



OED Evaluation: Mozambique Case Study

Country framework/starting point:

- ✓ Poor public sector capacity, highly centralized, conflict 1966-1992
- ✓ Nat'l plans, PRS, CASs, ... emphasize need for CD
- ✓ CD, Technical Assistance (TA) large share of donor support
- ✓ Many SWAPs, good donor coordination relatively speaking
- ✓ CD, TA donor supplied/driven more than other forms of aid

Country case analyses:

- ✓ Experiences across *countries*
- ✓ Experiences across *sectors*
- ✓ Experiences across *CD levels*
- ✓ Experiences across *sources/forms* of CD support (TA, training etc)



Sector Performance

Roads Sector "Best Practice":

- ✓ Large-scale comprehensive sector approach – infrastructure + CD
 - ✓ Skills development required – management, admin, engineering:
 - New recruits sent to University with fellowships
 - All new staff had mentors and career paths: "you will move up!"
 - Housing, other sector-owned assets used as "golden handcuffs"
 - ✓ TA was recruited against clear job descriptions:
 - DO tasks, act as mentor, provide on-the-job learning
 - Clear performance criteria and exit strategy
 - Contracts were owned by MOZ, who could fire – and did!
- ⇒ No PIU – all admin, accounting inside Roads Dept, w/ CD
- ⇒ No donors allowed to act outside programme (WB critical)



Education Sector I

Five projects, USD 250 mill budgets, USD 113 mill CD

- ✓ Began with stand-alone but comprehensive projects
 - ✓ Had projects also at tertiary level
 - ✓ Began with PIU (GEPE) to manage projects
 - ✓ With sector program ESSP, project management "mainstreamed":
 - First two years: poor performance, problems
 - Now better integrated, accepted, need to push to provinces
 - ✓ Projects and overall program over time:
 - Alignment: projects Good, ESSP Very good
 - Diagnosis, analysis: Very good
 - Design: Good
- ⇒ Quality at Entry largely Good/Very Good
- ⇒ CD increasingly moved into Ministry itself



Education Sector II

"Good practice I": MOZ Capacity Building Study (91-92):

- ✓ Six months, 40 locals, comprehensive CD perspective
- ✓ Long-term proposals covering secondary, tertiary, technical fields
- ✓ Comprehensive program: University (WB+), salary fund (NO, CH, SE), publ admin (EU), legal (DK, US), TA coord (UNDP)

"Good Practice II": University Eduardo Mondlane:

- ✓ TA used to substitute while staff got MA, PhD abroad
- ✓ TA time-limited, phased out, UEM with staff-retention plans



Levels of CD I

Institutional Development ("Rules of the Game")

- ✓ Strengthened accountability, role of lower level adm, including schools
- ✓ Opened up for private, non-public providers – competition
- ✓ Getting State out of school book production etc, more on quality development
- ⇒ **Changes largely non-controversial, using int'l "lessons learned"**

Organizational Development ("Actors playing the game")

- ✓ Took time for MinEd to "internalize" project management
- ✓ Poor HR *mngt* w/ skills development based on career paths etc
- ✓ Sector/ministry changes dependent on larger framework issues: staff incentives, salary scales, job satisfaction potential etc
- ✓ Organizational development: slow-moving non-transparent processes
- ⇒ **Few external stakeholders with clout, info**
- ⇒ **Internal stakeholders strong, particularistic agendas**



Levels of CD II

Human Resources development ("human capital")

- ✓ Huge resources into training, TA
- ✓ Fragmented, project driven funding, support ⇒ rent-seeking behavior
- ✓ Specific training – f ex for school heads – more efficient
- ✓ General training, esp'y Min staff, "leaks out" of public sector
- ✓ MOZ: leakage less than neighbors due to low staff rotation
- ✓ Little monitoring/tracking so unclear what long-term results are
- ⇒ Lack of coordination seems to generate serious wastage
- ⇒ Need broader labor-market perspective



Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)

Results-based M&E – Quality Assurance:

- ✓ Requires clear Outputs, Indicators, Targets – today largely missing
- ✓ Education sector scored WORST on this: difficult to track changes
- ✓ Most results reporting at activity level ("number of staff trained...")
- ✓ Little investment in developing better CD monitoring instruments
- ✓ Since most CD *project* based, M&E not pointing to *sector* issues
- ✓ CD heavily donor-supplied (TA), so donor coordination more important but also more difficult: little joint CD M&E
- ⇒ Little Structured M&E in CD projects: QA, learning weak
- ⇒ Little support for strengthening government M&E capacity



"Lessons Learned"

1. CD is long-term, comprehensive – projects usually are not
 2. CD complex, requires proper planning, monitoring, quality assurance
 3. Need to understand country but even more sector characteristics: CD touches core interests, concerns of stakeholders
 4. Sector programs open up for better CD, but no automaticity
 5. Differentiate *levels* ⇒ Demands different skills
 6. CD resources (TA, etc) costly yet poorly managed
 7. *Technical/sector* specialists usually not CD specialists
 8. "CD requires excess capacity": realism in planning essential
 9. Coordination costs are high – lack of coordination even more costly!
- ⇒ **Quality at Entry critical for long-term success**
- ⇒ **Little new: "ain't rocket science" – Back to Basics!**