



**CTB**



# ANNUAL REPORT- STUDY AND EXPERTISE FUND 2013 INTERVENTION ...

Insert your image here

<b>ACRONYMS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1 INTERVENTION AT A GLANCE .....</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1 INTERVENTION FORM.....	4
1.2 BUDGET EXECUTION.....	4
<b>2 CONTEXT .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 GENERAL CONTEXT .....	5
2.2 MANAGEMENT CONTEXT: EXECUTION MODALITIES .....	5
2.3 HARMO-CONTEXT .....	6
<b>3 ANALYSIS OF PROGRESS MADE.....</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1 STUDIES.....	7
3.1.1 <i>Progress of studies</i> .....	7
3.1.2 <i>Analysis of studies completed</i> .....	7
3.2 EXPERTISE .....	8
3.2.1 <i>Progress of expertise</i> .....	8
3.2.2 <i>Analysis of expertise</i> .....	8
3.3 BUDGET EXECUTION.....	8
3.4 QUALITY CRITERIA .....	9
3.5 RISK MANAGEMENT.....	10
<b>4 STEERING AND LEARNING .....</b>	<b>11</b>
4.1 RECOMMENDATIONS.....	11
4.2 LESSONS LEARNED.....	11
<b>5 ANNEXES .....</b>	<b>12</b>
5.1 “BUDGET VERSUS CURRENT (Y – M)” REPORT .....	12
5.2 DECISIONS TAKEN BY THE JLCB AND FOLLOW-UP .....	14



# 1 Intervention at a glance

## 1.1 Intervention form

Intervention name	<b>Mozambique –Belgium Consultancy Fund</b>
Intervention Code	MOZ 01003
Location	Mozambique
Budget	€0.5m
Partner Institution	Government Institutions – coordinated by MINEC
Date of Specific Agreement	05 Mai 2002 extended in August 2006 up to 2008 and again re-extended up to May 2012
End date Specific Agreement	48 months (extended in 2006 for additional 24 months and then again in 2008 for 48 months)
Objective	Financing in full or in part studies and consultancies in the framework of the Belgian-Mozambican Development Co-operation, including identification, preparation and follow up studies of projects and programmes, investigations, missions, seminars, audits, evaluations and services

## 1.2 Budget execution

Total Budget	Expenditure year N	Balance	Total Disbursement rate
€ 500.000,00	0.00€	<b>233.582,86 EUR</b>	53%

National execution official <sup>1</sup>	BTC execution official <sup>2</sup>
<b>DR. Neto Novela</b>	<b>Paul Van Impe</b>

<sup>1</sup> Name and Signature

<sup>2</sup> Name and Signature

## 2 Context

### 2.1 General context

In May 2002, a Specific Agreement concerning the creation of the Fund was signed by both parties. Due to different interpretations of agreed modalities under the General Agreement on Co-operation between the Parties signed on 11 May 2001 and in light of a request from Mozambican authorities, an exchange of letters was then proposed in April 2005, which however only entered into force as from May 2006, when MINEC eventually appointed a Fund Co-Director (being the Deputy Director of the Admin. & Finances Directorate), who together with the BTC Resident Representative would manage the Fund

Therefore, the intervention only started in 2007, when the first study was jointly approved by both parties

### 2.2 Management context: execution modalities

The Existing Specific Agreement, which was signed in May 2002, refers to a Co-Managed Fund; however and in accordance with a request from the Mozambican authorities the actual Fund modality is Régie.

Based on the above referred exchange of letters from April 2005, MINEC was appointed by the government of Mozambique as its representative. MINEC only appointed its Representative in 2006, being the head of Admin and Finance Depart. However the Specific Agreement expired in May 2006 and therefore an extension up to May 2010 was requested. Therefore, the intervention only started in 2007, when the first study was jointly approved by both parties.

In 2010 a new extension was awarded, which expired in May 2012 and was again extended.

## 2.3 Harmo-context

As per the existing agreement only public institutions (government entities) are eligible to use the fund for undertaking studies jointly approved by DGDC and MINEC. Even though the procurement process is fully managed by the Belgian Technical Cooperation, the preparation of the Terms of Reference for the approved studies is of the responsibility of the beneficiary, who in most cases has not the capacity to develop them, this resulting in delays or cancellations of the tendering process.

There are no other international agencies that are participating as contributors and/or co-financiers of activities of the Fund.

## 3 Analysis of progress made

### 3.1 Studies

#### 3.1.1 Progress of studies

Progress of studies <sup>3</sup>	A	B	C	D	Comments (only if the value is C or D)
1 National Study on Food Security and Nutrition – Funding for Gaza province		X			The study is at national Level but Belgium is only co-funding for the collection/analysis of data referring the Gaza province where a Food Security Program funded by BSF and a water project under the bilateral program referring the last ICP will be implemented
2					
3					
4					
5					

#### 3.1.2 Analysis of studies completed

**No study was completed during the period under review**

<b>Title of study:</b>	
<i>Describe, in a few sentences, for who the study was organised, and what it was about</i>	
<i>Have the studies been used as intended?</i>	
<i>To what did the study contribute?</i>	
<i>Issues that arose, influencing factors (positive or negative)? Unexpected results (positive or negative)? How did they impact the study or the use of the study?</i>	

<sup>3</sup> A: Ahead of schedule  
 B: On schedule  
 C: Delayed, corrective measures are required.  
 D: Seriously delayed (more than 6 months). Substantial corrective measures are required.

## 3.2 Expertise

### 3.2.1 Progress of expertise

#### No expertise under the review period

Progress of expertise <sup>4</sup>	A	B	C	D	Comments (only if the value is C or D)
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					

### 3.2.2 Analysis of expertise

N/A

<b>Title of expertise – name of expert:</b>	
<i>Describe, in a few sentences, what the expertise is/was about</i>	
<i>To what extent is the expertise delivering results?</i>	
<i>To what has the expertise contributed?</i>	
<i>Issues that arose, influencing factors (positive or negative)? Unexpected results (positive or negative)? How did these impact the expertise and the result of this expertise</i>	

## 3.3 Budget execution

Add – in annex – the “Budget versus current (y – m)” Report, which includes the data up to 31/12/2012, and refer to the annex here. Comment briefly on this financial report if relevant.

<sup>4</sup> A: Expertise completed in year N  
 B: Expertise ongoing  
 C: Expertise in preparatory phase: preparation going as planned (writing ToR, procurement procedure, etc.)  
 D: Expertise planned but delayed



### 3.4 Quality criteria

On the basis of the elements above, attribute a simple A, B, C or D score<sup>5</sup> to the following criteria

Relevance: The degree to which studies and expertise are in line with local and national priorities

Efficiency: Degree to which studies and expertise have been executed on time and on budget.

Effectiveness: Degree to which studies and expertise actually contribute to their intended objectives

Criteria	Score
Relevance	A
Efficiency	C
Effectiveness	C

---

<sup>5</sup>

- A: Very good performance
- B: Good performance
- C: Performing with problems, measures should be taken
- D: Not performing/ having major difficulties: measures are necessary

If a criterion cannot be assessed (e.g. because the intervention has only just started), attribute the criteria with an 'X' score. Explain why the criterion has not been assessed.

### 3.5 Risk management

Intervention is fully managed by BTC (Finances, Procurement) and is going to be closed in 2014 and its financial balance to be transferred into the new Project for Capacity Building. Therefore no Risks to be considered

Risk Identification			Risk analysis			Risk Treatment			Follow-up of risks	
Description of Risk	Period of identification	Risk category	Probability	Potential Impact	Total <sup>6</sup>	Action(s)	Resp.	Deadline	Progress	Status

6

Potential impact	High	B	C	D
	Medium	A	B	C
	Low	A	A	B
		Low	Medium	High
Probability				

## 4 Steering and Learning

### 4.1 Recommendations

Recommendations	Source	Actor	Deadline
<i>Description of the recommendation</i>	<i>The sub-chapter to which the recommendation refers (e.g. 3.2.3)</i>	<i>The person responsible for recommendation</i>	<i>e.g. Q1, Q2, Q3 or Q4 of year N+1</i>
Transfer of financial Balance to the new project “Fund for Capacity Building”		BTC/DGCD	1 <sup>st</sup> . Quarter 2014
Closing the intervention		BTC	End 3 <sup>rd</sup> . Quarter 2014

### 4.2 Lessons Learned

Lessons learned	Target audience
It is very difficult to formulate/implement a programme which involves so many implementing agencies with different visions/missions and views	BTC/EST, DGCD Government counterparts
Involvement of independent consultant in the formulation phase can contribute strongly in the clarification of roles of each stakeholder	DGCD Government counterparts BTC/EST
Good knowledge of the geographical and socio cultural characteristics of the partner can contribute to the improvement of the TFF of proposed projects/programme	DGCD Government Counterparts BTC/EST
To limit the access to this fund to government institutions, which in most cases do not have the capacity to present adequate ToRs hampers the implementation of studies by other potential candidates such as NGOs, Private entities etc	BTC/DGCD
Proper and adequate anchoring of the intervention is crucial for its implementation	BTC/DGCD/ Partner

## 5 Annexes

### 5.1 “Budget versus current (y – m)” Report

Budget vs Actuals (Year to Month, Last 5 Years) of MOZ/01/003											
Project Title : <b>Creation of a Mozambique-Belgium Consultancy Fund</b>											
Budget Version : <b>F7</b> Year to month : 31/01/2013											
Currency : <b>EUR</b>											
YtM : <b>Report includes all closed transactions until the end date of the chosen closing</b>											
	Status	Fin Mode	Amount	Start to 2009	2010	2011	2012	Expenses	Total	Balance	% Exec
<b>A CONSULTANCY FUND</b>			393.853,25	149.054,97	83.143,99	7.458,16	27.035,33	0,00	266.592,45	127.160,80	68%
01 Consultancy Fund			0,00			-161,10	-4,67	0,00	-165,77	165,77	7%
01 Consultancy fund		REGIE	0,00			-161,10	-4,67	0,00	-165,77	165,77	7%
02 PRPE II Infrastructure Road			11.560,00	11.563,84				0,00	11.563,84	-3,84	100%
01 PRPE II Infrastructure Road		REGIE	11.560,00	11.563,84				0,00	11.563,84	-3,84	100%
03 Ministry of Planning & Development			55.280,00	55.280,69				0,00	55.280,69	-0,69	100%
01 Ministry of Planning & Development		REGIE	55.280,00	55.280,69				0,00	55.280,69	-0,69	100%
04 GACOPI Norms for Hospital design			0,00					0,00	0,00	0,00	7%
01 GACOPI Norms for Hospital Design		REGIE	0,00					0,00	0,00	0,00	7%
05 INAS Rural Development of Magudes			21.030,00	21.026,30				0,00	21.026,30	3,70	100%
01 INAS Rural Development of Magudes District		REGIE	21.030,00	21.026,30				0,00	21.026,30	3,70	100%
06 Archbishop in Nampula			60.000,00	60.000,00				0,00	60.000,00	0,00	100%
01 Archbishop in Nampula		REGIE	60.000,00	60.000,00				0,00	60.000,00	0,00	100%
07 Codex Conference Participation			7.180,00	7.184,14				0,00	7.184,14	-4,14	100%
01 Codex Conference Participation		REGIE	7.180,00	7.184,14				0,00	7.184,14	-4,14	100%
08 Demining Programme			0,00					0,00	0,00	0,00	7%
01 Demining Programme		REGIE	0,00					0,00	0,00	0,00	7%
09 UEM- University Eduardo Mondlane			54.000,00	54.000,00				0,00	54.000,00	0,00	100%
01 Seminars on Human and Social rights and		REGIE	54.000,00	54.000,00				0,00	54.000,00	0,00	100%
10 UEM/ MPD	Deleted		0,00					0,00	0,00	0,00	7%
		REGIE	500.000,00	148.858,29	83.126,50	7.397,02	27.035,33	0,00	266.417,14	233.582,86	53%
		COGEST									
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>500.000,00</b>	<b>148.858,29</b>	<b>83.126,50</b>	<b>7.397,02</b>	<b>27.035,33</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>266.417,14</b>	<b>233.582,86</b>	<b>53%</b>

Budget vs Actuals (Year to Month, Last 5 Years) of MOZ/01/003 Printed on vrijdag 28 februari 2014

page: 1

## Budget vs Actuals (Year to Month, Last 5 Years) of MOZ/01/003

Project Title : **Creation of a Mozambique-Belgium Consultancy Fund**

Budget Version : **F7** Year to month : 31/01/2013  
 Currency : **EUR**  
 YtM : **Report includes all closed transactions until the end date of the chosen closing**

	Status	Fin Mode	Amount	Start to			Expenses		Balance	% Exec	
				2009	2010	2011	2012	Total			
01 UEM/ Ministry of Planning & Dev		REGIE	0,00					0,00	0,00	0,00	??%
<b>11 Food Security Study</b>			30.763,25		23.143,99	7.619,26		0,00	30.763,25	0,00	100%
01 Causes of Food Insecurity		REGIE	30.763,25		23.143,99	7.619,26		0,00	30.763,25	0,00	100%
<b>12 Re-formulation of the Food Security and</b>			27.040,00				27.040,00	0,00	27.040,00	0,00	100%
01 Food Security and Nutrition Project in the arid		REGIE	27.040,00				27.040,00	0,00	27.040,00	0,00	100%
<b>13 SETSAN</b>			60.000,00					0,00	0,00	60.000,00	0%
01 Food Security Baseline Survey		REGIE	60.000,00					0,00	0,00	60.000,00	0%
<b>14 Tax Reform</b>			67.000,00					0,00	0,00	67.000,00	0%
01 Evaluate the impact of the IEC activities on		REGIE	67.000,00					0,00	0,00	67.000,00	0%
<b>Z UNALLOCATED FUNDS</b>			106.146,75	-196,68	-17,49	-61,14		0,00	-275,31	106.422,06	0%
01 Unallocated Funds			106.146,75	-196,68	-17,49	-61,14		0,00	-275,31	106.422,06	0%
01 Balance available for Studies		REGIE	106.146,75	-196,68	-17,49	-61,14		0,00	-275,31	106.422,06	0%

REGIE	500.000,00	148.858,29	83.126,50	7.397,02	27.035,33	0,00	266.417,14	233.582,86	53%
COGEST									
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>500.000,00</b>	<b>148.858,29</b>	<b>83.126,50</b>	<b>7.397,02</b>	<b>27.035,33</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>266.417,14</b>	<b>233.582,86</b>	<b>53%</b>



## 5.2 Decisions taken by the JLCB and follow-up

Provide an overview of the important strategic decisions taken by the JLCB and the follow-up of those decisions since the beginning of the intervention.

Decision to take					Action			Follow-up	
Decision to take	Period of identification	Timing	Source	Actor	Action(s)	Resp.	Deadline	Progress	Status
To close this intervention and transfer the remaining funds in to the new project for Capacity Building, which will extend the scope of the intervention	July 13	End 2014/ Beginning of 2014	Minutes	BTC	Finalize formulation of the new project		1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter 2014	On going	
					Transfer of the balance				