themes (gender equality, non-discrimination, tripartism, and environmental issues) have been dully considered in the project design and/or received thorough attention during the implementation process. Tripartism and environmental issues are explicit in the results framework, particularly in outputs 1.3; 1.4 and 1.5. The project contemplated specific products to support the Mozambican government (GoMz) in the development of "green macro-economics sectoral policies", although this component was eventually dropped off the workplan.

Promotion of social dialogue and the support to the social partners have been widely present in both the design and the implementation of Moztrabalha, as will be further detailed under the effectiveness section. Likewise, the gender equality dimension has taken a prominent role among the project priorities. In this regard, the project document contains various sections where the specific needs of women are considered, as well as data on the presence of women and youth in the labour market. Non-discrimination received attention via the social dialogue component under Outcome 1 (Domestic workers' rights and outreach to the informal sector) and through Outcome 3 (support to informal workers). No

specific actions were foreseen to tackle discrimination of other specific groups such as disabled people, migrants or people living with HIV. Likewise, no targets have been set in the Results Framework regarding these two themes, but both have received extensive attention as cross-cutting issues. More analysis will be presented under the criterion “Gender equality and non-discrimination” ahead.

2.3. Project effectiveness

The analysis of this criterion was guided by the following questions:

- To what extent have the overall project objectives/outcomes been achieved?
- Were these results achieved through an integrated implementation of the project, or through fragmented implementation of separate project components?
- Has the management and governance structure put in place worked strategically with all key stakeholders and partners in Mozambique, ILO and the donor to achieve project goals and objectives?
- Has the knowledge sharing and communication strategy been effective in raising the profile of the project within the country and among the cooperating partners?
- Is the monitoring and evaluation system results-based, and does it facilitate a project adaptive management?
- How have contextual and institutional risks, and external factors (positive and negative) been managed?
- Was the market system approach successfully implemented as the unifying framework?
- Has the project implementation successfully adapted to changes over time?
- To what extent has the COVID-19 Pandemic influenced project results and effectiveness? How has the project adapted in light of the COVID-19 Pandemic?
- Can the (adapted) intervention models be considered a template to follow in other situations of crisis adaptation?

The analysis of effectiveness will be disaggregated in two different sections.

Firstly, attention is paid to the extent that the project has achieved its objectives and fulfilled its outcomes. This will be mainly done by comparison against the logframe indicators, as well as by verifying the presence of other, unanticipated effects. Since the project has applied such a long list of indicators (90 for the outcome the output level), it is not particularly convenient to go through a detailed review of each indicator. Thus, only the 14 indicators corresponding to the outcome level will be analyzed. The evaluation team has extracted the latest values from the MRM registers and elaborated a summary of the achievements made by the project using the logframe indicators that can be found at Annex VI. The second part of the analysis will be devoted to those evaluation questions pertaining to the implementation arrangements, including the structure, governance and the capacity to deliver. Some other questions included under effectiveness, such as those referring to

the MSD and the Monitoring System (MRM), have already been considered under the relevance section, as they were found to touch upon aspects of this criterion.

Analysis of the achievements

As already mentioned earlier, there are some gaps in the reporting of the indicators. This is largely due to the COVID-19 outbreak in 2020, which hampered the collection of information and data. Moreover, data corresponding to 2021 are still to be collected and processed. Nevertheless, the evaluation team will use some of the data available in the logframe to illustrate the findings presented in this section. The presentation will follow the structure of the results framework, starting with the immediate effects triggered in relation to each outcome and then a summary of the main outputs delivered under each.

In general, and despite some difficulties in implementation of some components, Moztabalha has been able to trigger various dynamics of change and transformation: a more strategic vision, better services, more capacities in place, to name just a few examples. In some other cases, however, it seems that the initiatives undertaken by the project have not reached the scale required to trigger transformative and durable effects.

The following is a more detailed recount of the main achievements of the project against its results framework.

Outcome 1: Strengthen national policy and institutional environment, leading to increased promotion of decent employment and sustainable economic transformation:

The general assessment of the evaluation team is that Moztrabalha has made important contributions towards the strengthening of the national policy and institutional environment. The evaluation team has gathered some additional data and information that supports the view of Moztrabalha as instrumental in the enhancement of pro-employment policies and decent work in Mozambique.

With regard to the implementation of the NEP, it is important to remember that there are no fewer than 21 sectors (each representing different ministries and governmental branches) integrated into one single plan, an achievement that should not be understated. Budgeting and the monitoring of the Action Plan remain as outstanding challenges, but despite these limitations the Action Plan has also enhanced the level of precedence that NEP is given in the political agenda of the Mozambican government. This is evident in reading the report of the recent High Level Meeting on Employment Policy (May 2021).

There is also evidence of stronger institutions that are capable of providing more and better services. In this regard, on top of references already made to COMAL and the Labor Market Observatory, there are examples from the INEP, which has more systems and infrastructure available for the insertion of people in the labour market. Additionally, the IPEME applies new methodologies to support start-ups and business promotion. Unfortunately, the project collaboration with the IFPELAC was not very successful and various contracts were

suspended due to mismanagement issues. Despite this, representatives of the institution still report some learnings related to the EIIP model, the construction alternative materials and the gender mainstreaming have been incorporated in the IFPELAC's pool of resources.

Finally, the social partners, particularly the Union sector, also report improvements in their capabilities and skills for Social Dialogue, specifically in relation to the collective bargaining and the negotiation of the minimum wage. The elaboration of comparative analysis to reform the regulatory framework (e.g. the regulation of domestic work in accordance with the ILO Convention 189) have also been referred to as a result of Moztrabalha. Also, within this line of action, there is evidence of the impact of the EESE diagnoses in the agenda of the employer's association (CAT), which has made provisions to continue some of the analysis initiated by the exercise in relation to the business environment in the country.

Review of indicators corresponding to Outcome 1

The revision of the logframe indicators offer a mixed picture of achievements and shortcomings, although the overall contextualized picture is a positive one.

These indicators are:

1. Number of productive jobs created as result of NEP implementation.
2. Number of public and private organizations committing to use a gender sensitive employment intensive investment approach
3. Percent of the budget of sectorial ministries that is employment- and gender-mainstreamed
4. Percent by which coverage of employers' organizations has been extended to informal business
5. Percent by which coverage of workers organizations has been extended to informal workers
6. Number of labour conflicts mediated
7. LMIS providing reliable and gender sensitive Labour Market data on a quarterly basis, including Annual Labour market forecasting
8. Number of vacancies filled through the employment centres

As explained earlier with regards to the performance of the MRM, some of the indicators have proved to be inadequate for the purpose of measuring the fulfilment of Outcome 1. For example, **Indicator #1** (referring the number of jobs created) has been ruled out by the monitoring team due to the weakness of the attribution link. As for **Indicators #4 and #5**, the evaluation team understand there to be no robust sources or verification, so that the social partners are providing an estimate.

Regarding **Indicator #2** (referring to the commitment of public and private institutions to use EIIP), the MRR lists 16 institutions which include Target, MOPHRH, ANE, OIKOS ANAMM, GREPOC, UNHABITAT, IOM, the Japanese Embassy, Italian Cooperation, IFPELAC and the local governments of Boane, Maputo, Beira and Manica. It is not clear

what is the binding force of these commitments, or to what extent they will be translated into an effective use of EIIP. So far, the evaluation team has learned of only one replication experience, conducted by the Japanese Cooperation (JICA) and taking place in the province of Manica.

Some of the institutions approached by the evaluation team, particularly the local governments, have expressed interest in the model. They have been able to provide examples of the benefits that it brings about – basically the provision of job opportunities for local residents and the benefits that it leaves in terms of capacities of the local workforce. The drawbacks are mostly related to the management of a program like this, which involves contracting, training and supervising many people. The role of the intermediary figure (the contractor), who often deals with all these tasks, seems to be the Achilles heel of the model. The qualitative perception of the evaluation team is that at this stage there are relatively good prospects of the EIIP model being applied by NGOs and Development Partners in their reconstruction programs, however it is not clear whether further replication will take place by public institutions.

As for **Indicator #3** (referring to the mainstreaming percentage of employment and gender allocations in the budget of sectorial ministries), the MRM reports 10% for the MOLESS in 2019 and 5% for the MEF in 2020. No figure is reported concerning the gender mainstreaming. In general, this is perhaps one area that remains particularly challenging and constitutes one of the bigger constraints to fully implementing the NEP.

Indicator # 6 refers to the number of labour conflicts mediated. The MRM shows a realization of approximately 10,000 cases against a target of 31,400. The information collected by the evaluation team regarding this line of action is, however, very positive and there are consistent testimonies indicating that Moztrabalha has played a key role in the consolidation and expansion of the COMAL. This institution has grown in various ways: providing more services (prevention, mediation and management of conflicts), being present in more provinces and becoming better known by key labour market stakeholders. Internally, the COMAL is using indicators referring to the conciliation success of the mediation services, which are probably more telling about the progress made than the number of cases mediated. This indicator shows significant progress, from 63% success at the baseline situation to a current 85% success rate. COMAL respondents have convincingly argued that the prevention services are reducing the number of mediated cases, but this should be interpreted as a sign of success and not of failure.

Indicator # 7, which measures the delivery of data and information by the Labour Market Observatory, has fulfilled the target set: four quarterly reports produced annually. The Observatory is another line of action which has made relatively good progress. There is a structure in place for collecting, processing and delivering information about the labour market. The service still requires further development regarding the reliability of its sources and the dissemination of data to the wider public. It was in certain cases reported that the information system provided by Moztrabalha is not yet performing satisfactorily and may therefore require some fine-tuning.

Indicator #8 refers to the number of vacancies filled through the employment centres. It shows a low performance, since approximately 21,000 vacancies are reported to be filled against a target of 74,000 vacancies. The hypothesis of the employment centres not yet delivering to their full potential is a plausible one, but some question marks remain as to how realistic and well-informed the original target was.

Delivery of outputs corresponding to Outcome 1

Moving onto the delivery of outputs, the evaluation team has found that Moztrabalha has delivered a wide range of key products and services to enhance the national policies and strengthen the institutional environment related to the promotion of decent employment. A selection of these products and services is presented ahead:

- The elaboration of Employment Policy Action Plan (PAPE). Moztrabalha supported the MTSS to elaborate the PAPE, which was approved by the cabinet in January 2018. It includes integrated actions under eight pillars, as well as a monitoring plan. A second PAPE was approved on 2021, as well as the annual reporting of the previous one, bringing different ministries together who reported on their NEP implementation activities and employment impact.
- Enabling the Environment for Sustainable Enterprises (EESA) assessments of the business environment. Under the leadership of the Confederation of Economic Associations of Mozambique (CTA), a workshop was organized applying the EESA methodology, which was followed by a survey aimed at the business community reaching approximately 300 stakeholders. These two activities provided inputs for the elaboration and delivery of the EESA assessments. Upon the assessments, various proposals to improve the business environment were elaborated.
- Technical support to the Labour Mediation and Arbitration Commission (COMAL). This included staff training (40 mediators and arbitrators every year), dissemination materials and the development of a database.
- Technical and material support to the National Institute for Employment (INEP). This included assistance to open and manage the employment orientation and job placement centers, the set-up of the employment portal and the provision of the self-employment kits.
- Technical Support to the Labour Market Observatory (LMO), including technical assistance of a diverse nature and the set-up of an information system. The latter is not yet fully operational.
- Technical support to the Institute for the Promotion of Medium and Small Enterprises (IPEME). Moztrabalha provided training to the IPEME managers and technicians in the “Start and Improve your Business” (SIYB) methodology. IPEME participated in the training of the cooperatives set up within the construction materials value chain.
- Introduction of the Employment Intensive Investments Policy (EIIP). Moztrabalha made a clear and intensive effort to introduce the EIIP model to public and private partners. These included the Ministry of Public Works, Habitation and Rural Development (MOPHDR), the Construction Business Federation, municipalities,

district offices, the Natural Disaster Commission (GREPOC), VET institutions, NGOs, and International Cooperation Agencies running reconstruction projects.

- Support to enhance social dialogue in the country by the training of social partners, the submission of proposals (e.g. regulation of domestic work), and support on transition to formality, among others.
- The green jobs modeling initially planned was dropped from the workplan in agreement with the Swedish Cooperation, upon the realization that the conditions for its implementation were not given.

The above summary shows that the Project has performed well in the delivery of key outputs related to the enhancement of policies and institutional capacities. Respondents have unanimously considered all of them as high-quality strategic products and services.

Outcome 2: Sectors are stimulated to create decent, sustainable and green employment opportunities for Mozambican women and men, in particular youth and those living in rural areas:

Outcome 2 has been generally more problematic, both in terms of delivering and achieving the expected results. The Employment Intensive Investment pilots performed well and were able to introduce the gender dimension into the construction sector, which is by default unaccustomed to the presence of women. That said, there are no clear signs of the model gathering momentum and taking off. There is one concrete example of replication in Manica province, plus favourable prospects in projects promoted by international cooperation agencies and NGOs, but the continuation of this model by other public and private players in the country is still uncertain.

The horticultural chain has shown, within its relatively small scale, a good performance, and there are indications that the articulation model works. Incentives are in place for all the actors along the chain, and the role of the market broker (in this case played by Aceagrarios) has proven critical in making the dynamic work. The growth process has been limited, partially due to the effects of the pandemic in drastically reducing the activity of the tourist sector during the last two years. In order to generate employment at a significant scale, the value chain needs to expand, something that could happen for example if Aceagrarios were to become a supplier of the energy multinational SASOL, which currently contracts its catering services in South Africa. It also seems possible to link with other cooperation programs (for example, some run by the German GIZ and the Norwegian NORAD) which are also working on strengthening the value chains.

The building materials value chain is facing a different set of problems in consolidating the model. Several stakeholders from the construction sector, including the MOPHRD, have expressed very positive views about the potential of the soil-cement products. So far, however, these products are struggling to penetrate and establish their position in the market. The project has mobilized different institutions in this endeavor, but the effort has not yet paid off. Within the scope of the project, only five rural cooperatives are producing for a single client, the Mozambican Red Cross. Qualified construction stakeholders confirm the suitability of the materials from various points of view: environmentally, price-wise, in terms of the quality of the construction (to name just a few). However, a number

of different constraints seem to be holding the initiative back and preventing it from fully taking off:

1. First, it is important to note that the product demand is unclear. The evaluation team has learned that previous cooperation projects have attempted to introduce these materials into the market with limited success. The explanation for this failure might have to do with insufficient continuity from the promoters, although there may be other plausible reasons for the little progress made.
2. The cooperatives, in their current state, may be feasible enterprises for only a limited segment of the market: reconstruction projects (usually related to natural disasters) and self-construction at the local level. However, in order to increase their market share and become a catalyser of employment, they need to overcome constraints such as the difficulties to access equipment and their limited capacity to invest, and ultimately increase their production. The figure of the market intermediary broker, which plays an important role in the horticulture value chain, is missing in this case.

Other options to break through in the construction sector and boost the use of alternative materials relate to the public sector becoming an active promoter and customer, particularly in public work contracts (e.g. social housing and infrastructure for public services) where such materials may need to be procured. Further exploring the opportunities with the private construction sector is also an option that the project is already considering. Although it is not clear whether the bigger construction firms will use materials produced manually, these companies could play a key role in popularizing them.

Review of indicators corresponding to Outcome 2

The review of the indicators set for **Outcome 2** (sustainable SMEs and employment opportunities) can illuminate some of analysis presented above.

The indicators show a weak performance in terms of creating new enterprises and jobs. The project has certainly fallen below the initial expectations, although there is also basis to question some of the targets set. Moreover, in some cases, such as the horticulture value chain, the data and information available are not considered precise enough to establish the number of new jobs created.

The indicators set in the logframe for Outcome 2 are as follows (numeration continues from outcome 1):

9. Number of decent jobs created as a direct result of project support to employment intensive investments, SME support and WEE (disaggregated by gender, age, locality).
10. Beneficiaries (disaggregated by gender, age, locality) of the project report improvement of income, working conditions and employment security over project period
11. Number of new businesses that were created, and existing business that have expanded their operations and created new jobs over the project period (desegregated by gender, age locality)

As for **Indicator #9** (referring to the creation of new jobs through EIIP, SME support and WEE), the MRM register reads 275 new jobs created, 72 of them (41 women) related to the three EIIP initiatives mentioned above. The different pilots performed well, but they were far from reaching the 3,000 new jobs set as the target. While the initiatives have not triggered a replication dynamic as expected, it should be noted that the 3,000 target was arguably not realistic.

Indicator #10 measures the number of beneficiaries reporting improvements in income and working conditions. The figure provided is 80 out of a target of 300. Looking into the registers, everything indicates that the collection of data on this indicator has been challenging (there are notable gaps in the data). According to the information orally gathered by the evaluation team, Moztrabalha has been able to create 30 new jobs in the construction materials value chain (20% women). Regarding the horticulture value chain, it is difficult to establish the exact number. It has been reported that 300 small producers have been linked to the scheme, but most of them were producers before Moztrabalha came into action, so that the benefits brought about by the project largely amount to an increase in existing production and sales. The two main indicators used by Aceagrarios to follow up the process are: (i) the number of new labourers hired by the produced and (ii) the volume of sales to the tourist operators. The evaluation team considers that collecting data on the income could have served to estimate the number of jobs created by using the minimum wage as a reference in the calculation (increased income / minimum wage = new jobs).

Registers corresponding to **Indicator #11** only read two new businesses created, but again, it is believed that there have been some gaps in the collection of information. The attainment is certainly far from the target of 300, but the evaluation team has come across 25 enterprises supported in Sofala through the initiative “Resilient business in Beira”, in collaboration with GAPI using the SIYB methodology. The five cooperatives set up (also in Sofala) for the production of alternative construction materials (soil-cement blocks), can also be considered as new business. Despite their limited presence in the market, they are currently up-and-running according to the information collected by the evaluation team.

Delivery of outputs corresponding to Outcome 2

The outputs delivered by Moztrabalha regarding Outcome 2 can be summarized as follows:

Three labour-intensive pilot interventions, under three different models.

1. The first intervention promoting EIM was in partnership with a private company called Casa Minha, which works on the implementation of the Partial Urbanization Plan of Polana Caniço. Through this partnership, a road of 150 meters was built connecting the neighbourhood to the main road.
2. The second intervention was in partnership with MUVA Green, which is a research program of female economic empowerment of Oxford Policy Management funded by UKAID. This pilot was implemented in one public garden of Chamanculo (Maputo).
3. The third intervention was the construction of gabions for soil stabilization in the neighbourhood of Mahotas in Maputo. ILO identified a contractor with experience in the kinds of gabions used by EII. The contractor, in this case, chose to hire only

young women and trained them to demonstrate the potential of such interventions to tackle the negative perceptions against women.

The three pilots have been very well documented, and promotion material including videos have been elaborated and distributed by the project.

Support to emerging, new and existing sustainable SMEs through targeted training and services.

This support basically focused on the articulation and activation of value chains using the MSD approach. It has been reported that difficulties were found in applying this approach to its full extent and that this, together with the COVID-19 restrictions, caused some delays and adjustments to the workplan. Eventually, the work around value chains took off and the project gathered pace, particularly during the latest year. The products and services delivered included:

- **Three market system analyses** in the following value chains: cashew nuts, building materials, catering.
- **Two processes of promotion of value chains**, for horticulture and building materials. Eventually the cashew nuts value chain was ruled out and the catering one reoriented towards the production of horticulture products for the tourist sector in Vilankulos (Inhambane).

The process in the horticulture value chain included training, provision of infrastructure for the production, incorporation of new producers and the articulation of the actors across the value chain from the producers to the final buyers. The articulation role was played by the private firm Aceagrarios, which acted also as a funding partner, contributing 44% of budget. It is also important to note the collaboration with the Farmer's School, a corporate social responsibility initiative that provides technical support to the small agro-producers using information and communication technologies (TV, radio, social network, newsletters).

As for the building materials value chain, Moztrabalha carried out different activities to disseminate the initiative and establish partnerships with both public and private institutions: the MOPHDR, IFPELAC, IPEME, District Offices, NGOs, the Construction Business Federation, among others. Five rural cooperatives were set-up in Sofala Province to produce the soil-cement construction materials. The process included technical training, business training, legalization and provision of equipment. The project also supported the cooperatives in liaising with Mozambican Red Cross with the aim of it becoming a user of these materials in its ongoing reconstruction projects in the province. The work related to this value chain was only carried out in the Province of Sofala because of the effects and damage caused by cyclone Idai. Activities in the other two provinces initially planned (Nampula and Manica) were eventually suspended.

Outcome 3: Resilient workers and enterprises to mitigate the socio-economic impact of COVID-19 in Mozambique. (added as Covid-19 Response):

Outcome 3 was added in 2020 as a response to the COVID -19 crisis and under this component Moztrabalha was able to improve the capacity of Mozambican institutions through the elaboration of pro-employment and risk prevention proposals. **Indicator #12** refers to four pro-employment and risk-prevention policies delivered or in the process of being implemented. Another important feature of Moztrabalha under Outcome 3 was the special emphasis placed on supporting the informal sector to navigate the effects of the pandemic. In this respect, two specific initiatives were undertaken:

1. The first one was the application of the EII model via agreements with municipalities to carry out rehabilitation works in peri-urban markets. According to the figures provided by the project officers, 80 temporary jobs were created in Boane (Umpala market) and 180 in Beira (Maquinino market), 260 jobs (30% women) in total against a target of 300 (**Indicator #13**). This target may well have been exceeded, had it not been for the failed collaboration between the Maputo municipality and the IFPELAC to rehabilitate six markets.
2. The second initiative was the support provided to informal vendors in three local markets. One of these was also the Umpala market in Boane, while the other two were the Chiquelene market in Maputo and Novo Mercado in Vilankulos. 185 vendors (84 women) received training, access to information via an Internet application, and funding via a rotatory fund. The experience has been reported as very successful, as judged by the 292 jobs created, the growing dynamic of the rotatory fund and the formalization of the 180 operators who received funding (**Indicator #14**)

The outputs delivered under Outcome 3 included the following:

- Rapid assessment of the impact of COVID-19 on the labour market
- Analysis of pro-employment policy options
- Delivery of National Occupational Health (OHS) profile
- Communication campaigns including awareness on OHS issues
- Promoting dialogue between constituents
- Public works of periurban markets in partnership with three municipalities. Works were completed works in Boane and Beira, but suspended in Maputo.
- Training, access to information and financing of market operators (three experiences in Boane, Beira and Vilankulos) in collaboration with GAPI, an investment society that provides business services including loans and credit.
- Manufacturing of facemasks. Collaboration with local associations.

Implementation arrangements

As mentioned earlier, the project is implemented through a complex structure involving a wide range of actors and institutions. Implementing the project's activities via existing programmes and/or institutions can be seen as an asset, in the sense that it can optimize the

use of resources, enable the capacity-building of the organizations involved and strengthen the prospects for sustainability. It should be noted that the project has engaged a long list of public and private stakeholders: the DNT, INEP, IPEME, IFPELAC, the LMO, Municipalities, District offices from the public side, and GAPI, Aceagrarios, Panavideo from the private sector, as well as unions and employers associations. While no formal calculation can be made to quantify monetary value of the contributions made by these partners and stakeholders, it is evident that significant contributions have been made in terms of staff, infrastructure, know-how and other intangible assets.

This approach, however, entails certain risks. Oftentimes it can be difficult to integrate the range of different styles, agendas and expectations. Assembling the different pieces of the implementation machinery might become challenging, instead resulting in situations of impasse and delays. Ahead are presented several internal and external factors that have, to greater or lesser extent, affected the project's capacity to deliver.

Internal factors (related to ILOs capacities):

- A team too small to properly address the demands of the implementation. As explained earlier, there are signs of the project team being overstretched and therefore incapable of properly managing the multiple and often simultaneous project dynamics.
- There are also some accounts that refer to insufficient familiarity with the MSD approach during the early stages of the implementation. This has affected the timely completion of certain processes and the quality of some deliverables, such as the market analyses in the three value chains.
- The absence of an ILO country office in Mozambique. Since there is no country office in Mozambique, the project has had to partly fill the role of a country office (overall relations with ILO constituents, representation etc.). Moreover, The project is back-stopped both by Pretoria (thematic/methodological support); Lusaka (administrative support); and Geneva. While this has not represented a critical bottleneck, it has affected – according to some respondents – the promptness of the decision making and the efficiency and effectiveness of the project.

External factors

- Uneven engagement and expectations of national partners. Although the project was designed through a consultative process, staff turnovers and political dynamics impacted the commitment, understanding and expectations that the national partners held towards the project. In most cases this required new rounds of discussions regarding what to fit into the workplan, and revised budgets. This added a new burden to the project team, caused delays and eventually impacted the implementation plan.
- Institutional reforms such as the split of Secretariat for Youth and Employment (SEJE) from the Ministry of labour and Social Security (MTSS). This reform represented an expression of the Government's focus on the generation of employment, and in this sense constituted an opportunity for the project. However

it also involved the discontinuation of some processes, and the need to restart these with new teams.

- Difficulties in hiring qualified expertise in-country for consultancy assignments.
- The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, the hidden debt scandal, plus of other emergencies such as those caused by the cyclones.

It should be noted, however, that the project team has shown the ability to react to both the internal and external factors, introducing adaptations accordingly. Particularly during the second half of the implementation, once the constraining factors were identified, Moztrabalha was generally able to find alternatives, regain its implementation pace and deliver a long list of products and services.

Institutional capacity building support has been delivered through the International Training Centre of the ILO (ITC-ILO), based in Turin (Italy). There are also instances of ILO methodologies and technical tools being applied, for example: NEP development and implementation support, promotion of pro-employment budgeting, the Enabling Environment for Sustainable Enterprise (ESEE) methodology, the Start and Improve Your Business program (SIYB), the Employment-Intensive Investment policies/programs (EIIPs). All the above represent examples of the optimization of ILO's wealth of technical resources.

The overall guidance to the project has been provided by Project Advisory Committee (CAP), which is an *ad hoc* group set-up in accordance with the tripartite structure. The CAP has been configured as a sub-commission of the Advisory Labour Commission (CCT), a permanent structure under the umbrella of the MTTTS which embodies the tripartism in the country, and therefore has a broader mandate. The evaluation team has revised the minutes from the CAP meetings and collected views from its different members. The overall assessment is that the Committee performed satisfactorily during the first half of the implementation period, allowing the flow of information and the exchange of opinions about different issues. However, its functioning was severely affected by the COVID-19 Pandemic. No meetings have been held since the second semester of 2020. It has to be noted, however, that the CCT – a permanent and more stable structure – has remained active, with various deliberations related to Moztrabalha taking place within its domain. Despite the aforementioned gaps in CAP operations, the social partners understand that the tripartite structure has been in place across the board, and Moztrabalha has served only to enhance it.

Communication and visibility strategy (C&V).

Finally, to conclude the analyses of effectiveness, it is important to note that the implementation of the activities corresponding to the three components was accompanied by a very comprehensive communication and visibility strategy, which deserves a positive assessment.

Moztabalha has acquired a high-profile presence in the public domain, and communicating messages to the different audiences is embedded in its routines. A C&V strategy was developed and updated accordingly with support from CO-Lusaka. A budget of USD 694,139 was tentatively allocated to C&V, and technical assistance was appointed to lead and coordinate the C&V effort. The communication strategy has been well-developed and is coherent and relevant given the project objectives.

Through the C&V strategy, the project has developed relevant knowledge management tools to facilitate replication and appropriation of the NEP and PAPE Promotion Materials. Also, there are promotion and dissemination materials of the approaches promoted and the related demonstration pilot interventions, including videos and brochures. A long and varied list of communication actions were conducted: press releases, radio programs, presence in social media (Facebook and YouTube), webpage (<https://MozTrabalha.co.mz/>) videos, edition of materials (posters, handbills, banners) for different type of events, training and support to ministerial units (among others). Some of these materials can be accessed through the project website under the gallery or news section.

It is also important to highlight that the TA progress reports included data about the public engagement. The C&V component played an important role in supporting the dissemination of key products of the Moztrabalha, such as the gender analysis.

2.3. Efficiency

The analysis of this criterion was guided by the following questions:

- **Have resources (financial, human, technical support, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve the project outputs and specially outcomes?**
- **To what extent did the project leverage resources to promote gender equality and non-discrimination, and inclusion of people with disabilities?**

No major issues can be raised with regard to the allocation of resources. The initial budget of USD 9,480,000 was broken down as follows: 27% for Outcome 1; 26% for Outcome 2; 30% for project management and oversight, 5% for the inception phase and 13% PSC. Outcome 3 represented an additional USD 1,100.00 in 2020, approximately 10% of the total budget. Taking into consideration the nature of the project, which involves a great deal of mobilization and technical support, the above distribution is found to be adequate. That said, some respondents have argued that the human component, in particular de size and composition of the project team, could have been allocated more resources in order to better cope with the demand and strains of the workplan.

According to the update of financial status provided to the evaluation team, as of October 2021, the final budget (after currency exchange adjustments) came to USD 9,789,666. The current budget execution is USD 8,081,033, or approximately 82.5% of the budget.

Encumbrances are already US\$ 819,012 (9%), and the forecast is to reach 100% of execution by end of the extended implementation period (March 2022).

ILO mechanisms have been in place to monitor the inputs (procurement), control the expenses and ensure their eligibility. No external financial audit has been conducted, but internal exercises of expenses verification are carried out. ILO protocols are deemed to be rigorous when it comes to ensuring transparency and accountability in the use of resources. The main drawback, according to some of the respondents, has been that the understanding and subsequent use of ILO financial and administrative procedures by certain stakeholders requires time, and might therefore cause some delays. That said, there is no conclusive evidence of this constituting a significant constraint for project management in this case.

The financial resources have been made available in a timely and appropriate manner, allowing the implementation of most of activities – although some adjustments were required. These adjustments included the re-framing or even cancellation of some activities. In general, these amendments do not seem to have critically affected the achievement of the objectives. In certain cases, however, particularly with regards to the value chain of construction materials, the suspension of the processes in two provinces has clearly affected the options to attain the scale and dimension needed to impact the market. The delays that have occurred have mostly been related to difficulties and constraints found for the program of activities to take off. This has most clearly been the case with Outcome 2 (employment opportunities), in particular the sub-component on the value chains, which required more time to take off and gather pace.

As for the management of the human resources, some issues have been raised regarding the size and expertise of the ILO team, particularly during the early stages when the implementation structure was to be put in place. There are signs of the ILO team struggling to cope during those stages with demands and requirements of the different processes. The most plausible explanation is a combination of reasons: the complexity and scope of the workplan, at times difficult to embrace by the project team whose members were generally deeply involved in the implementation of the activities and not always fully familiar with some of the processes, particularly those related to the MSD. It has been observed, however, that the command and control of the ILO team improved over time.

In this regard, the support and provided from other ILO offices has played an important role. National stakeholders have expressed positive views about the relevance and quality of the support provided by ILO. The technical backstopping has mainly been provided by the DWT based in CO Pretoria, with occasional contributions from the Zambia CO and the Geneva HQ. Different specialists in areas such as employment (lead backstopping), sustainable enterprises, employers' activities, employment intensive investments, social dialogue, gender and statistics have been regularly involved and participated actively in the strategic analysis and follow-up of the activities. The Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) raised some issues regarding frictions and disagreements between the ILO teams that had reduced the efficiency of the technical and administrative backstopping, but according to the assessment of this final evaluation, these situations have been mostly overcome.

Further ahead (under section 5.6) this report will examine what the project has delivered and achieved regarding gender equality and non-discrimination. Regarding the leverage of resources for the promotion of these two themes, the evaluation team has not come across any instance of Moztrabalha generating such an effect.

2.5. Impact orientation and sustainability

The analysis of this criterion was guided by the following questions:

- What level of influence has the project achieved on the development of employment and other areas on policies and practices at national and subnational levels?
- Which project-supported tools have been, or have the potential to be, institutionalized and/or replicated by partners or external organizations?
- Is the project contributing to expand the knowledge base and build evidence regarding the project outcomes and impacts?
- To which extent are the results of the interventions likely to have a long term, sustainable positive contribution to the country's national development, SDG achievement and relevant targets? (explicitly or implicitly)
- How has the sustainability approach of the project been affected by the COVID-19 situation in context of the national responses and how has the project and stakeholders responded in moving forward the project results appropriation?

The project has demonstrated an ability to influence policies to promote employment and beyond. The Action Plan for the NEP is clearly the most noteworthy example in this regard. The Plan is seen by the national stakeholders as the roadmap to fulfil the GoMz's objectives in this domain. It is generally acknowledged that its full and effective implementation will be particularly challenging for Mozambican institutions in the upcoming years, but it has already provided direction and clarity to the different Ministries on how to link their respective sectoral responsibilities to the generation of employment. The evaluation team has come across a dynamic to monitor the Plan under the leadership of the SEJE, but it has not been possible to collect further details about the findings of this monitoring process so far. This task is one that has been particularly affected by the split of the SEJE from the MTSS.

The Action Plan represents a very ambitious endeavour to materialise and put into practice the NEP. It contains a very detailed list of actions structured around eight pillars. Representatives of the different sectors consulted by the evaluation team have argued that the Plan has given direction and guidance to many sectors – including some that are not directly responsible for the economic promotion and job creation – on how to contribute to this objective. The stakeholders have expressed this in very different ways, for example:

- “There is a better understanding of our respective roles and responsibilities”

- “At least, now we have a vision, we know the itinerary that we have to follow”
- “There is structure in place, there are different groups working on the issue”
- “As an institution we have more awareness and a better understanding of the problem”

The evaluation team has also verified that employment and decent work are currently top priorities in the political agenda of the GoMz, but the economic climate following the pandemic is still very uncertain. There is a general consensus among the stakeholders suggesting that the GoMz will have to make an extra effort to allocate resources for the effective implementation of the Plan, plus its regular and transparent monitoring.

Moztrabalha has made a great effort around the empowerment and capacity building of the target groups, in particular public institutions under various Ministries (MTSS, SEJE and MOPRHN) but also the main social partners. Many of them have acquired new capacities in the form of skills, awareness, new instruments, tools, mechanism, etc. In principle, this could continue as a self-replicating process: once the capacities are appropriated by these groups, they might become embedded into their routines and organizational practices. Some examples of this have already been cited as part of the effectiveness analysis: the revision and expansion of the mediation and arbitration processes by COMAL, the improvement of job-placement services by INEP, the incorporation of new methodologies to support SMEs by IPEME (the SIYB) or the new topics on the agenda of the social partners. There are evidence of changes in the regulatory framework, but Moztrabalha has made inroads around incorporating Convention 189 (domestic work) and 190 (violence and harassment in the workplace) within the domestic legal framework.

The process of building capacities is still far from consolidated, something that may require some follow-up work. Often, a critical mass in terms of capacities has to be reached before the process can become truly self-sustaining. Some other processes, such as the EIIP model, have attracted the interest of different organizations. However, as already mentioned, it is not clear how exactly this is going to thrive and become the established model for public sector works or private sector investment.

As for the value chains, everything indicates that the horticulture sector in Vilankulos is reasonably well-consolidated and can therefore generate its own self-sustaining dynamic. There are also some opportunities to scale the process up, particularly if links are established with the multinational company SASOL. Some other development partners such as GIZ have also expressed an interest in lending continuity to the process. The prospect looks somewhat less bright for the construction materials value chain, since there are only five rural cooperatives producing for one single customer. At this stage, it is believed that the process has not reached enough presence and scale in the market to ensure its continuation and generate transformative effects.

Another key aspect under this section has to do with the generation of knowledge. Moztrabalha has contributed to this in two different ways: (i) by supporting the labour market information system and (ii) by producing different types of diagnosis and studies.

Moztrabalha has played an instrumental role in setting-up the Labour Market Observatory, which is widely perceived as a key service for the purpose of planning and acting strategically. The Observatory is a new structure created in 2016. ILO (through Moztrabalha) and the African Development Bank (ADB) became the main development partners in this endeavour. The ADB has been behind the “hard” component (infrastructure & equipment) while ILO focused on the “Soft” aspects (management, procedures, etc.). ILO is also supporting the GoMz in the improvement of statistics on social protection.

The Observatory is delivering regular reports (quarterly and annual bulletins) with data and information about the labour market. It still needs to consolidate some processes, particularly those related to the reliability of its sources and the dissemination of the information to the wider public. The observatory has been able to collect and integrate data from different institutions: the National Institute of Social Security, the Labour Inspection, the Import/Export Agency, the Commission for Mediation and Arbitration (COMAL), VET institutions and Migration services, among others. Relevant respondents from some of these institutions acknowledge that they need more time and support to improve the quality of the data that they provide to the Observatory.

The Observatory, moreover, is not yet able to carry out its own surveys on the conditions and characteristics of the workforce. The last survey of this nature was conducted in 2004. The release and dissemination of the data and information processed to the wider public is another outstanding challenge. The issue of 1000 bulletins every three months is certainly a step in the right direction, but various commentators have argued that there remains a need to improve digital access to the Observatory’s databases so that more individuals and groups (researchers, companies, the media...) can access and benefit from the information available.

Looking into the sustainability aspects, it has to be noted that the Observatory is a permanent structure within the MTSS which should be able to continue delivering its routine products and services: bulletins and other standard reports. The expansion towards new products and services, for example prospective studies to identify the skills demanded by the labour market, are likely to require further support from the development partners.

Moztrabalha has also been able to generate valuable knowledge by funding selected studies and assessments, such as the Gender Assessment of the Mozambican Labour Market and the National Profile of Occupational Health, Hygiene and Safety at Work in Mozambique Occupational Health (SOHST). Both of them represent valuable contributions towards the development of more systematic approaches in gender equality and OHS.

2.6. Gender equality and non-discrimination

The analysis of this criterion was guided by the following questions:

- What are so far the key achievements of the project on gender equality and women's empowerment?
- Has the use of resources on women's empowerment activities been sufficient to achieve the expected results?
- To what extent is the M&E data supporting project decision making related to gender?
- Has the project addressed other vulnerable groups, including people living with disabilities?

Moztrabalha has paid significant attention to gender equality. A specific strategy for gender mainstreaming was developed pursuing the following objectives:

1. Ensuring that the NEP is implemented taking into account gender equality.
2. Incorporating international standards on women's labour rights.
3. Strengthening women's agency in the implementation of the project.

A set of indicators was also developed to measure aspects such as the training of stakeholders, the audit of the NEP from a gender perspective and the set-up of women's cooperatives. Gender criteria have also been applied during the implementation of the activities, particularly in relation to the selection of the participants and the content of the training processes (which have generally included gender issues).

Moztrabalha has made some valuable contributions to incorporating the gender and equality prospective in labour relations. Unfortunately, the value of the indicators anticipated in the strategy has not been collected, and it is not possible to use them systematically for the purposes of an assessment. Some of the targets set for the value chains, such as the set-up of women's cooperatives, have not been achieved, but it is possible to establish, however, the delivery of key products like the following:

1. A gender analysis of the labour market and employment sector in Mozambique. This is a very comprehensive analysis that seeks to contribute new insights on gender and the labour market in Mozambique. It also provides insights into gender causality, making a link between the root causes of gender inequality and discrimination, and the gender gaps in employment.
2. A gender analysis of three productive sectors initially targeted by the project: cashews, catering and construction materials. In parallel with the market system analysis, a gender analysis was conducted to assess the gender dynamics and identify the practical and strategic needs of both men and women, as well as opportunities, constraints and gender dynamics in these three value chains.
3. A policy brief on the care economy. This is a document that aims at promoting investments in the care economy in Mozambique, and outlines alternatives to ensure a balanced sharing of responsibilities within the household.

4. Various training processes targeting partners and stakeholders. Beyond the delivery of specific training events, gender has been a theme that has triggered discussions and reflection, both internally among the members of the Moztrabalha team and externally with the project's partners.

As it has been said, some of the targets set for the construction sector have not been met, but partners and target groups still assess that Moztrabalha has been able to challenge the gender stereotypes prevailing in the sector. Although to a limited scale, the project has made an important contribution to normalizing the presence of women in construction work.

There is evidence that the project has made some important achievements and lay the foundations for more comprehensive work in the future, but several stakeholders argue that, even if the point of delivering key analysis has been reached, this does not necessarily mean that this will be translated into policies (or that those policies will be implemented). The perceptions of employers, civil servants, institutions, families, and underlying social norms are still powerful barriers to overcome, which will likely require structured and long-sustained action that is largely absent at the moment. There is still some resistance for gender equality to become a priority on the social partners' agenda and a reference issue in social dialogue.

As explained earlier, Moztrabalha, has paid attention to non-discrimination and particularly under Outcome 3 (Response to COVID-19), which has mainly focused on working with the informal sector: operators in peri-urban markets or unemployed people from marginalized and deprived areas to work in public works. The social dialogue component under Outcome 1 has also paid attention to domestic work as one of the sectors that by default employs a significant number of vulnerable people. An effort has been made as well to expand the coverage of the social partners into the informal sector. Through its different activities, the project, therefore, has promoted equal opportunities and inclusive employment.

No specific attention has been devoted to groups particularly prone to labour discrimination, such as people living with disabilities, ethnic groups, sexual minorities, the focus after the different assessment carried out was on women, youth and workers in the informal sector. Some respondents have indicated that the Mozambican regulatory framework is still lagging behind with regard to the incorporation of those labour standards. Minimum wage and collective bargaining are still the main priorities in the agenda of the government and the social partners. A revision of the Pillar 4 of the PAPE, which is devoted to these issues, is still regarded as vague and scarcely developed.

That said, there is room to promote a more ambitious mainstreaming of non-discrimination in the policy framework, as has been done regarding gender. The revision of the NEP Action Plan (PAPE) reveals that Pillar 4 (which covers these aspects), is still very vague, and further support could be vital to better identifying the discrimination barriers, the most affected groups and the measures that could be proposed to unpack the non-discrimination principle into more specific actions.

2.7. Status of follow up actions concerning the MTE recommendations

| Recommendation | Status of the follow-up actions |
|--|---|
| R1. Ensure a second phase to consolidate and further develop project results to achieve expected outcome | YES. SIDA has shown its preliminary willingness to support a second phase of Moztrabalha. Discussions are undergoing between the partner SIDA, ILO and the GoMz to define and eventually approve the different components, approaches, etc. of this second phase |
| R2. Take advantage of the actual window of opportunity to promote pro-employment budget and EII methods. | YES, the project has conducted several activities to promote pro-employment activities and EII methods |
| R3. Elaborate a risk analysis of the intervention with ACEAGRARIOS and if necessary, review its agreement with MozTrabalha and this company | YES, terms and conditions of the collaboration with ACEAGRARIOS have been revisited and both parties have come to a new understanding about the respective roles |
| R4. Adjust implementation and its monitoring system (MRM) to be outcome-oriented | Not implemented. The Moztrabalha team understands that the 14 indicators defined to assess the achievement of the three outcomes are enough for the purpose (three of these indicators were added to follow Outcome 3 in 2020 after the MTE had taken place). In any case, the MTE refers to only 3 indicators for Outcome 1, whereas the initial logframe includes 8. It should also be noted that the monitoring activities after the COVID-19 outbreak became very challenging, so that the Moztrabalha Team devoted more time and energy to catching up with the implementation |
| R5. Develop an exit strategy: | Yes, exit strategy has been developed |
| R6. Develop the project theory of change to unpack the project logical framework | Partially. The diagram with the linkages between the different outputs and outcomes was updated, but the ToC was not developed in the conventional manner. The Moztrabalha team understood that other methods were being applied to serve the same purpose. |
| R7: Work with the Mozambican women associations | Partially. The project has collaborated with the Domestic Workers Union, whose members are mainly women. Activities within Outcome 3 have also involved women's associations |

SECTION III: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

3 Conclusions

Moztrabalha has made important contributions to the development of employment policies in Mozambique. The combination of ambitious objectives, complex operational structure and the occurrence of some external factors caused some delays to the workplan and required some adjustments. Eventually, thanks to the flexible and adaptive approach adopted by the project team, it was possible to deliver an extensive list of valuable products and services and trigger some positive pro-employment dynamics. The operationalization and trickle down of the policies promoted across the different sectors and the scale-up of the interventions in the value chains remain as the main challenges for the future.

Relevance and strategy fit

1.- Moztrabalha is a highly relevant project to address the structural problems of employment and the labour market in Mozambique. The project is fully aligned with national policies and contributes to their effective implementation through the provision of plans, tools, studies, methodologies, training and other aspects related to the capacity building of the national institutions.

Validity of the design

2.- Design responds to the needs of the target groups and the components chosen correspond to the needs of the target groups and final beneficiaries. There are, however, some questions as to how these components have been translated into a realistic and workable proposal of intervention, adjusted to the circumstances of the context and the capacities of the main stakeholders involved.

3.- Implementation settings and demands were not always duly considered for such an ambitious project. Considered one by one, the project has selected very relevant actions and measures, but the aggregation of all of them in a single intervention resulted in an excessively ambitious endeavor, requiring the availability of expertise in very different areas, very demanding from the managerial point of view, and prone to result in the dispersion of efforts in multiple directions. The absence of a comprehensive ToC embracing the whole intervention could have helped in the anticipation of these aspects.

4.- Some disagreements have emerged concerning the use of the MSD approach as the overarching analytical framework of the project. ILO respondents have raised some concerns regarding the complexity that it brings about, particularly if it is combined with other non-MSD approaches under the same project. The Swedish Cooperation (SIDA) understands that the MSD was, in fact, not fully implemented due to the limited understanding of the ILO team and therefore, there is not enough basis to rule out the MSD as a valid methodology. In any case, there seem to be agreement on the need for more dialogue between ILO and SIDA on how to adapt the MSD/systems approach to the project's context

5.- The MRM is complex and difficult to implement. The Monitoring and Results Management System applied, which has been based on the Donor Committee for Enterprise Development (DCED) Standard for Results Measurement has equally proven to be very demanding and difficult to implement.

Efficiency

6.- No major issues can be raised with regard to the allocation of resources, although some respondents have argued that the human resources component, in particular the size and composition of the project team, should have been reinforced in order to better cope with the demand and strains of the workplan.

Effectiveness

7.- Flexible and adaptive management were key to overcome initial constraints. The factors just described, together with the effects of the COVID-19 and the occurrence of natural disasters, led to significant difficulties and challenges at the time of managing the project and take the implementation forward, particularly during the first half of the implementation period. Nevertheless, Moztrabalha, adopted a flexible and developmental approach and it was eventually able to deliver an extensive list of products and services. As part of this adaptation process, the Green Employment Project Model was dropped off the workplan to avoid overloading the program.

8.- Moztrabalha has been instrumental in the development of the policy framework and the improvement of the institutional environment in the employment sector (Outcome 1). The development of the NEP Action Plan (PAPE) and the subsequent engagement of 21 sectors and branches belonging to different Ministries around a single plan represented an important milestone in the process of acting strategically and comprehensively. There remain challenges regarding the funding and monitoring of the PAPE, but it has served to set the path and structure the action of the Government.

9.- National institutions are more capable to implement policies. Institutions such as COMAL, INEP, IPEME and the Observatory of the Labour Market, have seen, to different extent, their technical resources improved and expanded. Social Partners (trade unions and employers), have also strengthened capacities and broadened their institutional agendas.

11.- Results in business promotion and job creation have not reached a significant scale. In relation to the generation of employment opportunities (Outcome 2), the project has experienced some difficulties in implementing the workplan initially envisaged, leading into the readjustment of some targets and/or the cancellation of some activities. The pilot models put into practices have not generated employment with the pace and vigour that was expected.

Several initiatives of EIIP have been undertaken including contacts with public and private institutions, but their buy in is still unclear and the experiences of replication for the moment have been very limited.

Likewise, the breath and scope of achievements in the alternative building materials value chain, have been also limited, with only five rural cooperatives producing soil-cement blocks for a single customer. Despite the comparative advantages attributed to these materials, their demand in the construction market does not seem to be clear and under the current settings there are several constraints that would prevent an expansion.

The pilot model applied in the horticultural chain represents a better example of value chain articulation involving various actors along the process (small producers, intermediaries and

buyers), but in order to generate employment on a significant scale would be to expand its market share and win new customers.

12.- Successful response to the COVID-19 crisis. Regarding Outcome 3, Moztrabalha has been able to deliver a number of quality products to tackle the effects of COVID 19 in the labour market and improve the OHS framework. The project has also paid attention to the generation of job opportunities in the informal sector. This intervention has performed satisfactorily and shown its potential to favor the formalization of market operators, improve their working conditions and increase their incomes.

Gender equality and Non-discrimination

13.- Gender equality has received significant attention from Moztrabalha and the project has delivered key products and services to help mainstreaming it into policies and the stakeholders' agendas. A strategy for the mainstreaming of gender equality in the implementation of the activities has been elaborated and gender issues have also been present as a topic of internal reflection and discussion among partners. Valuable products have been delivered such as the “analysis of the labor market from a gender perspective” that represents a valuable input for the national institutions to continue advancing in this regard. There are, however, still many challenges ahead concerning the effective mainstreaming of gender equality into the policies and its prioritization in the social dialogue. The evaluation has collected various accounts from stakeholders that points towards attitudes of denial and underestimation of the extent that gender inequality impacts the labour market.

14.- Non-discrimination and inclusive employment. The principle of Non-discrimination has been also incorporated in many of the project activities, especially those aimed at the informal sector: markets, domestic work, public works. Outcome 3, in particular devoted a lot of attention to working with the informal sector. It has been noted, however, that Pillar 4 of the NEP Action Plan (PAPE) is still very vague regarding the measures and instruments to be applied to combat discrimination and promote inclusive employment.

Sustainability

15.- Many of the dynamics initiated by the project have self-replicating potential or can be easily embedded into institutional routines. This would be the case of several processes related to capacity development, awareness raising, social dialogue, etc. It is believed that once they have been appropriated, as it is mostly the case, they can continue as part of institutional routines. There are also examples of processes being continued (or can be continued) by other international cooperation partners: JICA, GIZ, Italian Cooperation. There is, however, a need for institutions to continue some processes and make new investments. Budget allocation and monitoring of plans aimed at job creation is still a challenge in many sectors. Other processes, such as those affecting the value chains, need to gain scale to be consolidated.

4. Recommendations

4.1 Recommendations for the ILO and SIDA

1.- Reassess the conditions that have to be in place for the successful application of the Market System Development (MSD) approach. ILO and SIDA should jointly carried out and in-depth analysis of the pros and cons of using the MSD and the conditions and / or adaptations that might be required to take it to fruition. As it has been said earlier, some issues have been raised about its complexity and possible incompatibility with other approaches used within the same project. It is considered important to conduct this assessment in order to determine the added value it can bring to the project, how it could be applied and what other systemic alternative methodologies could be used instead. The recommendation is made also with respect to the selection of the Monitoring of Results and Management System which could be adapted and/or even replaced by a more practical and workable model.

| Priority | Time frame | Resources |
|----------|------------|-----------|
| High | Medium | Low |

2.- A potential second phase of Moztrabalha would require a thorough appraisal of the design to ensure aspects such as the right combination of components, the feasibility of the targets and the presence of the minimum premises and conditions for its implementation. The implementation of the current phase of Moztrabalha has proven to be more challenging and strenuous than initially expected. Phase 2 should ensure that breath and scope of the different components are realistic and that the conditions for a smooth implementation are in place. Issues such as the ownership and commitment from partners, capabilities of the target groups; agreement around the terms and conditions of the implementation; presence, role and capabilities required from the ILO; among other aspects, should be carefully assess during the design phase of Moztrabalha 2. In particular, regarding the value chains component, ILO might consider relying more on delegate agreements with third parties who could take over the bulk of the implementation while ILO remaining in the backstopping role.

| Priority | Time frame | Resources |
|----------|------------|-----------|
| High | Medium | Low |

4.2 Recommendations for the ILO

3.- Revisit the ToCs applied for enterprise promotion and employment generation, particularly regarding their scalability and potential to grow. The pilots tested have shown their ability to be profitable, but the project has not clearly identified how to scale them up and create jobs on a significant extend. There is need to identify formulas to turn the small-scale but profitable initiatives into economic trends and sources of employment. The horticulture chain would need to scale up its size and increase its market share while the construction materials chain would require an in-depth analysis of the market conditions, particularly an assessment of the demand side, its dimension and characteristics. In general, ILO might look other options involving stakeholders with stronger positions in the market and bigger potential in terms of impact.

As for the EII programs, a more refined sustainability strategy seems to be necessary to get it embedded into institutional routines, particularly from public institutions. It is deemed appropriated for Moztralbalha to collect additional data and information during the remaining period of implementation (until March 2020) on the extent that these programs have appropriated and replicated. Based on the findings, a decision could be made on whether this model has reasonable chances to thrive in Mozambique and under which conditions.

| Priority | Time frame | Resources |
|----------|------------|-----------|
| High | Medium | Low |

4.- Consider the development and scale-up of a more comprehensive package of intervention for the informal sector upon the experience develop in peri-urban markets. A social component aimed at preventing and reporting abuse, especially of women, could harmoniously complement the package

| Priority | Time frame | Resources |
|----------|------------|-----------|
| High | Medium | Medium |

5.- Reassess the different options available to reinstate and strengthen the Just Transition towards an environmentally sustainable economy and society in the context of climate change and thereby the promotion of the green economy, green enterprises and green jobs in a potential new phase of Moztralbalha. This component is widely considered as of vital importance to support the country in the implementation of its roadmap “Towards a Green Economy” and it is deemed important to explore what can be done from a potential second phase of Moztralbalha in the light of the new developments and the difficulties experienced during phase 1..

| Priority | Time frame | Resources |
|----------|------------|-----------|
| High | Medium | Medium |

4.3 Recommendations for the ILO and its constituents

6.- The social dialogue component should place particular focus on the mainstreaming of gender equality in the agenda of the social partners and influencing the national regulatory framework in line with International Labour Standards. Domestic work and care services, in general, could deserve also more attention in the social dialogue, aiming to enhance the protection of rights in these two domains. Moztralbalha has made some strides in analysing and comparing the Mozambican regulatory framework against international labour standards such as ILO conventions 189 and 190. Lending continuity to this line of action aiming at the reform of the labour law (“Lei do Trabalho”) in line with these Conventions is deemed to be a reasonable option for an upcoming phase.

| Priority | Time frame | Resources |
|----------|------------|-----------|
| High | Medium | Low |

7.- Redouble efforts to advance in the effective implementation of the National Employment Policy (NEP) its Implementation Plan (PAPE) and the rest of policy products

and services delivered by Moztrabalha during this phase such as the EIIP, the EESE and the Pro-employment budgeting. All the improvements accomplished at the policy level have to be materialized at the operational level. In this regards it is deemed important to incorporate the actions foreseen for each sector in their respective Economic and Social Plans (PES), allocate budget and conduct transparent monitoring processes involving the social partners. Monitoring processes should contemplate independent impact assessments conducted over public policies and procurement processes.

| Priority | Time frame | Resources |
|----------|------------|-----------|
| High | Sort-Term | High |

4.4 Recommendations for the Government of Mozambique.

8.- The Labour Advisory Committee (CCT) could increase its role in the dissemination of labor rights, promotion of social dialogue from a gender perspective. The CCT could also benefit from exploring possible ways to link with the organized civil society and search

| Priority | Time frame | Resources |
|----------|------------|-----------|
| High | Sort-Term | Low |

SECTION IV: LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES

5. Lessons learned

1.- Interventions with ambitious goals, require a thorough analysis of the project assumptions and the alternatives available for its smooth implementation. The project was initiated assuming some of the most optimistic scenarios while the roll out of an intervention like this, covering so many areas of expertise and involving so many actors, is not such a straight-forward process. Processes and institutional arrangements are difficult to identify and articulate, particularly when the project represents the first phase of a process that usually requires a longer sequence of intervention. Moztrabalha has struggled to embrace and reasonably control the implementation of all the different lines anticipated in the design. It has been difficult to streamline into one single intervention actions that, in themselves, could have enough substance to become a separate project. A thorough analysis of the conditions that should be in place and time required seem to be necessary this kind of situation. Alternatively, the split of the big intervention into smaller interventions could be an option worth considering.

2.-It is not enough to apply a systemic approach to activate the value chains if scale-up is not considered from the design of the pilot It is not clear how the pilot models tested could spark a sizeable dynamic of employment generation. Small producers and rural cooperatives have been supported to improve their income generation activities, but their potential to grow and replicate in other value chains seems limited. The experience suggests that bigger players in the value chains have to be involved to generate a meaningful impact.

3. The work developed by Moztrabalha in periurban markets shows its potential to favor the formalization of market operators, improve their working conditions and increase their incomes. The combination of rehabilitation and sanitation work, business training, access to information and credit has shown potential to be an effective intervention package.

6. Good Practices

1.- Constructing processes from existing local resources. Putting in place national policies has to be adapted to the institutional conditions and capacities of the country. The project rightly chose to incorporate structures, such as the INEP, IPEME, COMAL that have responsibilities in the implementation of those policies and opted for developing their capacities. In general, constructing the processes from existing local resources: human, technical and material, even when local institutions and programs have significant weaknesses, would represent an investment into the future and a guarantee that the Program is acting in accordance with local paces and priorities

2.- The sustained commitment to internal and external dialogue. The promotion of dialogue between sectors (labor, finances, industry, education/VET) and between stakeholders from the private, public and civil society domains has been a hallmark of Moztrabalha and has helped the project to be flexible, reflective and draw lessons to improve the service model.

3.- Partnerships with private actors. Alliances of this nature formed within the framework of the project with private actors acting as services providers and even financial contributors, allowed greater flexibility in the use of resources, fostered channels of innovation, favored adaptation to the context, and broadened the prospects for expansion and replication of applied experiences.

ANNEX I – TERMS OF REFERENCE

ANNEX I

Terms of Reference

for Independent Final Evaluation of the project:

**“Decent Work for a Sustainable and Inclusive Transformation in Mozambique
(Moztrabalha)”**



International Labour Organization

TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR):

**INDEPENDENT FINAL EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT
“DECENT WORK FOR SUSTAINABLE AND INCLUSIVE
ECONOMIC TRANSFORMATION IN MOZAMBIQUE
(MOZTRABALHA)”**

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Project Title: | Decent Work for Sustainable and Inclusive Economic Transformation in Mozambique |
| Project Code | MOZ/16/01/SWE |
| Administrative Unit | CO-Lusaka |
| Technical Back stopping Units | EMPLOYMENT; ENTERPRISES, SKILLS, DEVINVEST, ITC-LO; WORKQUALITY, ACT/RAV, ACT/EMP, GENDER |
| Donor | Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) |
| Implementation period | December 2016- March 2022 |
| Budget | USD 9,480,000 + USD 1,198,190(Covid-19) =USD 10,678, 930 |
| Type of evaluation | Independent Final Evaluation |
| Date of evaluation | September-November 2021 |
| Evaluation Manager | Ricardo Furman, Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist ILO Regional Office for Africa |

1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Background of the project to be evaluated

For decades Mozambique has been one of the fastest growing economies in sub-Saharan Africa; however, the impressive record in term of growth has not automatically translated into reducing the poverty levels.

Recognizing that the poverty challenges are closely linked to the employment situation, the ILO and the Government of Mozambique with funding from the Government of Sweden are implementing a project on the promotion of Decent Work for Sustainable and Inclusive Economic Transformation in Mozambique, also known as the “MOZTRABALHA” project. The total expected contribution from Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) is USD now 8.6 million USD (actual cost due to exchange rate) for 5 years, starting from 1 /12/ 2016.

The project responds to the priorities identified in the National Employment Policy and aims at creating employment opportunities for poor people, particularly women and young people across the country. Opportunities to start and run commercial business will also be enhanced. The interventions proposed will empower the poor and provide them with appropriate tools for improvement of their living conditions. The project also addresses pertinent issues related to labour rights and social dialogue mechanisms and structures in Mozambique.

The project MozTrabalha project has three objectives:

- Immediate Objectives 1: Strengthen national policy and institutional environment leadings to increased promotion of decent employment and sustainable economic transformation.
- Immediate Objectives 2: Sectors are stimulated to create decent, sustainable and green employment opportunities for Mozambican women and men, in particular youth and those living in rural areas.
- Immediate Objective 3 (Covid-19 Response): Resilient workers and enterprises to mitigate the socio-economic impact of COVID-19 in Mozambique

Beyond its upstream work on policy and institutional support (immediate objective 1), the project seeks to directly create and improve employment outcomes in both urban and rural areas, by focusing on a) implementation of employment-intensive market infrastructure investments, b) stimulate Green Jobs through SME development and c) create opportunities and reducing constraints to access productive employment for women and female-headed households (immediate objective 2). Later on, a third immediate objective was added to support workers and businesses, especially in the informal economy, that have been hit hard by the Covid-19 crisis.

The project was designed to pursue a market systems development approach as the unifying framework.

The key stakeholders of the project are two distinguished target groups; intermediate/direct beneficiaries and ultimate beneficiaries. The ultimate beneficiaries targeted are Mozambican women and men, especially those who live in poverty, and are engaged in various forms of economic activities ranging from highly insecure and vulnerable employment and survivalist activities to more productive and gainful jobs, e.g. in formalized and growth-oriented enterprises. Due to the project's employment-intensive rural infrastructure component, many of the ultimate beneficiaries are also the direct recipients, in the form of jobs being created in the demonstration projects.

Project Management Arrangement

The project is managed by a Chief Technical Adviser (CTA), responsible for overall project management based in Maputo, Mozambique, and reports to the director of the ILO CO for Malawi, Mozambique and Zambia. The Project Management Team comprises also two other internationally recruited technical staff as follows:

- An international expert on employment policy and labour intensive investment ;
- An international expert on enterprise development and green jobs.

In addition, the project has three National Project Officers who are responsible for specific work streams as follows:

- National officer on research, statistics and gender;
- National officer on labour rights and social dialogue;
- National officer on Employment Intensive Investment Programme (EIIP)

2. PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

Evaluation Background

ILO considers evaluation as an integral part of the implementation of technical cooperation activities. This project has gone through an independent mid-term evaluation⁷ and at its end will go under an independent final evaluation. Both evaluations are managed by an ILO certified evaluation manager not linked with the project.

The evaluation in ILO is for the purpose of accountability, learning and planning and building knowledge. It should be conducted in the context of criteria and approaches for international development assistance as established by: the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standard; and the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System. This evaluation will follow the ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation; and the ILO EVAL Policy Guidelines Checklist 3 "Preparing the inception report"; Checklist 4 "Validating methodologies"; and Checklist 5 "Preparing the evaluation report". The evaluation will follow the OECD-DAC framework and principles for evaluation. For all practical purposes, this ToRs and ILO Evaluation policies and guidelines define the overall scope of this evaluation. Recommendations, emerging from the evaluation, should be

⁷ The report is available at <https://www.ilo.org/ievaldiscovery/#a12glss>

strongly linked to the findings of the evaluation and should provide clear guidance to stakeholders on how they can address them.

Purpose and objectives of the evaluation

The main purpose of this evaluation is to provide an independent assessment of the progress to date, through an analysis of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, effects and orientation to impact of the project. The specific objectives of the evaluation are the following:

1. Establish the relevance of the project design and implementation strategy in relation to the ILO, UN and national development frameworks (i.e. SDGs and UNDAF) and final beneficiaries needs;
2. Assess the extent to which the project has achieved its stated objectives and expected results, while identifying the supporting factors and constraints that have led to them, including strategies and implementation modalities chosen, partnership and arrangements
3. Identify unexpected positive and negative results of the project
4. Assess the level of implementation efficiency of the project.
5. Review the institutional set-up, capacity for project implementation, coordination mechanisms and the use and usefulness of management tools including the project monitoring tools and work plans;
6. Assess the extent to which the project outcomes will be sustainable;
7. Analyze the project impact at institutional level as well at the level of the final men and women beneficiaries
8. Identify specific lessons learned and potential good practices for the key stakeholders.
9. Provide strategic recommendations for the different key stakeholders to promote sustainability and support further development of the project outcomes.

Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will cover the period December 2016-March 2022 through two phases. First, a main evaluation process for the period until September 2021 and second, a desk-review to document updates from findings in the evaluation first phase by February-March 2022. The evaluation will cover all the planned outputs and outcomes under the project, with particular attention to synergies between the components and contribution to national policies and programmes.

The intention is that the first phase of the evaluation findings, conclusions, recommendations, etc. can be used for an on-going proposal development for a second phase of the project

The evaluation will discuss how the project is addressing the ILO cross-cutting themes including gender equality and non-discrimination, social dialogue and tripartism, international labour standards, and just transition to environmental sustainability.

The evaluation should help to understand how and why the project has obtained or not the specific results from output to potential impacts.

3. REVIEW CRITERIA AND KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

a) Review criteria

The evaluation should address the overall ILO evaluation concerns such as relevance and coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact as defined in the ILO Policy Guidelines for results-based evaluation, 2017 following OECD-DAC evaluation criteria:

https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/--eval/documents/publication/wcms_571339.pdf

The review will address the following ILO evaluation concerns;

- Relevance, coherence and strategic fit of the project;
- Validity of the project design;
- Project effectiveness;
- Efficiency of resources use;
- Sustainability of project outcomes;
- Impact orientation;
- Gender equality and non-discrimination

The ILO crosscutting themes should be integrated in the evaluation question as necessary during the inception phase and reflected in the Inception report.

b) Key Evaluation Questions

The evaluator shall examine the following key issues:

g) Relevance and strategic fit,

- Is the project coherent with the Government objectives, National Development Frameworks, beneficiaries' needs, and does it support the outcomes outlined in the UNDAF/UNSDCF, DWCP, ILO Planning, as well as the SDGs?
- How does the project complement and fit with other on-going ILO programmes and projects in the country?
- What links have been established so far with other activities of the UN or other cooperating partners operating in the Country in the areas of employment, market development and women's empowerment?
- Has the project been able to leverage the ILO contributions, through its comparative advantages (including tripartism, international labour standards, ILO Decent Work Team etc.)?

h) Validity of intervention design

- Does the project address the major causes of unemployment and underemployment in Mozambique?

- Is the project realistic (in terms of expected outputs, outcome and impact) given the time and resources available, including performance and its M&E system, knowledge sharing and communication strategy?
- To what extent has the project integrated ILO cross cutting themes in the design?
- To what extent did the problem analysis identify its differential impact on men and women and on other vulnerable groups (like people with disabilities and others as relevant)?
- Are the indicators of the achievements clearly defined, describing the changes to be brought about? Were the indicators designed and used in a manner that they enabled reporting on progress under specific SDG targets and indicators?
- Is the project Theory of change comprehensive, integrate external factors and is based on systemic analysis?

➤

i) Effectiveness:

- To what extent have the overall project objectives/outcomes been achieved?
- Were these results achieved through an integrated implementation of the project or through fragmented implementation of separate project components?
- Has the management and governance structure put in place worked strategically with all key stakeholders and partners in Mozambique, ILO and the donor to achieve project goals and objectives?
- Has the knowledge sharing and communication strategy been effective in raising the profile of the project within the country and among the cooperating partners?
- Is the monitoring and evaluation system results-based and facilitate a project adaptive management?
- Assess how contextual and institutional risks and external factors (positive and negative) have been managed by the project management?
- Was the market system approach successfully implemented as the unifying framework?
- Has the project implementation successfully adapted to changes over time?
- To what extent has the COVID-19 Pandemic influenced project results and effectiveness and how the project have addressed this influence to adapt to changes?
- Does the (adapted) intervention models used in the project suggest an intervention model for similar crisis response?

j) Efficiency of resource use

- Have resources (financial, human, technical support, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve the project outputs and specially outcomes?
- To what extent did the project leverage resources to promote gender equality and nondiscrimination; and inclusion of people with disability

k) Impact orientation and sustainability

- What level of influence has the project achieved on the development of employment and other areas on policies and practices at national and subnational levels?
- Which project-supported tools have been, or have the potential to be, institutionalized and/or replicated by partners or external organizations?
- Is the project contributing to expand the knowledge base and build evidence regarding the project outcomes and impacts?
- To which extent are the results of the interventions likely to have a long term, sustainable positive contribution to the country's national development, SDG achievement and relevant targets? (explicitly or implicitly)
- How has the sustainability approach of the project been affected by the COVID-19 situation in context of the national responses and how has the project and stakeholders responded in moving forward the project results appropriation?

l) Gender equality and non-discrimination

- What are so far the key achievements of the project on gender equality and women's empowerment?
- Has the use of resources on women's empowerment activities been sufficient to achieve the expected results?
- To what extent is the M&E data supporting project decision making related to gender?
- Has the project addressed other vulnerable groups, including people living with disabilities?

4. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation will comply with evaluation norms and standards and follow ethical safeguards, all as specified in ILO's evaluation procedures. The ILO adheres to the United Nations Development Group (UNDG) evaluation norms and standards as well as to the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards. The evaluation is an independent evaluation and the final methodology and evaluation questions will be determined by the consultant in consultation with the Evaluation Manager.

The information needs and evaluation questions call for an in-depth understanding of the situation to provide a holistic assessment and interpretation of the project's achievements. The methodology should include examination of the intervention's Theory of Change (ToC). The theory of change should give light of the logical connect between levels of results and their alignment with the national policy frameworks, the ILO's strategic objectives and outcomes at global and national levels, as well as with the relevant SDGs and targets.

The methodology should be participatory and include a mix-methods approach, with analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data. It should also be able to capture the intervention's contributions to the achievement of expected and unexpected outcomes.

The evaluation will be carried out through a desk review and field visit to the project stakeholders in the country with appropriate gender disaggregation. In addition, to the extent possible, the data collection, analysis and presentation should be responsive to and include issues relating to diversity and non-discrimination, including disability issues.

Recommendations, emerging from the evaluation, should be specific and actionable, strongly linked to the findings of the evaluation and should provide clear guidance to all stakeholders on how they can address them, indicating in each one to whom is directed, Priority, Resources required and timeframe (long, medium or short).

Due to the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic and its impact on the world of work, this evaluation will be conducted in the context of criteria and approaches outlined in the ILO internal guide: Implications of COVID-19 on evaluations in the ILO: An internal Guide on adapting to the situation (version March 25, 2020).

The evaluation will be conducted by an international experienced consultant virtually (home-based) with support of a national consultant. If the the COVID-19 situation allows the national consultant will conduct field visits to the project sites. This will be discussed at the inception phase of the evaluation.

In particular, this evaluation will follow the ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation; and the ILO EVAL Policy Guidelines Checklist 3 "Preparing the inception report"; Checklist 4 "Validating methodologies"; Checklist 5 "Preparing the evaluation report" and Checklist "6 Rating the quality of evaluation report".

Within this scenario, reliance on desk review and online methods (e.g. online surveys, telephone, Zoom, Teams and Skype interviews) will take higher prominence. This will require enhanced engagement and collaboration with the project team. Particularly for the national consultant all effort under the safety COVID-19 rules will be considered for field visits and face-to-face interviews and focal groups.

The project team will develop and avail to the evaluation team a database with contact details of ILO constituencies and stakeholders and will work closely with the evaluator to make the virtual meetings available covering final beneficiaries (including covering communications cost if needed).

The evaluators will ensure that opinions and perceptions of women and other vulnerable groups are equally reflected in the interviews and that gender-specific questions are included.

A virtual stakeholders' workshop will be organized to discuss initial findings and complete data gaps with key stakeholders, ILO staff and representatives of the development partners.

The workshop will be logistically supported by the project and programmatically managed by the evaluator. The details of it should be stated clearly in the Inception Report for further preparation during the data collection phase.

The evaluator is encouraged to propose alternative mechanism or techniques for the data collection phase. These will be discussed with the project and the evaluation manager at the Inception phase. Any alternative should be reflected in the Inception report.

The methodological process includes the following techniques (the evaluator at the inception phase can propose other techniques):

Desk review of project design and strategy documents, activity documents, communications and research and publications

Key informant interviews with project staff, relevant ILO specialists, GoMZ, tripartite constituents, civil society organizations and other stakeholders and partners (see annex Focus group discussions with beneficiaries (women and men potential migrants, migrant workers, return migrant workers and members of their families)

Field In-depth interviews in Mozambique: The Evaluation team is expected to meet project beneficiaries' men and women to undertake more in depth reviews on the project work and results.

The project intervenes in 5 provinces in Mozambique: South (Maputo and Inhambane), Centre (Manica and Beira), and North (Nampula)-The evaluation team is expected to visit a purposive selection of communities in addition to interviews in Maputo.

The selection of the field visits locations should be based on criteria to be defined by the evaluation team. Some criteria to consider may include:

- Locations with successful and less or unsuccessful results (from the perception of key stakeholders and the progress reports). The rationale is that extreme cases, at some extent, are more helpful than averages for understanding how process worked and results have been obtained;
- Locations that have been identified as providing particular good practices or bringing out particular key issues as identified by the desk review and initial discussions;
- Locations next to and not so close to main roads (accessibility).

Presentation of the preliminary findings before the key stakeholders in a workshop: a virtual workshop in Portuguese (and English interpretation if required) with key stakeholders (ie. national ones, ILO and the donor) will be conducted at the end of the data collection phase to present preliminary findings and recommendations to identify any misinterpretation or data gaps to be addressed in the draft report.

Development of a draft and final versions of the report (see in the next sections)

Development of an update of the evaluation report as an annex of the final evaluation: based desk review and calls with the project team to develop a short report to discuss updates on results and analysis of the project in the evaluation report (period of October 2021-March 2022). This report will be separate from the evaluation report and will be annexed to the main evaluation report (without any modification to the main report)

5. MAIN DELIVERABLES

- a) An inception report (not more than 20 pages excluding the annexes) - upon the review of available documents and an initial discussion with the project management (EVAL Guidelines –Checklist 3). The inception report will:
- Describe the conceptual framework that will be used to undertake the evaluation;
 - Elaborate the methodology proposed in the TOR with changes as required;
 - Set out in some detail the data required to answer the evaluation questions, data sources by specific evaluation questions, (emphasizing triangulation as much as possible) data collection methods, and sampling
 - Selection criteria for locations to be visited;
 - Selection criteria for individuals for interviews (as much as possible should include men and women);
 - Detail the work plan for the evaluation, indicating the phases in the evaluation, their key deliverables and milestones;
 - Set out the list of key stakeholders to be interviewed and the tools to be used for interviews and discussions;
 - Set out the agenda for the stakeholders workshop;
 - Set out outline for the final evaluation report;
 - Interview and focus group guides.

The Inception report should be approved by the Evaluation manger before proceeding with the field work.

- b) Preliminary Findings to be shared with the key stakeholders (i.e. the Advisory Committee and the donor) at the end of field work phase. The ILO will organize a half day virtual meeting to discuss the preliminary findings of the evaluation after data collection is completed. The evaluator will set the agenda for the half-day to one day meeting. The presentation should provide a brief review of key results for each evaluation criteria. The workshop will be technically organized by the evaluation team with the logistic support of the project.
- c) First draft of Evaluation Report (Checklist 5 to be provided to the Consultant) -to be improved by the methodological review by the Evaluation manager. The Evaluation Manger holds the responsibility of approving this draft. The draft review report will be shared with all relevant stakeholders and a request for comments will be asked within a specified time (2 weeks).
- d) Final version of evaluation report incorporating comments received of ILO and other key stakeholders. The report should be no longer than 30 pages excluding annexes with executive summary (as per ILO standard format for evaluation summary). The quality of the report will be assessed against the EVAL checklist 5, 6 and 7 to be provided to

Consultant). Any identified lessons learnt and good practices will also need to have standard annex templates (1 lessons learnt and one Good Practices per page to be annexed in the report) as per EVAL guidelines. The report should also include a section on output and outcome level results against indicators and targets of each project and comments on each one.

The final version is subjected to final approval by EVAL (after initial approval by the Evaluation manager and the Regional evaluation officer)

e) Executive summary in ILO EVAL template

The draft and final versions of the evaluation report in English and Portuguese (maximum 30 pages plus annexes) will be developed under the following structure (EVAL Check list 5):

1. Cover page with key project data (project title, project number, donor, project start and completion dates, budget, technical area, managing ILO unit, geographical coverage); and evaluation data (type of evaluation, managing ILO unit, start and completion dates of the evaluation mission, name(s) of evaluator(s), date of submission of evaluation report).
 2. Table of contents
 3. Acronyms
 4. Executive Summary
 5. Background of the project and its intervention logic
 6. Purpose, scope and clients of evaluation
 7. Methodology and limitations
 8. Presentation of findings (by criteria)
 9. Conclusions and Recommendations (including to whom they are addressed, resources required, priority and timing)
 10. Lessons Learnt and potential good practices
 11. Annexes (TOR, table with the status achieved of project indicators targets and a brief comment per indicator, list of people interviewed, Schedule of the field work overview of meetings, list of Documents reviewed, Lessons and Good practices templates per each one, other relevant information).
- f) Update report on evaluation analysis to integrate project results for October 2021-March 2022. A report of maximum 10 pages updating findings, conclusions recommendations, lessons learned and good practices. It will be an annex of the main report and can do all necessary references to it. The report outline should be reflected in the Inception report. It should consider:
1. Introduction
 2. Methodology and limitations (for the update)
 3. Presentation of updated issues on findings
 4. Conclusions and Recommendations (update from the main report)
 5. Lessons Learnt and potential good practices (update from the main report if applicable)

6. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS AND WORK PLAN

Evaluation Manager: the evaluation will be managed by Mr. Ricardo Furman, who has not prior involvement in the project.

The evaluation manager is responsible for completing the following specific tasks:

- Draft and finalize the evaluation TOR with inputs from key stakeholders;
- Develop the all for expression of interest and select the independent evaluator in coordination with EVAL;
- Approve the inception report
- Brief the evaluator on ILO evaluation policies and procedures;
- Initial coordination with the project team on the development of the field mission;
- Circulate the first draft of the evaluation report for comments by key stakeholders;
- Ensure the final version of the evaluation report address stakeholders' comments (or an explanation why any has not been addressed) and meets ILO requirements.
- Approve the draft version before circulation and first approval of the final version and submission to EVAL for final approval

Team leader

- The evaluation team will consist of one international consultant and one national consultant that can be individually contracted or as a firm.
- The team leader will have responsibility for the evaluation report.
- The evaluation team will agree on the distribution of work and schedule for the evaluation and stakeholders to consult.
- The team leader will have the oversight responsibility to translate the report into Portuguese. The ILO will reimburse the cost of translation.
- The team leader will report to the evaluation manger

Qualifications

Team Leader

- University Degree in social development or economic or related subject at master level or equivalent
- Seven years of experience in project /program evaluation including theory of change-based approach in Sub-Saharan Africa
- Expertise in market systems development approach, decent work and employment creation, local economic and enterprise development, and/or green economy, as well as Human Rights Based Approach programming and Results Based Management;
- Experience in in applying, qualitative and quantitative research methodologies including participatory community-based
- Knowledge of ILO's roles and mandate and its tripartite structure as well as UN evaluation norms and its programming is desirable;
- Excellent analytical skills and communication skills;
- Demonstrated excellent report writing skills in English. The knowledge of Portuguese will be an added value.

Team member

- University Degree in social development or economic or related subject or equivalent
- 3-5 years of experience in project /program evaluation including theory of change-based approach in Mozambique
- Expertise in market systems development approach, decent work and employment creation, local economic and enterprise development, and/or green economy, as well as Human Rights Based Approach programming and Results Based Management would be asset;
- Experience in applying, qualitative and quantitative research methodologies including participatory community-based,
- Knowledge of ILO's roles and mandate and its tripartite structure as well as UN evaluation norms and its programming is desirable;
- Excellent analytical skills and communication skills;
- Demonstrated excellent report writing skills in English and Portuguese; excellent command of one or two other national languages spoken in Mozambique will be an asset.

Stakeholders' role:

Key stakeholders namely the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Security, employers and workers organizations, Social Partners, the representatives of the donor (SIDA) in Mozambique, including the project teams, ILO CO-Lusaka, DWT/CO-Pretoria, ILO technical unit at HQ and stakeholders in field locations including final beneficiaries will be consulted and will have opportunities to provide inputs to the TOR and draft final evaluation report and in principle will be interviewed.

The tasks of the Project:

The project management team will provide logistical support to the evaluation team and will assist in organizing a detailed evaluation mission agenda. The projects will also ensure that all relevant documentations are up to date and easily accessible (in electronic form in a space such as Dropbox) by the evaluation team from the first day of the contract (desk review phase).

Evaluation Timetable and Schedule

The evaluation will be conducted between September 2021 and February 2022 (first phase September-November 2021 and second phase February 2022).

| List of Tasks | Responsible | Time line (Tentative Dates) |
|---|-------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Circulation of draft TORs among stakeholders | EM | 5-16 August |
| Circulation of Call for EoI for consultants | EM | 5-16 August |
| Selection of the consultant and contract signing | EM with project support | 17 August -3 September |
| Briefing with the evaluation manager Briefing with the project | EM and Project | 13-24 September: |

| | | |
|--|------------|--------------------|
| Desk review of project background documents and development of the Inception report. | Evaluators | 13-24- September |
| Submission of draft Inception report including design of evaluation instrument | Evaluators | 20 September |
| Feedback on inception report | EM | 20-23 September |
| Finalization of the inception report | Evaluators | 24 September |
| Field visit and interviews Stakeholders workshop for preliminary results | Evaluators | 4-15 October |
| Analysis of information/data collected and preparation of the draft report | Evaluators | 18-22 October |
| Review of the Draft evaluation report | EM | 25 October |
| Translation to Portuguese | Evaluators | 26-30 October |
| Circulate draft report among key stakeholders including donor and receive feedback | EM | 1-12 November |
| Consolidate feedback and share with the Consultant. | EM | 15-16 November |
| Finalize the final report addressing comments (in English and Portuguese) | Evaluator | 17-19 November |
| Approval of Final Report by EVAL | EM-EVAL | 15-19 November |
| Develop the update report annex (English and Portuguese) | Evaluator | 21-25February 2022 |
| Approval by EVAL | EM-EVAL | March 2022 |

Proposed work days for the evaluation team

| Phase | Responsible Person | Tasks | No of days | |
|--------------|--|--|------------|-----------|
| | | | IC | NC |
| I | Evaluation team leader | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Briefing with the evaluation manager, the project team and the donor o Desk Review of programme related documents o Inception report (English) | 5 | 2 |
| II | Evaluation team with organisational support from ILO | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o In-country consultations with programme staff o Field visits o Interviews with projects staff, partners beneficiaries o Stakeholders workshop for sharing findings o Debriefing with the CO- Addis Ababa | 10 | 10 |
| III | Evaluation team | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Draft report based on consultations from field visits and desk review and the stakeholders' workshop (English and Portuguese) | 10 | 2 |
| IV | Evaluation Manager | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Quality check and initial review by Evaluation Manager o Circulate draft report to stakeholders o Consolidate comments of stakeholders and send to team leader | 0 | 0 |
| V | Evaluation team leader | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Finalize the report including explanations on why comments were not included (English and Portuguese) | 3 | 0 |
| VI | Evaluation team leader | Development of the update report (English and Portuguese) | 3 | 0 |
| TOTAL | | | 31 | 14 |

IC: International Consultation and Team leader NC: National consultant

Budget

A budget under the full control of the evaluation manager will cover:

For the evaluation team:

- Fees for the team leader of the evaluation team for 31 days
- Fees for the team member of the evaluation team for 14 days
- DSA and travel as per ILO regulations
-

For the evaluation exercise as a whole:

- Communications
- Any other miscellaneous costs

ToRs ANNEX RELEVANT POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

ILO Policy Guidelines for evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations, 3rd ed.

http://www.ilo.ch/eval/Evaluationpolicy/WCMS_571339/lang--en/index.htm

Code of conduct form (To be signed by the evaluators)

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206205/lang--en/index.htm

Checklist No. 3: Writing the inception report

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165972/lang--en/index.htm

Checklist 5: preparing the evaluation report

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165967/lang--en/index.htm

Checklist 6: rating the quality of evaluation report

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165968/lang--en/index.htm

Template for lessons learnt and Emerging Good Practices

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206158/lang--en/index.htm

Guidance note 7: Stakeholders participation in the ILO evaluation

https://www.ilo.org/global/docs/WCMS_165982/lang--en/index.htm

Guidance note 4: Integrating gender equality in the monitoring and evaluation of projects

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165986/lang--en/index.htm

Template for evaluation title page

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_166357/lang--en/index.htm

Template for evaluation summary

<http://www.ilo.org/legacy/english/edmas/eval/template-summary-en.doc>

UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation

<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/548>

Guidance on the evaluation requirements for ILO interventions under the COVID 19 Multi-Partner Trust Fund

<https://intranet.ilo.org/collaborate/evalksp/Documents/Guidance%20on%20evaluation%20requirements%20for%20MPTF%20COVID-19%20interventions.pdf>

ANNEX II – MATRIX WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

| Relevance and strategic fit | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|--|
| Criteria | Key questions | Sub-question / Indicators | |
| Relevance & strategic fit | 1. Is the project coherent with the Government objectives, National Development Frameworks, beneficiaries' needs, and does it support the outcomes outlined in the UNDAF/UNSDCF, DWCP, ILO Planning, as well as the SDGs? | References /examples of connections, links, synergies and interactions with government's strategy, policies and plans of UNDAF/UNSDCF, DWCP, ILO Planning as well as the SDGs. Stakeholders clearly endorse alignment of the project with main policies and plans being implemented in the country. | Conexiones son claras y suficientemente desarrolladas en la documentación. Ver web Moztabalha, PRODOC, evaluación intermedia, carpeta documentación Egidio Stakeholders clearly endorse alignment of the project with main policies and plans being implemented in the country. Reference to the latest RANE 2021 |
| Relevance & strategic fit | 2. How does the project complement and fit with other on-going ILO programmes and projects in the country? | Examples of actual complementarities with other ILO programmes. Consensus among stakeholders about consistency and complementarity between ILO programmes. Presence and frequency of interaction between officers of HQ, Regional and Country programs. | Previas ILO intervenciones en Moz fueron intervenciones de pequeña escala: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More and better Jobs in Cabo Delgado and Nampula • Skills employment and productivity in Low income countries (KOICA) • Support to the elaboration of the NEP Moztabalha is the first comprehensive intervention of ILO in the country. Consensus among stakeholders about consistency and complementarity between ILO programmes. Moztabalha builds on these previous interventions and elevates the profile of ILO's presence in the country Other small actions identified. "Your employment for early recovery)2019 – 0.6 M USD) . Presence and frequency of interaction between officers of HQ, Regional and Country programs have been high. |
| Relevance & strategic fit | 3. Has the project been able to leverage the ILO contributions, through its comparative advantages (including tripartism, international | Benefits from tripartite coordination, International Standards, ILO Decent Work Team on project implementation, and output and outcome achievement | Tripartite approach is deemed to be appropriate to implement a project of this scope, since it brings together a wide array of key stakeholders in the labour domain. |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | labour standards, ILO Decent Work Team, etc.)? | | <p>ILO expertise, standards, tools and well developed methodologies (examples: EESE, SIYB, among others), have been instrumental regarding the capacity building effort</p> <p>ILO backstopping has regarded as of high quality and very helpful</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

Validity of Intervention Design

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Validity of Intervention Design | 4. Does the project address the major causes of unemployment and underemployment in Mozambique? | Correspondence between the major causes of unemployment and underemployment in Mozambique according to all stakeholders and project activities and outcomes. | <p>Yes, but within the limits and constraints of a single intervention.</p> <p>The analysis presented in the concept paper and the Prodoc is consistent and presented in a convincing manner. The analytical framework underpinning the programme strategy takes inspiration from systems theory and frames the programme interventions in the context of a people-centred market systems development approach: the people to be reached through the programme are analysed in the context of their network of institutional relationships. the model emphasizes on interaction rather than stakeholders in their individual capacity.</p> <p>It is comprehensive approach that search seeking effects at different level:</p> <p>Meta-level: T, perceptions and belief sets held by actors across system levels, including their notions towards entrepreneurship and gender equality.</p> <p>Macro-level: rules of interaction' along the network, codified in policies, laws and regulations.</p> <p>Meso-level: The meso-level relates to institutional capacity and quality of services delivered</p> <p>Micro-level: the exchange of goods and services in the market place, including the exchange of labour as well as financial services.;</p> <p>The project has tried to achieve its objectives by acting and linking the effects of those different levels</p> <p>No major disagreements with the key strategic options of acting at these four levels.</p> <p>Some disputes about specific emphasis, e.g. more support to self-employment packages or more private sector orientation.</p> |
|---------------------------------|---|--|---|

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Validity of Intervention Design | 5. Is the project realistic (in terms of expected outputs, outcome and impact) given the time and resources available, including performance and its M&E system, knowledge sharing and communication strategy? | Objectives are deemed to be realistic and achievable by most of the stakeholders Degree of consensus around the Theory of Change (ToC). Managers and project technicians show a good understanding of the ToC, and presence of mechanisms to update the ToC and the project activities. Assessment on the appropriateness of the schedule and resources allocated, verifying gaps and delays. Activities included in the logFrame are deemed consistent and logical for obtaining the project outputs. Assess usefulness of its M&E system in terms of applicability for planning, identification of performance problems, and use by all stakeholders involved. Verify at which stage the project is known by stakeholders and other external partners. | Some issues about being very ambitious. Necessary conditions not in place to implement some components: expertise, capacities, ownership Appropriateness of the MSDA ToC not fully unpacked. Has this been a problem? Not necessarily. The underlying ToC for the whole intervention is implicit in the project rationale and justification. Being such a wide and comprehensive project, it might be justified to use a developmental approach and elaborate more specific ToCs for the different components (for example, the horticulture value chain). This has been done along the implementation process, Results Chains defined for each intervention of each Outcome for monitoring of intervention progress, although in some cases, the outcome of these analysis have not delivered satisfactory results (e.g. the conditions for the constructions materials to thrive in the construction sector) Vertical and horizontal logic of the LF are ok. Some questions can be raised, however, regarding the scale and capacity of some outputs to attain the expected outcomes (e.g., the set-up of rural cooperatives to introduce soil-cement building materials in the construction sector)- |
| Validity of Intervention Design | 6. To what extent has the project integrated ILO cross cutting themes in the design? | Consensus around the consideration of gender issues, inclusion of vulnerable groups and working conditions, climate change and environment, and social dialogue during the design (needs assessment, specific actions etc.). Specific activities and expected outputs defined related to cross cutting issues. | Generically OK <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tripartisim widely present across the project, with some specific actions meant to reinforce social dialogue. • Gender Equality. Significant focus placed on gender issues. Various gender analysis foreseen and carried out. Also capacity building effort • Environmental issues: Also present although more on the fringes. Specific component on Green Jobs, not very clear focus on mainstreaming the transitions towards green jobs what was to be achieved. Not very successful • Attention to vulnerability: The project pays attention to vulnerability in many different ways, mainly by targeting vulnerable population. Inclusion of disable people is not |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| | | | clearly addressed. Mainstreaming of inclusive employment is not very visible (this might be a bit controversial) | |
| Validity of Intervention Design | 7. To what extent did the problem analysis identify its differential impact on men and women and on other vulnerable groups (like people with disabilities and others as relevant)? | Specific issues assessed during the design phase regarding gender issues and vulnerable groups, and how they finally integrated the project framework. Disaggregation of indicators regarding gender and vulnerable groups according to problems detected during the initial analysis | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | |
| Validity of Intervention Design | 8. Are the indicators of the achievements clearly defined, describing the changes to be brought about? Were the indicators designed and used in a manner that they enabled reporting on progress under specific SDG targets and indicators? | Indicators meet SMART criteria at the different level. Indicators correspond to their level in the results chain. Clear identification and differentiation of outputs and outcomes, and judicious combination of quantitative and qualitative indicators. Availability of baseline values and targets for both quantitative and qualitative indicators. Clear identification of contribution to specific SDG targets and indicators, and inclusion of these indicators within the M&E system. Project reports include related SDG indicators follow-up. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documental review | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ILO Staff (Hq, Regional & Country Offices) Donors Project staff (managers and technicians) |
| Validity of Intervention Design | 9. Is the project Theory of change comprehensive, integrate external factors and is based on systemic analysis? | Long-term goal in clear and states the consensus about the project final impact. The ToC includes all preconditions affecting the expected long-term goal Assumptions explicit how the project will work and are well documented. All stakeholders participated in the definition of the connecting outcomes and assumptions, and the final ToC integrates their interests, vision and voice. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Semi-structured in-depth Interviews (face to face or Skype) with stakeholders Documental review Written Questionnaire or Mini-survey. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ILO Staff (Hq, Regional & Country Offices) Donors National Stakeholders Project staff (managers and technicians) Representatives of target groups. |

Project effectiveness

| Criteria | Key questions | Sub-question / Indicators | Tools to be applied | Stakeholders involved |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Project effectiveness | 10. To what extent has been made towards achieving the overall project objectives/outcomes been achieved? | Verification of the Logframe indicators and /or Monitoring Performing Plan Perception of the stakeholders on achievement and delivering results Quality of the products and services delivered according to the stakeholder's perception. Main factors affecting the delivery of products and services (positively or negatively) have been identified. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Semi-structured in-depth Interviews (face to face or Skype) with stakeholders Written Questionnaire or Mini-survey Documental review | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ILO Staff (Hq & Country Offices) National Stakeholders Project staff (managers and technicians) Representatives of target groups. |
| Project effectiveness | 11. Has the management and governance structure put in place worked strategically with all key stakeholders and partners in Mozambique, ILO and the donor to achieve project goals and objectives? | Type of coordination routines, participation, integration of stakeholders, and applicability of conclusions of coordination meetings. Specific level of participation of each stakeholder, and its effective influence on implementation and achievement of goals. Factors affecting the participation of stakeholders, and gaps found in practice (low frequency of participation, poor integration of specific points of view,...). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Semi-structured in-depth Interviews (face to face or Skype) with stakeholders Documental review | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ILO Staff (Hq & Country Offices) National Stakeholders Project staff (managers and technicians) |
| Project effectiveness | 12. Has the knowledge sharing, and communication strategy been effective in raising the profile of the project within the country and among the cooperating partners? | Cooperation partners and related government bodies know the project, its objectives and goals, and activities implemented. Type of communication activities held, and audience reached. Channels and Tools for knowledge sharing are well known by cooperation partners, and the information is ready and easy to see, to use and to share. Other projects and institutions show interest in partnering with ILO for complementing their interventions. Best practices from the project are used in other interventions. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Semi-structured in-depth Interviews (face to face or Skype) with stakeholders Written Questionnaire or Mini-survey Documental review | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ILO Staff (Hq & Country Offices) National Stakeholders Project staff (managers and technicians) Representatives of target groups. |
| Project effectiveness | 13. Is the monitoring and evaluation system results- | The M&E system defines achievable final and intermediate goals, and adequate means for verification. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Semi-structured in-depth Interviews (face to face or | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ILO Staff (Hq & Country Offices) |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | based and facilitate a project adaptive management? | The M&E system gives clear and updated information about project progress with high frequency along the year, and this information is shared among stakeholders, specially those with responsibility on project planning and management. M&E information is accessible by stakeholders and includes tools for facilitating its interpretation and decision making. There are mechanisms for including M&E information within project planning. | Skype) with stakeholders • Documental review | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Stakeholders • Project staff (managers and technicians) • Representatives of target groups. |
| Project effectiveness | 14. Assess how contextual and institutional risks and positive external to the project factors have been managed by the project management? | Consensus on how external contextual factor have been managed within the project, minimizing the risks and taking advantage of the positive ones. Possible conflicts or issues raised by the management team due to lack of their institutional and contextual understanding | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Semi-structured in-depth Interviews (face to face or Skype) with stakeholders • Documental review | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ILO Staff (Hq & Country Offices) • National Stakeholders • Project staff (managers and technicians) • Representatives of target groups. |
| Project effectiveness | 15. To what extend has the COVID-19 Pandemic influenced project results and effectiveness and how the project has addressed this influence to adapt to changes? | Type and number of activities affected by Covid19 government restrictions and on implementation, and its consequences. Project arrangements to address negative covid influence on implementation, and their effect on progress | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Semi-structured in-depth Interviews (face to face or Skype) with stakeholders • Written Questionnaire or Mini-survey • Documental review | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ILO Staff (Hq & Country Offices) • National Stakeholders • Project staff (managers and technicians) • Representatives of target groups. |
| Project effectiveness | 16. Does the (adapted) intervention models used in the project suggest an intervention model for similar crisis response? | Factors underlying the present intervention that supported the adapted model. Applicability of adaptation process to other similar type of crisis: problem analysis held, definition of consensual measures to be taken, and final adaptation of the intervention. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Semi-structured in-depth Interviews (face to face or Skype) with stakeholders • Documental review | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ILO Staff (Hq & Country Offices) • National Stakeholders • Project staff (managers and technicians) • Representatives of target groups. |
| Efficiency on resource use | | | | |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| Efficiency on resource use | 17. Have resources (financial, human, technical support, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve the project outputs and specially outcomes? | The resources have been available in a timely and appropriate manner, allowing the implementation of all activities without delays or the expected coverage. Technical capacities were timely in place to respond to project technical needs and were available there where the activities were implemented and directly with the stakeholders involved and contributed to the achievement of outcomes. Dimension of the technical and management team and capacities put in place versus technical needs and stakeholders' capacities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Semi-structured in-depth Interviews (face to face or Skype) with stakeholders • Written Questionnaire or Mini-survey • Documental review | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ILO Staff (Hq & Country Offices) • National Stakeholders • Project staff (managers and technicians) • Representatives of target groups. |
| Efficiency on resource use | 18. To what extent did the project leverage resources to promote gender equality and nondiscrimination; and inclusion of people with disability | Resources directly addressing gender equality, nondiscrimination activities or inclusion of people with disability on project activities or in work conditions within project implementation: quantification, and assessment on specific use on those issues | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Semi-structured in-depth Interviews (face to face or Skype) with stakeholders • Written Questionnaire or Mini-survey • Documental review | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ILO Staff (Hq & Country Offices) • National Stakeholders • Project staff (managers and technicians) • Representatives of target groups. |

| Impact orientation and sustainability | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| Criteria | Key questions | Sub-question / Indicators | Tools to be applied | Stakeholders involved |
| Impact orientation and sustainability | 19. What level of influence has the project achieved on the development of employment and other areas on policies and practices at national and subnational levels? | Examples of changes of employment and related policies due to project direct influence. Examples of practices on employment development and level of implantation (from pilot experiences up to solid implanted practice). Assessment of institutions using these practices and capacity for future replication and dissemination. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Semi-structured in-depth Interviews (face to face or Skype) with stakeholders • Written Questionnaire or Mini-survey • Documental review | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ILO Staff (Hq & Country Offices) • National Stakeholders • Project staff (managers and technicians) • Representatives of target groups. |
| Impact orientation and sustainability | 20. Which project-supported tools have been institutionalized, or have the potential to, by | List of tools applied by the project that can be used by other partners after the end of the project or support: constraints | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Semi-structured in-depth Interviews (face to face or | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ILO Staff (Hq & Country Offices) |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| | partners and/or external organizations be replicated? | for their replication, easy to use, funds and capacities needed, and context validation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Skype) with stakeholders Written Questionnaire or Mini-survey Documental review | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Stakeholders Other partners Project staff (managers and technicians) Representatives of target groups. |
| Impact orientation and sustainability | 21. Is the project contributing to expand the knowledge base and build evidence regarding the project outcomes and impacts? (linked to question 12) | Assess the systematization of practices, tools used and accessibility to information/materials and evidence. Examples of best practices of the projects that are composed and detailed to be disseminated easily by other partners. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Semi-structured in-depth Interviews (face to face or Skype) with stakeholders Written Questionnaire or Mini-survey Documental review | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ILO Staff (Hq & Country Offices) National Stakeholders Other partners Project staff (managers and technicians) Representatives of target groups |
| Impact orientation and sustainability | 22. To which extent the results of the intervention likely to have a long term, sustainable positive contribution to the SDG and relevant targets? (explicitly or implicitly) | Needs for long-term effects on SDG and other targets: funds, human capacities, institutional capacities, inclusion on policies and legal framework. Conditions to meet these needs and likelihood to be met without external aid Understanding by stakeholders around the sustainability strategy. There are commitments and partnerships established with local authorities or other partners | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Semi-structured in-depth Interviews (face to face or Skype) with stakeholders Written Questionnaire or Mini-survey Documental review | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ILO Staff (Hq & Country Offices) National Stakeholders Project staff (managers and technicians) Representatives of target groups. |
| Impact orientation and sustainability | 23. How has the sustainability approach of the project been affected by the COVID-19 situation in context of the national responses and how has the project and stakeholders responded in moving forward the project results appropriation? | Covid19 and national response influence on long term benefits or practices. Changes of stakeholders' approach to the project due to Covid19, and influence on long term benefits Project response to Covid19 and minimization of its influence on long term benefits | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Semi-structured in-depth Interviews (face to face or Skype) with stakeholders Documental review | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ILO Staff (Hq & Country Offices) National Stakeholders Project staff (managers and technicians) Representatives of target groups. |

| Gender equality and non-discrimination | | | | |
|---|----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Criteria | Key questions | Sub-question / Indicators | Tools to be applied | Stakeholders involved |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| Gender equality and non-discrimination | 24. What are so far the key achievements of the project on gender equality and women's empowerment? | Achievement of gender goals regarding gender equality and women's empowerment (project indicators). Examples of gender equality and women's capacities improvement due to the project outcomes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Semi-structured in-depth Interviews (face to face or Skype) with stakeholders • Written Questionnaire or Mini-survey • Documental review | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ILO Staff (Hq & Country Offices) • National Stakeholders • Project staff (managers and technicians) • Representatives of target groups. |
| Gender equality and non-discrimination | 25. Has the use of resources on women's empowerment activities been sufficient to achieve the expected results? | Factors influencing lack or lower impact on expected women's empowerment: external, internal within the project, due to resources or other factors. Type of resources influencing lower impact on gender issues: human, financial, time of implementation for consolidation, etc. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Semi-structured in-depth Interviews (face to face or Skype) with stakeholders • Written Questionnaire or Mini-survey • Documental review | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ILO Staff (Hq & Country Offices) • National Stakeholders • Project staff (managers and technicians) • Representatives of target groups. |
| Gender equality and non-discrimination | 26. To what extent is the M&E data supporting project decision making related to gender? | Level of gender disaggregation of the indicators and data collected. Existence of reliable sources of information with specific gender data Examples of decisions on gender related activities due to data collected and analyzed within the project. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Semi-structured in-depth Interviews (face to face or Skype) with stakeholders • Documental review | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ILO Staff (Hq & Country Offices) • Project staff (managers and technicians) |
| Gender equality and non-discrimination | 27. Has the project addressed other vulnerable groups, including people living with disabilities? | List of beneficiaries and identification of vulnerable groups Consensus on effective inclusion of vulnerable groups. Examples of activities with the participation of vulnerable groups, and specific outcomes for their needs. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Semi-structured in-depth Interviews (face to face or Skype) with stakeholders • Documental review | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ILO Staff (Hq & Country Offices) • National Stakeholders • Project staff (managers and technicians) • Representatives of target groups. |

ANNEX III - DATA COLLECTION TOOL FOR THE INTERVIEWS

ANNEX III

Data collection tool for the interviews

Guide – notes for interviews with representatives of National and Regional Stakeholders:

Ministry of Labour and Social Security, Advisory Committee – CCT, SEJE – Secretary of State for Youth and Employment/National Directorate of Employment, MITSS/DNT - National Directorate for Labour, CCT – Labour Advisory Committee, DNOMT – National Directorate of Labour Market Observatory, INEP – National Employment Institute; IFPELAC, Labour Inspection; Employers, Unions, Municipalities and partners: Reencontro, Nhamai, AVIMAS, ACEAGRARIOS, AMOPSI, PANAVIDEO, GAPI.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this interview is to discuss your organization's activities related to the project MOZTRABALHA including challenges, successful strategies, perceived outcomes, and sustainability plans. This interview will last approximately 60 minutes. With your permission, we will audio record the discussion to assist with note-taking. No one outside the evaluation team will have access to this recording.

This interview will work best if you do most of the talking. Feel free to speak openly and candidly about your experiences and perspectives regarding this project. Your participation in this interview is voluntary. If, at any time, you wish to discontinue participation, you may do so without penalty.

The data gathered through these interviews will be reported in an aggregate manner, highlighting informational points from specific project activities and stakeholder groups, and not from particular individuals. You will not be identified by name or position.

Do you have any questions for me before we begin?

Introductory questions:

- Name:
- Position of the interviewed person:
- Time in that position:
- Experience/knowledge of ILO project and involvement in the program:
- Establish level of participation in the program:

Relevance and Strategic fit:

1. What motivates you/your department / agency /organization to participate in the project? Can you tell us about your engagement in the design and implementation of the project?
2. To what extent do the strategies of this project meet the needs and interests of the Government and your department /unit in particular?/ of your organization/institution? Are any key issues not addressed in the project strategies?
3. What is in your opinion the added value of the project(s) the country's strategies and action plans?
4. Does the project(s) constitute and adequate response to the current needs of the country target groups /end beneficiaries?
5. Do you think the project is adapted to the conditions and circumstances of the local context? (capacities, political commitment and ownership by main stakeholders)
6. Up to what extent do you think that Project shows links, synergies and interactions with government's strategies, policies and plans in Mozambique? Is there any example of how the

project has benefited from the synergies and /or complementarity with any of these interventions? Have you identified any coordination issue?

7. Are you aware of any other ILO funded interventions in the country? if yes, how do you assess the complementarity between those interventions?
8. Which are in your opinion the main strength and contribution of ILO as the implementing agency?

Validity of design

1. What is your general assessment on the program objectives and design: strengths and weaknesses, possible gaps, constraints, drawbacks, etc.?
2. Do you think the project has selected appropriate components to address unemployment issues, social dialogue and decent work in the country?
3. Do you have any comment on how the project has approached gender, non-discrimination and environmental issues?
4. Has the design clearly defined outcomes, outputs and performance indicators with quantitative and/or qualitative baselines and targets?
5. Was the project design realistic considering the timeframe and resources allocated?
6. Did the project design include an integrated and appropriate strategy for sustainability?
7. Were any lessons learned from previous pilot projects considered in the design and implementation of the project?

Project effectiveness

1. **Progress and achievements:** Considering the progress so far, what do you observe as the key contributions of the Project together with its partners, nationally and regionally? For example, towards:
 - a. Changes in the regulatory framework
 - b. Generating a better understanding, knowledge and information on labor market and decent work;
 - c. Build up the capacities of employment and labor stakeholders
 - d. Developing local-level models, methodologies, tools, good practices, and lessons learned.
 - e. Generating opportunities to make the labor market more inclusive.
 - f. Enhancing social dialogue
2. What have been the main achievements in relation to the work carried out by your department /unit /organization? Have your policies/programs been strengthened?
3. What factors are helping the project and its partners to achieve its intended results, and what factors make it difficult? (*Prompt: Internal/organizational factors/external factors*)
 - a) Opportunities or limitations of the regulatory and policy framework to create job opportunities?
 - b) Understanding or resistance among government, private sector, local communities to the proposals made by the project?
 - c) Availability of resources
 - d) Other factors?

4. To your knowledge, is the implementation of some activities/components **more successful** than others? If so, which ones? Why? What are the challenges? How has the COVID-19 pandemic affected the project progress/ children's situation?
5. What, if any, unintended results of the project have been identified or perceived?
6. How gender, social dialogue, international standards and tripartism have been taken into account to increase project effectiveness?

Efficiency of resource use

1. Have the available technical and financial resources been adequate to fulfil the project plans?
2. Does the management and governance arrangement of the project contributed to facilitate the project implementation? How do you see the co-ordination structures?
3. Has the project created good relationship and cooperation with relevant national, regional and local level government authorities and other relevant stakeholders, including the donors to achieve project results? Were there problems during implementation and what are they? How do you evaluate the performance of the partnership?
4. Has the project received adequate administrative, technical and - if needed - policy support from the ILO office and specialists in the field (Lusaka, Pretoria, Geneva)
5. Has the project been able to integrate the existing local capabilities (institutional knowledge, networks, existing mechanisms, etc.) in order to optimize the implementation structure and enhance the efficiency?
6. Are you satisfied with the performance of the project in terms providing the inputs/resources necessary for the implementation of the activities?
7. Which are in your opinion the main implementation challenges? How has the project team responded to those challenges? What effects has the COVID-19 pandemic had on project implementation and how successful were the projects in adapting to this situation?

Impact orientation and sustainability

1. Would you like to highlight any particular change or dynamic that can be reasonably associated to the project.
2. Can you provide any example of practices on employment development and level of implantation (from pilot experiences up to solid implanted practice).
3. Has there been any unintended impacts of the project? (*can be positive or negative*)
4. To what extent there is evidence of positive changes in the life of the ultimate men and women project beneficiaries?
5. Are project outcomes sustainable and can you identify steps that have been taken to enhance it?
6. Was there ownership, prospects of continuation of project activities by other programs, commitments, and leverage of funding? What are the main constrains in this regard?

GUIDE – TOPICS FOR PROJECT STAFF FIELD WORKERS of ILO and IPs

Comments on the design project design and design process.

- Brief review of the design process and adaptation mechanisms
- Explain assessment, diagnosis, mapping, baseline studies conducted.
- Accuracy of the diagnosis for the purpose addressing unemployment and underemployment in Mozambique.
- Please, assess the project Results Framework and Theory of change? (Not found among the documents)
- Involvement of Stakeholders and Target Groups in the design and management: Ministry of Labour and Social Security, SEJE – Secretary of State for Youth and Employment/National Directorate of Employment, MITSS/DNT - National Directorate for Labour, CCT – Labour Advisory Committee, DNOMT – National Directorate of Labour Market Observatory, INEP – National Employment Institute; IFPELAC, Labour Inspection; Employers, Unions, CSOs /NGOs, ultimate beneficiaries,
- Any issue regarding links and connections with policy frameworks? Programme and Budget (P&B), Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP), SDG, Abidjan Declaration (2019), UNDAF. Also to the National Development Frameworks.
- Examples of applications of previously developed tools, methodologies, approaches, etc. developed by ILO, SIDA or other donors/agencies? What's the added value of ILO expertise?
- Integration of ILO's crossed themes.
- Explain / describe the criteria applied for selection of the value chains, communities, target groups.
- Identification of assumptions and external factors
- Flexibility to adapt to unexpected or changing circumstances. Mechanisms used to adapt to new circumstances.
- The design itself: was logical and coherent? Are the 2 results the right choice? Why there is not result for institutional development? Were gender and non-discrimination issues duly considered? The same for sustainability?
- Realistic? Too ambitious? Over comprehensive? Adaptation to local capabilities and institutional arrangements. Examples in one direction or the other.
- Focus on capacity building, but was there a capacity building strategy in place?
- Methodologies adequate? Some issues raised regarding the MSAD
- Has the budget been adequate and enough to implement the program of activities?
- What could be improved concerning the design process? Were ILO and SIDA complementary along the design process or their respective views, roles, mandates, etc. acted as hindrances in this regard?

Implementation capacity /management arrangements:

- Can you assess the delivery process of these activities, performance, achievement of targets, etc.? Examples of success and or failures, underachievement, etc. Reasons/Explanations for one and the other.
- In general, TPR refers some initial delays related to the value chains component. Please, expand.
- Comment of the liaison problems with Governmental institutions (if any)
- Asses commitment and ownership by local stakeholders

- Examples of complementation, use of comparative advantages and synergies between ILO programmes. Can you refer to some examples of complementation and synergies between ILO Programmes. And with other UN interventions/agencies?
- Management of resources: resources have been available on time, there are guidelines available and / or formal procedures for the procurement of goods and services,
- Performance of the sub-contractors or service providers: IFRC, ACEAGRARIOS,
- Assess the governance structure: Steering (or advisory) Committee and Coordination mechanisms with service providers. Effective engagement of ILO constituents. Frequency of meetings.
- The Monitoring System: comprehensive, friendly use, delivering data and information? Please assess its strength and weaknesses.

Direct Achievements:

- Discuss achievements in each of the 3 Outcomes: (I) development of policies and institutional capacities; (II) Job enhancing opportunities; (III) Resilience to COVID-19 effects, substantiated with examples. Review of Logframe indicators
- Empowered families and /or communities to plan and initiate and income generating activities on their own.
- Underachievement. Why?
- Mobilized and more capable local institutions to support employment and decent work
- Positive dynamics in public policies
- Involvement and interest shown by other social actors particular Employers and Unions
- Enabling environment actions? NEP, DWCP... Any particular achievement?
- Social Dialogue, (Examples)
- Assess communication strategy.

Reporting

- Describe and assess the reporting mechanisms in place
- Strengths and weaknesses
- Possible improvements
- Asses the process for documenting and disseminating models of intervention, best practices, lessons learned, etc? Any example of this?

Sustainability:

- Assess the design of the sustainability strategy for the w the ILO projects, and assess the progress of the strategy.
- Tools applied to identify and manage the sustainability factors
- Determine the potential to sustain the gains of the project beyond its life and what measures are needed to ensure this. Examples. What is going to happen with all the training effort which has been made?
- Identify potential good practices and inputs for models of intervention with returnees. Outputs susceptible of expansion or scale-up
- Factors of Sustainability

NOTES – GUIDE FOR FOCUS or DISCUSSION GROUPS WITH BENEFICIARIES

Introduction (5 minutes)

Good morning/afternoon. My name is *[your name]*. With me, I have *[introduce other researchers]*. We are very grateful that you agreed to participate in our discussion today. The purpose of this focus group is to discuss your experiences with the Moztrabalha Project. Today's discussion will allow us to better understand your experiences as participants, particularly your attitudes and suggestions regarding any training or activities you've participated in as part of the project.

Our discussion today will last about 60 minutes. With your permission, we will audio record the discussion. Even though *[insert name]* will be taking notes, we want to be very sure we are accurate in our information. **But please be assured that your remarks will be kept confidential. No one outside the evaluation team will have access to this recording.** Is it OK if I record the discussion?

The data gathered through these interviews /focus groups will be reported in an aggregate manner, highlighting informational points from specific project activities and stakeholder groups, and not from particular individuals. **You will not be identified by name or position.** (in case of FG) The focus group will work best if you do most of the talking. Feel free to speak openly and candidly about your experiences and perspectives regarding this project. There are no right or wrong answers. We will ask you to speak one at a time so everyone can be heard. **Everyone has a right to express his or her opinions.** If you disagree with what someone else is saying, please be polite and let them finish their thoughts. Everyone will get their chance to speak.

Do you have any questions for me before we begin?

Interviewee Background

- What is your name?
- What is your title?
- Try to establish the extent of their participation / involvement in the project activities. Check if they can identify the activities of the project

Questions

- Describe how they became involved in the project. Channels they were approached or how they got the information about the services provided by the project.
- Describe the things they liked and did not like about the project activities: organization, quality of the services, timing, what has been different about the project
- Did they miss anything?
- Good things that happened to them after they became involved in the project activities. Examples of benefits they obtained in different areas: self-esteem, knowledge, social links, livelihoods, etc. Describe the situation before and after.
- Describe present situation. What kind of assistance is still needed.
- Assess capacity of local programs to continue providing this kind of support.
- Aspirations for the future.
- Try to assess if the beneficiaries, especially women, are able to identify gender specific actions conducted by the project.

ANNEX IV – ONLINE MINI-SURVEYS TOOL

**ANNEX IV
ONLINE MINI-SURVEYS tool**

QUESTIONÁRIO 1

(Atores governamentais: ministérios e instituições públicas)

Introdução / Apresentação

Como parte da Avaliação do projecto MOZTRABALHA, apresentamos o presente inquérito dirigido aos actores chave no sector.

Acreditamos que as suas opiniões vão supor uma adição de valor muito importante para a análise da informação, e vão ajudar a melhorar o desempenho do apoio da OIT e a Cooperação do Governo da Suécia no futuro

Data limite para o envio do questionário preenchido: 22/10/2021 até o fim do dia

Estima-se que o tempo necessário para preencher o questionário são por volta de 20 minutos, especialmente se adicionar os detalhes nas caixas de comentário.

Instruções: Caso você não tenha tempo para preencher o questionário de uma vez, é possível sair da aplicação e voltar a editar ou continuar respondendo posteriormente usando o mesmo link, desde que: (i) você use o mesmo dispositivo e o navegador da web que usou para iniciar o link do inquérito; (ii) clique no botão “próximo” após cada pergunta; e (iii) clique no botão “concluído” quando desejar sair.

Também enviamos o arquivo “Word” do inquerito como um documento anexo, caso você prefira usar este formato se tiver problemas com a sua conexão a Internet. Pode nos devolver o arquivo por e-mail.

Por favor, saiba que as suas respostas e comentários serão tratadas de maneira estritamente confidenciais.

Em caso de dúvida ou necessidade de esclarecimentos, por favor, não hesite em contactar ao líder da equipa, Chema Alvarez em chema_elea@hotmail.com ou Fernando Martin em fernando.dlrm@gmail.com/ ou no cel: XXXXXX

1.- O suporte do projecto Moztrabalha tem sido consoante com as prioridades nacionais na área de criação de emprego e promoção do trabalho digno

(Por favor, marque a caixa que corresponde à sua escolha)

| | Criação de emprego | Trabalho digno |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| Concordo plenamente | | |
| Concordo | | |
| Neutro | | |
| Discordo | | |
| Discordo totalmente | | |
| Não é relevante/ não sei | | |

Por favor, use a caixa de comentário para comentar os fatores principais que suportaram ou dificultaram esta consistência/alinhamento.

2.- A organização/instituição que represento participou no desenho das ações do projeto Moztrabalha em relação com os seguintes aspectos.

| Aspetos | Em grande medida | Até certo ponto | Muito limitado | De modo nenhum | Não sei |
|--|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Estudos preliminares | | | | | |
| Análise de problemas | | | | | |
| Análise de alternativas | | | | | |
| Definição de atividades | | | | | |
| Consultas gerais | | | | | |
| Outros (por favor, especifique abaixo) | | | | | |

Por favor, use a caixa abaixo para expandir as suas opiniões ou comente se acha que o nível de participação da sua instituição no desenho de ações de Moztrabalha tem sido baixo em alguns casos em particular.

3.- O suporte do projecto Moztrabalha tem sido flexível e adaptável às mudanças do contexto político nos aspetos relativos à criação de emprego e promoção do trabalho digno.

| | Em grande medida | Até certo ponto | Muito limitado | De modo nenhum | Não sei |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Criar emprego | | | | | |
| Promover trabalho digno | | | | | |

Por favor, use a caixa abaixo para expandir as suas opiniões ou comente se acha que alguns elementos do contexto em evolução não foram bem refletidos na prestação de apoio por parte de Moztrabalha.

4.- Julga que o projecto Moztrabalha tem alguma vantagem comparativa com respeito a outras iniciativas nas áreas relacionadas com a criação e emprego e promoção do trabalho digno?

| | SIM | NÃO | Não Sei |
|-------------------------|-----|-----|---------|
| Criar emprego | | | |
| Promover trabalho digno | | | |

Se a resposta for sim, consegue descrever que vantagem comparativa é esta?

5.- Considera que os componentes e medidas promovidos pelo projecto Moztrablha foram/são apropriados para atingir os objetivos de criar emprego e promover o trabalho digno?

| | SIM | NÃO | Não Sei |
|-------------------------|-----|-----|---------|
| Criar emprego | | | |
| Promover trabalho digno | | | |

Por favor, use a caixa abaixo se quiser elaborar a sua resposta

6.- O apoio do projecto Moztrablaha tem sido coordenado com outras iniciativas nacionais. (reformas legais no progresso, programas apoiados por outros doadores, outras iniciativas promovidas pelos parceiros sociais, etc.)

| Em grande medida | Até certo ponto | Muito limitado | De modo nenhum | Não sei |
|------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|---------|
| | | | | |

Por favor, use a caixa abaixo para expandir as suas opiniões ou comentar os fatores principais que, na sua opinião suportaram ou dificultaram a coordenação com outras iniciativas.

7.- O apoio do projecto Moztrablaha tem sido gerido de forma participativa tendo em conta as opiniões do governo e os parceiros sociais

| Em grande medida | Até certo ponto | Muito limitado | De modo nenhum | Não sei |
|------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|---------|
| | | | | |

Por favor, use a caixa abaixo para expandir as suas opiniões ou comentar os fatores principais que suportam a sua avaliação

8.- O apoio de Moztrablaha contribuiu/está a contribuir para a desenvolver as políticas e o marco regulatório do país em relação aos seguintes aspetos.

| Aspetos | Em grande medida | Até certo ponto | Muito limitado | De modo nenhum | Não sei |
|--|------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|---------|
| Reformas legais | | | | | |
| Políticas de emprego | | | | | |
| Planos e estratégias nacionais e regionais | | | | | |
| Geração de dados, informações e conhecimento sobre o mercado de trabalho | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Integrar a harmonizar os esforços dos diferentes sectores (e.g. ministérios) para a criação de emprego | | | | | |
| Reforçar a importância de equidade de género nas políticas de emprego | | | | | |
| Considerar as necessidades dos grupos marginalizados e/ou mais vulneráveis | | | | | |
| Outros (por favor especifique abaixo) | | | | | |

Por favor use a caixa abaixo para comentar fatores principais que suportaram ou dificultaram estas melhorias e fornecer exemplos para sustentar as suas opiniões.

9.- O apoio de Moztrabalha contribuiu/está a contribuir a criar oportunidades de emprego em relação com os seguintes aspectos:

| Aspetos | Em grande medida | Até certo ponto | Muito limitado | De modo nenhum | Não sei |
|---|------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|---------|
| Melhorar o ambiente de negócios (e.g. as condições para a criação de empresas, disponibilidade de informação, assessoria, etc.) | | | | | |
| Identificar e articular cadeias de valor com potencial para criar emprego | | | | | |
| Introduzir modelos de investimento publico dirigidos a criação de emprego massivo | | | | | |
| Criar mecanismos para a formalização de trabalhadores e actividades informais | | | | | |
| Favorecendo o acesso a financiamento dos empreendedores | | | | | |
| Outros (por favor, especifique abaixo) | | | | | |

Por favor use a caixa abaixo para expandir as suas opiniões e fornecer exemplos

10.- O apoio do projecto Moztrabalha contribuiu/está a contribuir para fortalecer as capacidades das autoridades e/ou estruturas gestoras das políticas de emprego em relação com os seguintes aspetos.

| Aspetos | Em grande medida | Até certo ponto | Muito limitado | De modo nenhum | Não sei |
|--|------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|---------|
| Visão estratégica e planeamento | | | | | |
| Revisão da estrutura organizacional (incluindo descentralização) | | | | | |
| Competências técnicas dos funcionários | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Desenvolvimento de ferramentas, métodos e procedimentos | | | | | |
| Infraestrutura e equipamento (incluindo tecnologias digitais) | | | | | |
| Outros (por favor especifique abaixo) | | | | | |

Por favor use a caixa abaixo para expandir as suas opiniões e fornecer exemplos.

11.- O projecto Moztrabalha tem contribuído/esta a contribuir a melhorar o diálogo social em relação com os seguintes aspectos.

| Aspectos | Em grande medida | Até certo ponto | Muito limitado | De modo nenhum | Não sei |
|---|------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|---------|
| Melhor entendimento entre o governo e os parceiros sociais sobre as políticas e mecanismos para a criação de emprego | | | | | |
| Presença de um diálogo institucionalizado entre os atores chave (governo, empregadores, sindicatos, sociedade civil) seguido da aprovação de nova normativa e desenho de novas políticas. | | | | | |
| Capacidades técnicas dos parceiros sociais (sindicatos e empregadores) | | | | | |
| Favorecendo a adoção dos padrões internacionais relativos ao trabalho digno | | | | | |
| Outros (por favor, especifique abaixo) | | | | | |

Por favor, use a caixa abaixo para expandir as suas opiniões ou comente outros aspetos chave que, na sua opinião, devem ser considerados para abordar devidamente essas necessidades.

12.- Apoio de Moztrabalha está a contribuir para melhorar a atenção paga por instituições responsáveis pelas políticas de emprego para os seguintes aspetos de género.

| Aspetos | Em grande medida | Até certo ponto | Muito limitado | De modo nenhum | Não sei |
|--|------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|---------|
| Análise sobre o mercado de trabalho desde uma perspectiva de género | | | | | |
| Desenho e implementação de políticas com perspectiva de género para o sistema ETPF | | | | | |
| Conscientização de género das equipas responsáveis pela implementação das políticas de emprego | | | | | |
| Sensibilização sobre estereótipos de género no mercado de trabalho | | | | | |
| Sensibilização para atrair mulheres e meninas para profissões tradicionalmente masculinas | | | | | |
| Outros (por favor, especifique) | | | | | |

Por favor use a caixa abaixo para expandir as suas opiniões e/ou fornecer exemplos

Muito obrigado pelo seu tempo!

QUESTIONÁRIO 2

(Parceiros do sector privado, municípios em ONGs)

Introdução / Apresentação

Como parte da Avaliação do projecto MOZTRABALHA, apresentamos o presente inquérito dirigido aos actores chave no sector.

Acreditamos que as suas opiniões vão supor uma adição de valor muito importante para a análise da informação, e vão ajudar a melhorar o desempenho do apoio da OIT e a Cooperação do Governo da Suécia no futuro

Data limite para o envio do questionário preenchido: 22/10/2021 até o fim do dia

Estima-se que o tempo necessário para preencher o questionário são por volta de 20 minutos, especialmente se adicionar os detalhes nas caixas de comentário.

Instruções: Caso você não tenha tempo para preencher o questionário de uma vez, é possível sair da aplicação e voltar a editar ou continuar respondendo posteriormente usando o mesmo link, desde que: (i) você use o mesmo dispositivo e o navegador da web que usou para iniciar o link do inquérito; (ii) clique no botão “próximo” após cada pergunta; e (iii) clique no botão “concluído” quando desejar sair.

Também enviamos o arquivo “Word” do inquerito como um documento anexo, caso você prefira usar este formato se tiver problemas com a sua conexão a Internet. Pode nos devolver o arquivo por e-mail.

Por favor, saiba que as suas respostas e comentários serão tratadas de maneira estritamente confidenciais.

Em caso de dúvida ou necessidade de esclarecimentos, por favor, não hesite em contactar ao líder da equipa, Chema Alvarez em chema_elea@hotmail.com ou Fernando Martin em fernando.dlrm@gmail.com/ ou no cel: XXXXXX

1.- A organização/instituição que represento participou no desenho das ações do projeto Moztrabalha em relação com os seguintes aspectos.

| Aspetos | Em grande medida | Até certo ponto | Muito limitado | De modo nenhum | Não sei |
|--|------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|---------|
| Estudos preliminares | | | | | |
| Análise de problemas | | | | | |
| Análise de alternativas | | | | | |
| Definição de atividades | | | | | |
| Consultas gerais | | | | | |
| Outros (por favor, especifique abaixo) | | | | | |

Por favor, use a caixa abaixo para expandir as suas opiniões ou comente se acha que o nível de participação da sua instituição no desenho de ações de Moztrabalha tem sido baixo em alguns casos em particular.

2.- O suporte do projecto Moztrabalha tem sido flexível e adaptável às mudanças do contexto e outros factores externos

| Em grande medida | Até certo ponto | Muito limitado | De modo nenhum | Não sei |
|------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|---------|
| | | | | |

Por favor, use a caixa abaixo para expandir as suas opiniões ou comente se acha que alguns elementos do contexto em evolução não foram bem refletidos na prestação de apoio por parte de Moztrabalha.

3.- Julga que o projecto Moztrabalha tem alguma vantagem comparativa com respeito a outras iniciativas nas áreas relacionadas com a criação e emprego e promoção do trabalho digno?

| | SIM | NÃO | Não Sei |
|-------------------------|-----|-----|---------|
| Criar emprego | | | |
| Promover trabalho digno | | | |

Se a resposta for sim, consegue descrever que vantagem comparativa é esta?

4.- Considera que os componentes e medidas promovidos pelo projecto Moztrablha foram/são apropriados para atingir os objetivos de criar emprego e promover o trabalho digno?

| | SIM | NÃO | Não Sei |
|---------------|-----|-----|---------|
| Criar emprego | | | |

| | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|
| Promover trabalho digno | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|

Por favor, use a caixa abaixo se quiser elaborar a sua resposta

5.- O apoio do projecto Moztrablaha tem sido coordenado com outras iniciativas nacionais ou regionais

| Em grande medida | Até certo ponto | Muito limitado | De nenhum modo | Não sei |
|------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|---------|
| | | | | |

Por favor, use a caixa abaixo para expandir as suas opiniões ou comentar os fatores principais que, na sua opinião suportaram ou dificultaram a coordenação com outras iniciativas.

6.- O apoio do projecto Moztrablaha tem sido gerido de forma participativa tendo em conta as opiniões dos parceiros sociais

| Em grande medida | Até certo ponto | Muito limitado | De nenhum modo | Não sei |
|------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|---------|
| | | | | |

Por favor, use a caixa abaixo para expandir as suas opiniões ou comentar os fatores principais que suportam a sua avaliação

8.- O apoio do projecto Moztrabalha contribuiu/está a contribuir para fortalecer o diálogo social em relação com os seguintes aspetos.

| Aspetos | Em grande medida | Até certo ponto | Muito limitado | De nenhum modo | Não sei |
|---|------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|---------|
| Desenvolvimento das capacidades técnicas dos parceiros | | | | | |
| Fornecimento de infraestrutura e equipamento | | | | | |
| Desenvolvimento de ferramentas e estruturas para favorecer o diálogo social | | | | | |
| Reforma do quadro regulatório para incorporar estândaes laborais internacionais | | | | | |
| Outros (por favor especifique abaixo) | | | | | |

Por favor use a caixa abaixo para expandir as suas opiniões e fornecer exemplos.

9.- Apoio de Moztrabalha está a contribuir para melhorar a equidade de género no mercado de trabalho através dos seguintes aspectos.

| Aspetos | Em grande medida | Até certo ponto | Muito limitado | De modo nenhum | Não sei |
|---|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Análise sobre o mercado de trabalho desde uma perspetiva de género | | | | | |
| Conscientização sobre direitos das mulheres no local de trabalho | | | | | |
| Sensibilização sobre estereótipos de género no mercado de trabalho (empregadores e trabalhadores) | | | | | |
| Sensibilização para atrair mulheres e meninas para profissões tradicionalmente masculinas | | | | | |
| Prevenção de abusos e discriminação a mulheres no local de trabalho | | | | | |
| Outros (por favor, especifique) | | | | | |

Por favor use a caixa abaixo para expandir as suas opiniões e/ou fornecer exemplos

Muito obrigado pelo seu tempo!

QUESTIONÁRIO 3

(Parceiros sociais: empregadores e sindicatos)

Introdução / Apresentação

Como parte da Avaliação do projecto MOZTRABALHA, apresentamos o presente inquérito dirigido aos actores chave no sector.

Acreditamos que as suas opiniões vão supor uma adição de valor muito importante para a análise da informação, e vão ajudar a melhorar o desempenho do apoio da OIT e a Cooperação do Governo da Suécia no futuro

Data limite para o envio do questionário preenchido: 22/10/2021 até o fim do dia

Estima-se que o tempo necessário para preencher o questionário são por volta de 20 minutos, especialmente se adicionar os detalhes nas caixas de comentário.

Instruções: Caso você não tenha tempo para preencher o questionário de uma vez, é possível sair da aplicação e voltar a editar ou continuar respondendo posteriormente usando o mesmo link, desde que: (i) você use o mesmo dispositivo e o navegador da web que usou para iniciar o link do inquérito; (ii) clique no botão “próximo” após cada pergunta; e (iii) clique no botão “concluído” quando desejar sair.

Também enviamos o arquivo “Word” do inquerito como um documento anexo, caso você prefira usar este formato se tiver problemas com a sua conexão a Internet. Pode nos devolver o arquivo por e-mail.

Por favor, saiba que as suas respostas e comentários serão tratadas de maneira estritamente confidenciais.

Em caso de dúvida ou necessidade de esclarecimentos, por favor, não hesite em contactar ao líder da equipa, Chema Alvarez em chema_elea@hotmail.com ou Fernando Martin em fernando.dlrm@gmail.com/ ou no cel: XXXXXX

1.- A organização/instituição que represento participou no desenho das ações do projeto Moztrabalha em relação com os seguintes aspectos.

| Aspetos | Em grande medida | Até certo ponto | Muito limitado | De modo nenhum | Não sei |
|--|------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|---------|
| Estudos preliminares | | | | | |
| Análise de problemas | | | | | |
| Análise de alternativas | | | | | |
| Definição de atividades | | | | | |
| Consultas gerais | | | | | |
| Outros (por favor, especifique abaixo) | | | | | |

Por favor, use a caixa abaixo para expandir as suas opiniões ou comente se acha que o nível de participação da sua instituição no desenho de ações de Moztrabalha tem sido baixo em alguns casos em particular.

2.- O suporte do projecto Moztrabalha tem sido flexível e adaptável às mudanças do contexto e outros factores externos

| Em grande medida | Até certo ponto | Muito limitado | De modo nenhum | Não sei |
|------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|---------|
| | | | | |

Por favor, use a caixa abaixo para expandir as suas opiniões ou comente se acha que alguns elementos do contexto em evolução não foram bem refletidos na prestação de apoio por parte de Moztrabalha.

3.- Julga que o projecto Moztrabalha tem alguma vantagem comparativa com respeito a outras iniciativas nas áreas relacionadas com a criação e emprego e promoção do trabalho digno?

| | SIM | NÃO | Não Sei |
|-------------------------|-----|-----|---------|
| Criar emprego | | | |
| Promover trabalho digno | | | |

Se a resposta for sim, consegue descrever que vantagem comparativa é esta?

4.- Considera que os componentes e medidas promovidos pelo projecto Moztrabalha foram/são apropriados para atingir os objetivos de criar emprego e promover o trabalho digno?

| | SIM | NÃO | Não Sei |
|-------------------------|-----|-----|---------|
| Criar emprego | | | |
| Promover trabalho digno | | | |

Por favor, use a caixa abaixo se quiser elaborar a sua resposta

5.- O apoio do projecto Moztrablaha tem sido coordenado com outras iniciativas nacionais ou regionais

| Em grande medida | Até certo ponto | Muito limitado | De modo nenhum | Não sei |
|------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|---------|
| | | | | |

Por favor, use a caixa abaixo para expandir as suas opiniões ou comentar os fatores principais que, na sua opinião suportaram ou dificultaram a coordenação com outras iniciativas.

6.- O apoio do projecto Moztrablaha tem sido gerido de forma participativa tendo em conta as opiniões dos parceiros sociais

| Em grande medida | Até certo ponto | Muito limitado | De modo nenhum | Não sei |
|------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|---------|
| | | | | |

Por favor, use a caixa abaixo para expandir as suas opiniões ou comentar os fatores principais que suportam a sua avaliação

7.- O apoio do projecto Moztrabalha contribuiu/está a contribuir para fortalecer o diálogo social em relação com os seguintes aspetos.

| Aspetos | Em grande medida | Até certo ponto | Muito limitado | De modo nenhum | Não sei |
|---|------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|---------|
| Desenvolvimento das capacidades técnicas dos parceiros | | | | | |
| Fornecimento de infraestrutura e equipamento | | | | | |
| Desenvolvimento de ferramentas e estruturas para favorecer o diálogo social | | | | | |
| Reforma do quadro regulatório para incorporar estândaes laborais internacionais | | | | | |
| Outros (por favor especifique abaixo) | | | | | |

Por favor use a caixa abaixo para expandir as suas opiniões e fornecer exemplos.

8.- Apoio de Moztrabalha está a contribuir para melhorar a equidade de género no mercado de trabalho através dos seguintes aspectos.

| Aspetos | Em grande medida | Até certo ponto | Muito limitado | De modo nenhum | Não sei |
|---|------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|---------|
| Análise sobre o mercado de trabalho desde uma perspectiva de género | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Conscientização sobre direitos das mulheres no local de trabalho | | | | | |
| Sensibilização sobre estereótipos de género no mercado de trabalho (empregadores e trabalhadores) | | | | | |
| Sensibilização para atrair mulheres e meninas para profissões tradicionalmente masculinas | | | | | |
| Prevenção de abusos e discriminação a mulheres no local de trabalho | | | | | |
| Outros (por favor, especifique) | | | | | |

Por favor use a caixa abaixo para expandir as suas opiniões e/ou fornecer exemplos

Muito obrigado pelo seu tempo!

ANNEX V- ITINERARY AND LIST OF PEOPLE CONTACTED

ANNEX V – ITINERARY AND LIST OF PEOPLE CONTACTED

| D | Day | Institution | Persons |
|-------------------|------------|---|--|
| 2 ^a -f | 10/04/2021 | ILO- DWCT ILO- DWCT | Mwila Chigaga, Gender Advisor Bernd Mueller, Employment advisor |
| 3 ^a -f | 10/05/2021 | ILO Maputo – Moztrabalha ILO Maputo – Moztrabalha ILO Maputo – Moztrabalha | Antenor Pereira, Social Dialogue Eduardo Viera, CTA Egidio Simbine, M&E & Gender |
| 4 ^a -f | 10/06/2021 | ILO- DWCT CCT (CTA) OSH – MITSS ILO Maputo – Moztrabalha ILO Maputo – Moztrabalha ILO Maputo – Moztrabalha | Jens Christensen Victor Miguel Paulina Mutolo Abdul Afande, EII/ Covid Response Zabrodin Maxime, EII Francesco Rubino, Value Chains Wilma Mondlane, Value Chains Juvenal Dengo, General Director |
| 5 ^a -f | 10/07/2021 | INEP – National Employment Institute / Maputo MITSS/DNT OTM-CS – Mozambique Workers' Organization, Central Trade Union / Maputo | Marta Mate, Director Daniel Ngoque, Head of Department of Communications, Image and International Relations |
| 6 ^a -f | 10/08/2021 | OTM Workers' Organization PARDEV | Antonio Paunde Elma Meijboom |
| sábado | 10/09/2021 | Beneficiaries of TARGET Beneficiaries of TARGET Beneficiaries of Training and Employment in Boane Beneficiaries of Training and Employment in Boane Beneficiaries of TARGET | Lourdes da Conceição Monjane Vanessa Ribeiro Sofata Roberto Julia Dimande |
| 2 ^a -f | 10/11/2021 | IFRC Cooperatives Soil-Cement Blocks GAPI | Amélia Bombe Edson Custodio, Abrigo Nuria Celestino Donaldo Mavararinga Joana Tomocene, Dondo Joao Malunga, Caia Adolfo Muholove, PCE Rui Amaral, Capacitação e Consultoria |
| 3 ^a -f | 10/12/2021 | Panavideo IPEME Sindicato Nacional das Empregadas Domesticas Excoll AMOPSI Aceagrarios | Ilda Samuel, Jornalista Ernesto Ramatane, Service Director Sonia Mbanze, Officer Stelio Guanbe, Officer Rosa Maria Palisse. General Secretariat Perdro Bernardo. Delegations Jeremias Albino Jordao Tangune, PCA Arnaldo, presidente Manuel Dom Luis Alfinar Marcelino Botao Raquel Malunga |
| 4 ^a -f | 13/10/2021 | ILO Maputo – Moztrabalha MOPHRH, Department of Materials Promotion Laboratorio de Engenharia de Moçambique (LEM) Sofala Beira Municipality | Faizal Julaya, head of department Bernardette Dinis Moreno Domingos Cristo, Head Delegate |
| 5 ^a -f | 14/10/2021 | DNOMT – National Directorate of Labour Market Observatory / Maputo - MITESS | Dercio Lucas Assa Guambe, National Director Lourenço Vilanculos Armindo Mapace |

| | | | |
|-------------------|------------|---|--|
| | | SEJE – Estate Secretary for Youth and Employment Maputo Municipality | Eduardo Chimela, National Director |
| | | Boane Municipality | Cesar Cunguara, Deputy Director of Markets |
| | | ILO- DWCT | Auguto Mambero, Head of Infrastructures |
| 6 ^a -f | 15/10/2021 | CCT – Labour Advisory Committee / Maputo | Alexandre Levy, Finance |
| | | COMAL – Labour Mediation and Arbitration Committee / Maputo | Bernd Mueller, Employment advisor |
| | | SDPI (District Services of Planning and Infrastructures) /Nhamatanda | João Motim Rodrigues Secretary-General |
| | | IFPELAC | Teodora Wate, Executive Assistant |
| 2 ^a -f | 18/10/2021 | ILO Maputo – Moztrabalha | Nelson Nensa, Director |
| | | SIDA | Anastacio Chembeze, former deputy director |
| | | ILO- Maputo | Stelio Marerua, Communication officer |
| | | ILO- Maputo | Hanna Marsk |
| 3 ^a -f | 19/10/2021 | Farmers Vilankulos | Egidio Simbine, M&E & Gender |
| | | Farmers Vilankulos | Eduardo Viera, CTA |
| | | Fundação Reencontro - Masks | Anselmo Alberto |
| | | Association Nhamai - Masks | Cristina |
| 5 ^a -f | 21/10/2021 | CTA – Confederation of Economic Associations of Mozambique / Maputo | Iria Ombe |
| | | | Antonia Majate |
| | | | Claudia Pinto |
| | | | Executive Assistant - Pillar for Labour Policy and Social Services |

ANNEX VI: SUMMARY OF ACHIEVEMENTS AGAINST THE LOGFRAME INDICATORS

**ANNEX VI - SUMMARY OF ACHIEVEMENTS AGAINST THE LOGFRAME
INDICATORS**

Outcome level Monitoring Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|------------------|-----------------|
| OVERALL OBJECTIVE | Creation of decent work for Mozambican women and men, in particular youth and those living in rural areas, in line with the National Employment Policy | | | | |
| SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 1 | Effective implementation of NEP and increased pro-employment focus of policy making | | | | |
| | OUTCOME INDICATOR | TARGET /PROJECTION | CUMULATIVE | Last data | Comments |
| Immediate Objective 1: A strengthened national policy and institutional environment leads to increased promotion of decent employment and sustainable economic transformation | Number of productive jobs created as result of NEP implementation, particularly for women and youth; | 20,994 | 0 | 2017 | |
| | Number of public and private organizations committing to use gender sensitive employment intensive investment approach | 10 | 17 | 2020 | |
| | Percent by which the budget of sectorial ministries is employment and gender mainstreamed | 10% per sector | 10% from the MOLESS 5% from MEF | 2020 | |
| | Percent by which coverage of employers' organizations has been extended to informal business | 20% | 15% | 2020 | |
| | Percent by which coverage of workers organizations has been extended to informal workers | 20% | 25% | 2020 | |
| | Number of labour conflicts mediated | 31,437 | 9467 | 2020 | |
| | LMIS providing reliable and gender sensitive Labour Market data quarterly basis, including Annual Labour market forecasting | 20 quarterly reports and 4 annual forecasting reports | LMIS being updated 4 Quarterly reports produced annually | 2020 | |
| | Number of vacancies filled through the Employment Centres, disaggregated by gender and age | 74,373 | 20,994 | 2020 | |
| | SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 2 | Greater access to sustainable and productive employment opportunities for youth and women in particular those living in the rural areas | | | |
| Immediate Objective 2: Sectors are stimulated to create decent, sustainable and green | Number of decent jobs created as a direct result of project support to employment intensive investments, SME support and WEE(disaggregated by gender, age, locality) | 3,000 | 275 (43 women) | 2020 | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|-----|-----------------------------|------|--|
| employment opportunities for Mozambican women and men, in particular youth and those living in rural areas | Beneficiaries (disaggregated by gender, age, locality) of the project report improvement of income, working conditions and employment security over project period | 300 | 275 (43 women) | 2019 | |
| | Number of new businesses that were created and existing business that have expanded their operations and created new jobs over the project period (desegregated by gender, age locality) | 300 | 2 (AceAgrarios and Albe) | 2019 | |
| SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 3 (COVID-19) | Resilient workers and enterprises to mitigate the socio-economic impact of COVID-19 in Mozambique | | | | |
| Immediate Objective 3: Workers and enterprises are able to mitigate and readjust to the socio-economic impact of COVID-19 in Mozambique | Number of pro employment policies implemented | 3 | 5 | 2021 | |
| | Employment generated through public works | 300 | 244 or 18300 working days | 2021 | |
| | Number of enterprises and vendors in Informal Economy are strengthened | 300 | 217 | 2021 | |

Output Level Monitoring Plan

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| OVERALL OBJECTIVE | Creation of decent work for Mozambican women and men, in particular youth and those living in rural areas, in line with the National Employment Policy | | | | | |
| SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 1 | Effective implementation of NEP and increased pro-employment focus of policy making | | | | | |
| NUMBER | | INDICATOR | TARGET | CUMULATIVE | Last data | Comments |
| 1.1. NEP Implementation plan, Dissemination Strategy, and M&E framework developed and implement | | Number of institutions part of the working group for employment | 10 | 11 | 2020 | |
| | | Number of NEP M&E reports | 5 | 3 | 2020 | |
| | | Number of NEP dissemination actions | 5000 NEP Brochures printed | 7000 | 2020 | |
| | | Number women focal points for NEP implementation amongst key NEP stakeholders | 10 Women Focal points(1 in each institution) | 11 | 2020 | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|-----------------------------------|------|--|
| | | Number of coordinated plans | 1 Per year | 1 | 2020 | |
| 1.2. GoMZ Capacity Strengthened for implementation of green and employment intensive macro-economic and sectorial policies | | Number of key stakeholders (staff) trained (gender disaggregated) | 10 sectors | 36(people from 15 sectors) | 2020 | |
| | | Percentage increase on number of employment creation and gender equality programs | 10% increase on the number of programs | 5% | 2020 | |
| | | Number of employment and gender-sensitive sector budgets are developed in national documents/strategies/policies | 10 annual sector plans and budgets | 10 | 2020 | |
| 1.3. GoMZ Capacity Strengthened to establish and implement employment intensive policies and programs | | Number of field visits to pilot initiatives | 50 Visits | 20 | 2019 | |
| | | Number of Employment-intensive investments (EII) created by public institutions | 4 programs | 0 | 2018 | |
| | | Number of Employment-intensive investments (EII) created by private companies | 4 programs | 0 | 2018 | |
| | | Number of jobs created by GoMz Programs on Employment-intensive investments (EII) | 1000 | 0 | 2018 | |
| 1.4. Employers 'and Workers' organizations provide more effective representation and services to their members to improve working conditions | | Number of Certified arbitrators/media tors for resolution and prevention of labour conflicts represented at national level | 45 | 45 | 2019 | |
| | | Number of EESE Action plan and business agenda implemented | 6 | 1 EESE Action plan(3 priorities) | 2019 | |
| | | Reduction on Labour conflicts resolution time | 10% | 12% | 2019 | |
| | | Percentage increase in | 20% | 9% | 2019 | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|---------|------|--|
| | | coverage by Employers' and workers' organisations | | | | |
| 1.5. Support to Workers' and Employers' organizations to achieve better coverage of informal sector enterprises and workers | | Number of mapping studies | 1 | 1 | 2019 | |
| | | Number of policy positions on informality | 2 | 2 | 2019 | |
| | | Number of strategy and action plan to extend services to the informal economy | 2 (1 Advocacy strategy and 1 Action plan) | 1 | 2019 | |
| | | Percentage increase of coverage of the informal sector by the formal sector | Additional 10% in association coverage | 5% | 2019 | |
| 1.6. LMIS Strengthened | | Number of employment centers using the services and the portal as part of the service provision | 24 | 20 | 2019 | |
| | | Number of labour related information, bulletins, studies produced and disseminated by LMO | 20 LMI Reports or Studies | 12 | 2019 | |
| | | Number of jobseekers registered in the Employment Portal | 50000 | 12582 | 2019 | |
| | | Range of vacancies registered in the Employment Portal | 30 Sectors (From the Economic Activities Classification) | 30 | 2019 | |
| | | Number of people of accessing LMIS information | 1000000 | 3000 | 2019 | |
| | | Number of people successfully placed in employment | 1.200.000 | 419.652 | 2019 | |
| | SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 2 | Greater access to sustainable and productive employment opportunities for youth and women in particular those living in the rural areas | | | | |
| 2.1. Employment | 2.1.1 Pilot 1 Muva Green Chamanculo C | # of Jobs created | 25 Jobs | 27 | 2019 | |
| | | # of women jobs created | 17 | 18 | 2019 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|-------------------|------|------|------|--|
| Intensive investments in sustainable rural market system relevant infrastructure promoted | | % of Women Jobs created | 0.7 | 0 | 2017 | | |
| | | # of youth jobs created | 25 | 27 | 2019 | | |
| | | # of people with increased income | TBD | 30 | 2019 | | |
| | 2.1.2. Pilot 2 Casa Minha Road Polana Caniço | # of Jobs created | 30 | 30 | 2019 | | |
| | | # of women jobs created | 8 | 8 | 2018 | | |
| | | % of Women Jobs created | 0.15 | 0.15 | 2018 | | |
| | | # of youth jobs created | 38 | 38 | 2018 | | |
| | | # of people with increased income | TBD | 0 | 2017 | | |
| | 2.1.3. Pilot 3 Target Gabions Ferroviario Mahotas | # of Jobs created | 15 | 15 | 2019 | | |
| | | # of women jobs created | 15 | 15 | 2019 | | |
| | | % of Women Jobs created | 1 | 100% | 2019 | | |
| | | # of youth jobs created | 14 | 14 | 2019 | | |
| | | # of people with increased income | 15 | 15 | 2019 | | |
| | | # of people with increased income | TBD | 0 | 2018 | | |
| | 2.2. Support to emerging , new and existing sustainable SME´s through targeted training and services | 2.2.1. Strengthen business linkages between producers and hotels and restaurants in Vilankulo and Inhassoro | # of Jobs created | 240 | 0 | 2018 | |
| # of women jobs created | | | 50 | 0 | 2018 | | |
| % of women jobs created | | | 21% | 0 | 2018 | | |
| # of youth jobs created (young women + young men) | | | 200 | 0 | 2018 | | |
| % of youth jobs created | | | 83% | 0 | 2018 | | |
| # of people with increased income | | | TBD | 0 | 2018 | | |
| 2.2.2. Cashew Nut Processing Factoty | | | # of Jobs created | 200 | 0 | 2018 | |
| | | # of women jobs created | 160 | 0 | 2018 | | |
| | | % of women jobs created | 80% | 0 | 2018 | | |
| | | # of people with increased income | TBD | 0 | 2018 | | |
| 2.2.3. Production of Soil Cement Block and Micro Concrete Roof Tiles | | # of Jobs created | 100 | 0 | 2018 | | |
| | | # of women jobs created | 30 | 0 | 2018 | | |
| | | % of Women Jobs created | 30% | 0 | 2018 | | |
| | | # of youth jobs created | 80% | 0 | 2018 | | |
| | | # of people with increased income | TBD | 0 | 2018 | | |
| SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 3 | | Resilient workers and enterprises to mitigate the socio-economic impact of COVID-19 in Mozambique | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|------|--|
| 3.1. Pro Employment Policies generated in support of the informal economy and social dialogue | 3.1.1. Technical assistance to SEJE for the design of Pro-Employment policy interventions in support of the informal economy in the context of Covid-19 | Number of measures focused on employment promotion and improve the business environment for informal workers implemented by SEJE and GoMz | At least 1 policy intervention designed | 6 | 2021 | |
| | 3.1.2. Development of communication strategy for pro-employment and OSH measures linked to Covid-19 | Number of men and women reporting using pro-employment or OSH related measures linked to Covid-19 | 1 communication strategy implemented | 2 | 2021 | |
| | 3.1.3. Develop OSH management systems | OSH regulations and management systems linked to the informal market in the context of Covid-19 are approved and established by November 2020 | OSH management system implemented for the specific circumstances of the informal market | 1 OSH Profile | 2021 | |
| | 3.1.4. Facilitate social dialogue through technical/explo rative workshops with constituents | Number of institutions attending the Tripartite event to discuss the way forward in terms of employment generation during and after covid-19 epidemic | 1 tripartite meeting on pro-employment strategies and COVID-19 | 2(High level meeting and Technical meeting) | 2021 | |
| 3.2. Income generated and Covid-19 mitigated through public works | 3.2.1. Training of unemployed informal market workers in labour-based construction techniques | Number of women and men trained in construction techniques with applicability to public works | Training of at least 300 women and men beneficiaries | 357 | 2021 | |
| | 3.2.2. Implementation of public works for covid-19 mitigation | Number of public works secure infrastructure development using community contracting | 100 public works 20,000 person-days of employment in the communities | 4 Public Works and 18300 working days | 2021 | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|-----|------|--|
| 3.3. Resilience of enterprises in the informal economy strengthened | 3.3.1 Increase access to finance to the informal sector operators and, to a lesser extent, to formal MSEs | Number of MSEs trained on resilient entrepreneurship and business continuity management | 400 MSEs supported | 24 | 2020 | |
| | | Number of MSEs implementing business continuity plans | 2'000-3'000 workers | 18 | 2020 | |
| | | Number of jobs created and/or retained (distinction will be made) | | 83 | 2020 | |
| | 3.3.2. Establishment of safe work spaces | Number of MSEs that are OSH safety checked based on ILO action check list | | 357 | 2020 | |
| | | Number of MSE implementing the response plan on COVID-19 prevention | | 24 | 2020 | |
| | | Number of MSEs re-organized the work and work spaces to allow for physical distancing and other safety measures | 1,000 work places with safer conditions 5'000-7'000 workers | 24 | 2020 | |
| | | Integrating safety and health into contingency and business continuity plans to sustain and make operations resilient for future shocks | | 24 | 2020 | |
| | 3.3.3. Business start-up and improvement of sanitation firms | Number of enterprises selected to be supported | 30 enterprises 200-300 workers | 140 | 2021 | |
| | | Number of entrepreneurs and their workers trained | | 140 | 2021 | |
| | | Number of women and men accessed new fund for their initiatives | | 140 | 2021 | |
| | | Number of jobs created and/or retained (distinction will be made) | | 205 | 2021 | |

ANNEX VII – LIST OF DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

ANNEX VII: LIST OF DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

LIST OF DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

- Terms of Reference.
- ILO EVAL Briefing package
- ILO at a glance Mozambique
- ILO P&B 16-17; 18-19; 20-21.
- UNDAF 2017-2020
- SADC Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan
- Project Document PRODOC
- Final Report of Mid-Term Evaluation (2019) & Evaluation Summary
- Intermediate Project reports (2018, 2019 and 2020)
- Project Monitoring System: manual and registers/evidences regarding the different indicators
- Several Project deliverables:
 - Gender Analysis and Gender Mainstreaming Strategy
 - Market analysis: Cashew, Tourism, Construction Material
 - Rapid assessment on the impact of COVID-19 in the labour market
 - EESE diagnose
 - National profile of SOHST
 - Case study of the pilot project “Resilient Business in Beira”
 - Exit strategy
- NEP Action Plan
- Statistics COMAL
- Report of the High Level Meeting on Employment (May 2021)
- Communication Strategy and communication products
- Reports and minutes on different activities, Project Advisory Committee meetings, seminars, training processes, etc.
- Annual workplans
- Administrative Documentation

