



Republic of Mozambique: Country Strategy and Programme Evaluation

Main findings and recommendations

99th session of the Evaluation Committee

October 2017

Independent Office
of Evaluation



Investing in rural people

IFAD in Mozambique, an overview

- 12 projects funded thus far, total cost: US\$370 million
 - ❖ IFAD highly conc. loans: US\$ 212 million (57%)
 - ❖ Gov counterpart: US\$ 40m (11%)
 - ❖ International cofinancing: US\$ 110m (30%)
 - ❖ Beneficiaries' contribution: US\$ 8m (2%)
- Country office since 2003; resident Country Director since mid-2015

CSPE scope

- Second CSPE in the county (previous completed in 2009). Lending portfolio (2010-2019), 4 loan-projects
- Five grants, both in support of loans and self-standing
- Other Non-lending activities: policy dialogue, knowledge management, partnership building
- Performance of IFAD and the Government
- 2011 COSOP performance

Main evaluation findings

Lending portfolio - strengths

- Technology transfer contribution: poultry, read meat, cassava, fishing gear and fish post-capture conservation (post-harvest handling, processing and marketing)
- Promotion of accumulative savings and credit associations (ASCAs), for a large number of poor rural women and men
- Contribution to capacity of public organizations (e.g., demand-responsive extension services; national organizations supporting artisanal fisheries and aquaculture)
- Attention to integrating women among beneficiaries and as leaders of grassroots groups and associations

Main evaluation findings

Lending portfolio – challenges and issues

- Low efficiency, significant delays in projects' implementation
- Focus on small farmers with marketable surplus (less attention to potentially food insecure farmers)
- Overall, limited financial services for beneficiaries, partly due to IFAD's withdrawal from the sector. A barrier to engagement in value chains
- Low level of attention to environmental sustainability
- Limited gender analysis during project planning, implementation and M&E (e.g., sex-disaggregated data)

Main evaluation findings

Non-lending activities

- **Knowledge management:** mostly focused on communication products. Limited analytical work and little capturing of experience in other countries
- **Partnerships:** IFAD highly-valued partner for the Government; solid with Rome-based Agencies, other UN organizations and bilateral partners, reflected in resources leveraged
- **Policy engagement:** advocacy and support for mainstreaming nutrition in the National Agricultural Extension System. Constraints: high turnover of CPMs and limited country office staffing and resources

Main evaluation findings

Non-lending activities (cont.)

- **Grants.** High synergy between grants and loans. Filled in some design gaps (e.g., nutrition, HIV/AIDS and natural resource management)
- **Regional grants** have contributed key technical assistance on phyto-sanitary control, fully integrated in the National Agricultural Extension System.

Key conclusions

- Programme relevant to the needs of the country and aligned with national policies and strategies
- Two main operational shortcomings: (i) focus on surplus farmers, less so on food-insecure households; (ii) limited progress in providing financial services adapted to the poor's needs (except ASCAs);
- Mixed experience in engaging service providers
- Non-lending activities had adequate treatment in the COSOP but there were limited resources available

Six Strategic Recommendations

- 1. Focus on rural poor and on more vulnerable groups, including women, youth and people living with HIV.**
Project strategies must tackle the obstacles they face in participating in value chains.
- 2. Full attention to sustainable natural resources management and to strengthening climate-change resilience.**
- 3. IFAD's support to the rural finance sector to be conceptualized within a long-term commitment horizon and based on lessons learned**

Six Strategic Recommendations (cont.)

4. **Enhance efficiency of financial execution.** While maintaining harmonization with the Government's systems and procedures, pursue fast-tracking mechanisms for contract approval
5. **Develop guidance for engaging external service providers in project implementation**
6. **Dedicate further attention and resources to knowledge management and policy dialogue**