



Evaluation Summary



International
Labour
Office

Evaluation Unit

Strengthening cultural and creative industries and inclusive policies in Mozambique – Final Joint Evaluation

Quick Facts

Countries: *Mozambique*

Final Evaluation: Jan 2012

Mode of Evaluation: *Independent*

Technical Area: *EMP/SEED*

Evaluation Management: *MDG Spanish Fund, UNDP*

Evaluation Team: *EURISIS*

Project Code: *MOZ/08/56/UND*

USD 5,000,000 - UNESCO: 2,648,086 (Lead)

UNFPA: 310,300 ITC 749,000 UNHCR 134, 820

FAO: 450,524 ILO 720,270

Keywords: small enterprise development, socio-cultural development

Background & Context

Summary of the project purpose, logic and structure

Introduction

This report represents the final evaluation of the Joint Programme (JP) on Culture and Development for Mozambique, also known as the Joint Programme on Strengthening Cultural and Creative Industries and Inclusive Policies in Mozambique. It was initially a three year programme for 2008-2011, financed by the Spanish Government through the Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund (MDG-F) with a \$5 million budget. In June 2010, immediately following the mid-term evaluation, the programme was reformulated from its original ambitious scope from two components and six outcomes to two components and three outcomes. It was also extended for five months (to February 2012).

The JP counted on six United Nations (UN) agencies and ten Government of Mozambique (GoM) ministries in its implementation. The programme covered 6 areas: Maputo City, Zavala District, Inhambane City, Mossuril District, Ilha de Moçambique District and Nampula City (including Maratane Refugee Camp, on the outskirts of Nampula).

Methodology of the Final Evaluation

The final evaluation was carried out based on the reformulated programme and the respective log frame of June 2010 and it responds to the TOR prepared by the MDG-F Secretariat and adapted by the Evaluation Reference Group in Mozambique.

This evaluation was conducted from mid October 2011 to mid-January 2012. The team collected information over a six-week period (in October and November of 2011). The evaluation team collected data from primary and secondary sources, and used mixed methods aiming at gathering both quantitative and qualitative information. The methodology used in the evaluation comprised the following steps:

1. Collection and analysis of key documents
2. Development of assessment tools
3. Field visits
4. Administration of a questionnaire
5. Interviews with key stakeholders (PMC Members, Ministries, UN and Output Related Staff in Provinces)
6. Focus Group Discussions with Implementers/Beneficiaries

The questionnaire was developed to gather quantitative data. A web-based version was also used for its administration (in addition to a paper based version), allowing for a further collection of responses. A total of 46 individuals filled in the questionnaire and 32 of these were interviewed (in all 6 implementation areas of the JP) for further collection of qualitative data. In addition, 16 focus group discussions were conducted, involving more than 60 individuals.

In line with the TORs, the evaluation team collected data and information on two levels: firstly, an analysis on the basis of the performance of each of the Programme's 12 specific outputs; and secondly, an analysis of the performance of the JP on the basis of five criteria: relevance, ownership, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability. Therefore, this report presents findings on these two levels. Final Evaluation of Joint Programme of MDG-F in Mozambique: Culture and Development 8

Complexity of the Joint Programme

Before presenting the results of this evaluation, the evaluation team finds it relevant to first consider a number of aspects around the JP's design, planning and implementation that were recurrently mentioned during interviews, especially by the JP coordination team. These are:

Design: The JP called on the active participation of six UN agencies, ten ministries, various implementing organisations and short-term consultants in its implementation. The JP entailed thus a complex coordination, management and implementation structure, composed of many institutions, each with their respective expectations, objectives, needs and priorities. The amount and quality of coordination necessary to ensure that all institutions are aligned and in unison should not be taken lightly.

Deliverables: The quantity and scope of outcomes, outputs and their respective activities remained highly ambitious, even after the reformulation of the JP and the decrease from 6 to 3 outcomes and 18 to 12 outputs. Complexity increases with the vast geographical dispersion of the locations

where these outputs were supposed to occur, ranging from Maputo to Ilha de Moçambique.

Planning: The JP remained largely “idle” during the first eight months of year one. This resulted in procurement and contracting processes initiating much later than expected, resulting in further time loss.

Timeframe: After the reformulation in June 2010, the remaining time available to successfully implement activities and conclude all the outputs was extremely short, as many of the activities were linked to each other and a delay in the first activity under a certain output implied that all the remaining activities would also be implemented later than planned. Another important aspect to take into consideration in terms of time is that the JP also aimed to change the mind-frame of its stakeholders in relation to what culture entails. This is not an easy task to accomplish in such a small period of time.

To conclude, as recurrently mentioned by stakeholders involved in this evaluation, even if the JP would have had a full three years to implement, the expectations for the outputs were set unattainably high. The JP as a programme was an ambitious undertaking from its start and was confronted with various challenges.

Level of accomplishment of Outcomes and Outputs

Chapter 5 of the full report presents the results of the evaluation of each of the 12 outputs that comprise the Joint Programme. This evaluation is based on the revised log-frame produced as part of the reformulation of the Joint Programme half-way through its lifetime.

The evaluation team found that, despite the little time for implementation, many outputs were achieved. Below are highlights of the findings per output.

Performance in the five criteria: relevance, ownership, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability

Relevance: The evaluation team has heard from all interviewed sectors, ranging from top government officials to final beneficiaries how the JP has helped them understand how vast the concept of culture is. In particular, the JP’s committed effort for creative industries to be taken seriously as a sector that can stimulate innovation, create jobs, improve income levels, raise living standards and provide a boost to the country’s GNP has succeeded, as evidenced by government officials recognizing during interviews that this sector has largely been ignored in the past but now urgently needs concrete policies and strategies in order to maximize its potential.

Ownership: Judging from interviews with focal points of the JP, the overall level of Government ownership of the JP has arguably been one of its greatest weaknesses. Primarily, this is because government officials don’t see the value of the JP in terms of their own objectives and did not know clearly from the start what roles and responsibilities the JP expected of its focal points. Almost all interviewed focal points expressed to have a very poor understanding on a personal level regarding what their role actually was, even as late as two years after the start of the JP. Not understanding their role resulted in focal points quickly becoming disillusioned and losing motivation to participate and take an active involvement in the Programme.

Efficiency: In order to function efficiently, JPs fundamentally require its multiple stakeholders to not only assume active engagement but also promote excellent coordination between themselves in order to jointly work towards achieving the defined results. With ownership running low on the part of the Government, the implications on the level of efficiency were several: weak contribution to PMC meetings, low level of commitment and willingness to cooperate and act as facilitators within JP activities, and reporting from Final Evaluation of Joint Programme of MDG-F in Mozambique: Culture and Development 13

government institutions taking longer than expected as government officials prefer to prioritize internal tasks given to them by their government superiors. A further aspect that has affected efficiency negatively within the JP is the coordination between UN agencies themselves. The fact that different UN agencies pursue vastly different goals and objectives and have different work methodologies has naturally resulted in a certain level of miscommunication and differences in expectations.

Effectiveness: It is clear that despite the difficulties related to efficiency, the JP has at least delivered. It is, however, very difficult for the evaluators to judge the quality and impact of the results, due to the fact that many of the expected results of the JP had not been implemented by September 2011 as planned. A critical aspect raised was that collaboration

between different sectors has a greater potential to show impact where there exist natural linkages between the different sectors in regard to the challenge faced, e.g. the SRH output where three sectors combined their expertise and experience in order to create a holistic approach towards a common challenge, and proved to be highly effective.

Sustainability: The sustainability of the JP can be evaluated in three aspects:

1. Whether there exists *genuine interest* in continuing the work commenced under the JP: The interviewees agree that the fundamental concept here is “seeing is believing” – in order to accept and adopt new approaches and strategies that differ from current praxis, the stakeholders need to first see the positive effects before they are able to fully understand the benefits.
2. Whether there is sufficient *technical capacity* to continue the activities: focal points and beneficiaries spoke of good quality but insufficient amount of trainings with a lack of continuous follow-up. Focal points suggest using cheaper local consultants who are then able to provide follow-up workshops over time. Presently, technical capacity is still lacking.
3. Whether there is sufficient *financial capacity* to continue the activities: There is consensus here that the GoM lacks the financial ability to fund the JP activities after the end of the JP.