



Evaluation Summaries

WORKING OUT OF POVERTY PROGRAMME *Mozambique*

Quick Facts

Country: Mozambique

Final Evaluation Date: April 2009

Mode of Evaluation: Independent, External

Technical Area: Employment, youth and workers with disabilities, women workers

Evaluation Management: ILO Lusaka

Evaluation Team: Thomaz K. Chianca and Hélder Nhamaze

Project Start: 29 June 2006

Project End: 30 Apr 2010

Project Code: MOZ/06/50/NET

Donor: Working Out Of Poverty (WOOP)

Keywords: Employment creation, poverty alleviation, youth employment, gender equality, disabled worker

Background & Context

Summary of the project purpose, logic and structure

The *Working Out of Poverty* (WOOP) Programme was conceived as a response to specific development challenges identified in the Mozambican context. After a civil war and persistent occurrence of natural disasters the country has been enjoying a steady track of economic growth.

However, some features still could pose a threat to full blown development achievement. The overwhelming majority of economically active Mozambicans do not have jobs in the formal economy, particularly among first-time labour market entrants below 25 years of age living in urban areas.

Project Purpose

a) Determine if the programme is making progress towards the achievement of its stated outcomes and explain why/why not;

b) Provide recommendations, based on the Programme Document and implementation of the Programme so far, on how to improve programme performance and further implementation. The evaluation should also determine whether it is feasible to continue the implementation of the Programme, and on what conditions. Additionally, an assessment of the relevance of WOOP to fostering coherence and synergy in the national Decent Work programming framework shall be conducted;

c) Where necessary, identify the possible need to refine the Programme's strategy.

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

Methodology of evaluation

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

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

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

From the more than 40 scheduled meetings, only three did not take place. According to the Ministry of Labour (MoL) counterpart, the Minister cancelled the meeting because she wanted to talk to the evaluators at the end of their visit to Mozambique; however, she was out of the country when the evaluators returned to Maputo and the interview could not take place. The evaluators were told that the Minister felt her views about the Programme were adequately conveyed by the MoL's Permanent Secretary during his interview with the evaluators.

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

The last meeting held by the external evaluators in Mozambique was a debriefing with ILO's Director for Malawi, Mozambique and Zambia. The evaluation team benefitted from the flexibility, cooperation and frankness from the contacted persons. Trying to manage a tight schedule, prepared in a very short period of time, it was possible for the team to make last minute re-arrangements in Maputo, Nampula and Sofala thanks to the high level of cooperation

demonstrated by the contact persons. Ms. Salmina Merique and Ms. Raquel Malunga, from the ILO office in Maputo, played an essential role in putting together the evaluation schedule and making most of the local arrangements for the external evaluators to successfully conduct their work.

Main Findings & Conclusions

WOOP is clearly relevant to and aligned with the country's needs and the government priorities.

- The Programme has developed several activities since its inception and achieved some positive results, including some benefits to the target population and opening doors for ILO to increase and consolidate its operations in Mozambique. WOOP has, however, been challenged in terms of implementation and the results achieved are limited.
- WOOP's design was too ambitious. In trying to tackle all the gaps identified in the needs assessment conducted at the planning stage, the programme Logframe became too broad.
- There were too many experts involved in the process trying to mainstream as much as possible their specific areas into the programme plan.
- The validation of the Programme design with the main stakeholders had problems due to time limitations and language barriers.
- Only very few people, besides the ILO staff, seemed to have understood the programme in the way it was originally intended.
- There are clear differences in perception between ILO staff and representatives of partner agencies, especially the MoL, on how the programme should be managed and implemented. Those differences were never properly addressed and, as the time passed, a major climate of mistrust got installed that resulted in the programme becoming practically stalled a little less than one year after its inception.
- The problem has technical and interpersonal components. On the technical side, the Programme partners, especially the MoL, expected WOOP funds to be managed by them (or by

- INEFP) while ILO always planned to directly manage the Programme resources.
- There were three main interpersonal issues influencing the current problem: (i) the counterpart from the MoL to WOOP was reported to start undermining the Programme after his expectation of financial compensation was not met; (ii) the members of the SC became bitter about WOOP for not feeling valued and for not being compensated for their time dedicated to the Programme; and (iii) a climate of mistrust and serious communication problems between the Minister of Labor and the ILO/LO Director started to grow as the differences in perspectives about WOOP were not resolved.
 - Lack of local control from the ILO/Maputo office of WOOP's financial resources created major challenge for its implementation, becoming a serious source of frustration for many Programme partners.
 - The Programme's CTA had good technical expertise and was essential for WOOP to achieve its results. He was, however, unable to bring the different partners together to resolve the differences in perspectives on how the Programme should be managed and implemented.
 - This complex web of problems has prevented the Programme to properly spend its resources and to be implemented in a way that will increase the possibilities for producing its expected impacts. It has also negatively influenced the sustainability of WOOP's results.

Recommendations & Lessons Learned

Main recommendations and follow-up

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

The first two scenarios are based on the idea that it is possible to make a final attempt to resolve the pending issues so the Programme can produce its

important intended effects. The evaluators believe those are the most preferable options for at least two important reasons: (i) Mozambique clearly needs an intervention such as WOOP and the people of Mozambique would suffer the greatest loss if the Programme closes down, and (ii) the main players (especially ILO and MoL representatives) have expressed their willingness and interest to find ways to overcome the current problems and make good use of the available resources.

Scenario 1:

WOOP should focus in the area of youth self-employment promotion as proposed by Andreas Klemmer in his 2008 report.

A two to three-day retreat outside Maputo should be conducted with a team from ILO and from the key partner organizations (MoL, workers' and employers' organizations) to realign WOOP's strategies and management structure for the remaining term. The retreat can also serve to increase understanding about ILO's mode of operation, and its singularity among UN agencies. The Minister of Labour and the ILO/LO Director should be present at least for the final day of the retreat to ensure representativeness and credibility to the final decisions. A main output for the retreat should be a clear redefinition of the WOOP's objectives, strategies, and clarity on 24 stakeholders' roles. The process should be facilitated by an external consultant with extensive experience in conflict resolution.

Creation of two provincial offices in charge of dynamizing and coordinating Programme's implementation and monitoring in the provinces of Nampula and Sofala. Those provincial offices should be located within the local INEFP buildings with the idea of strengthening those agencies. The new offices should be properly staffed and equipped.

Hiring a new CTA with:

- (i) The proper technical expertise to lead the Programme.
- (ii) Adequate language and cultural skills to work in Mozambique, and
- (iii) the political ability to bring together different individuals and groups to collaborate.

Agree upon a job description for a MoL counterpart to the Programme with clear and specific attributions. Due to the serious friction

with the current counterpart, identify a new person to play this role.

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

Scenario 2:

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

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

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

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

An ILO representative indicated a few additional positive aspects associated with this scenario.

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

Joint Programme on Youth Employment and WOOP's SC.

Scenario 3:

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

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

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

Important lessons learned

Important to have the ILO coordinator for the region speaking the official languages of the countries she/he will be responsible for. Even though this measure would not, of course, prevent or resolve some interpersonal problems that might arise between individuals, it would probably help diminish them.

Pay attention to Programme timing when there is the need to translate basic documents to the local language. To ensure full participation of some key stakeholders it is necessary to budget enough time especially in the planning phase.

When there are several experts involved in planning a programme, it is essential to provide adequate time and specific procedures to ensure that key stakeholders fully understand what is being proposed and actually have a real opportunity to have their concerns and ideas being addressed comprehensively by the planning team.