



RESULTS REPORT

2018

Study and Expertise Fund

MOZ1302611

Table of contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
ACRONYMS	4
1 INTERVENTION AT A GLANCE (MAX. 2 PAGES)	5
1.1 INTERVENTION FORM	5
1.2 BUDGET EXECUTION	6
1.3 SELF-ASSESSMENT PERFORMANCE	6
1.3.1 <i>Relevance</i>	6
1.3.2 <i>Effectiveness</i>	6
1.3.3 <i>Efficiency</i>	6
1.3.4 <i>Potential sustainability</i>	7
1.4 CONCLUSIONS	8
2 RESULTS MONITORING	9
2.1 EVOLUTION OF THE CONTEXT	9
2.1.1 <i>General context</i>	9
2.1.2 <i>Institutional context</i>	9
2.1.3 <i>Management context: execution modalities</i>	9
2.1.4 <i>Harmo context</i>	10
2.2 PERFORMANCE OUTCOME	10
2.2.1 <i>Progress of indicators</i>	10
2.2.2 <i>Analysis of progress made</i>	11
2.2.3 <i>Potential Impact</i>	11
2.3 PERFORMANCE OUTPUT 1	12
2.3.1 <i>Progress of indicators</i>	12
2.3.2 <i>Progress of main activities</i>	12
2.3.3 <i>Analysis of progress made</i>	12
2.4 PERFORMANCE OUTPUT 2	13
2.4.1 <i>Progress of indicators</i>	13
2.4.2 <i>Progress of main activities</i>	13
2.4.3 <i>Analysis of progress made</i>	13
2.5 PERFORMANCE OUTPUT 3	14
2.5.1 <i>Progress of indicators</i>	14
2.5.2 <i>Progress of main activities</i>	14
2.5.3 <i>Analysis of progress made</i>	14
2.6	15
2.7	15
2.8 TRANSVERSAL THEMES	15
2.8.1 <i>Gender</i>	15
2.8.2 <i>Environment</i>	15
2.8.3 <i>Other</i>	15
2.9 RISK MANAGEMENT	16
3 STEERING AND LEARNING	17

3.1	STRATEGIC RE-ORIENTATIONS.....	17
3.2	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	17
3.3	LESSONS LEARNED.....	18
ANNEXES.....		19
3.4	QUALITY CRITERIA	19
3.5	DECISIONS TAKEN BY THE STEERING COMMITTEE AND FOLLOW-UP	22
3.6	UPDATED LOGICAL FRAMEWORK.....	23
3.7	MORe RESULTS AT A GLANCE	23
3.8	“BUDGET VERSUS CURRENT (Y – M)” REPORT	23
3.9	COMMUNICATION RESOURCES	25

1 Intervention at a glance (max. 2 pages)

1.1 Intervention form

Intervention title	Study and Expertise Fund
Intervention code	MOZ1302611
Location	Maputo- Mozambique
Total budget	750.000 EUR (as per decision from the Belgian Government of May 2016)
Partner Institution	Ministry of Economy and Finances (replacing the MPD since 2015)- Maputo, Mozambique
Start date Specific Agreement	12 th Dec 2014
Date intervention start /Opening steering committee	20 July 2015- however and due to changes within the government cabinet and extinguishing of MPD and creation of the Ministry of Economy and Finances the project only started its activities in 2016
Planned end date of execution period	December 2019
End date Specific Agreement	12 th Dec 2020
Target groups	Public Institutions (Government departments), NGOs and Associations
Impact¹	Contributing to capacity development of Mozambican institutions in the sectors of Agriculture/Food Security, Energy for Rural development, Health and crosscutting issues
Outcome	Institutional and organizational capacity building efforts have been supported through short and medium term consultancies and technical assistance, specific studies and seminars in the priority sectors and geographical areas of concentration of the Belgian-Mozambican Cooperation
Outputs	Result 1: "The study and expertise fund is set up and procedures are known among the institutions of the priority sectors at different levels"
	Result 2: "Needs from the sectors are identified in line with their strategic and policy priorities and formulated into requests"
	Result 3: "Activities supported through the Study and Expertise Fund are implemented in a qualitative way"
Year covered by the report	2018

¹ Impact refers to global objective, Outcome refers to specific objective, output refers to expected result

1.2 Budget execution

	Budget	Expenditure		Balance	Disbursement rate at the end of year n
		Previous years	Year covered by report (n)		
Total	750.000,00	363.875,90	155.608,20	230.515,90	69%
Output 1	6.069,00	6.021,51	0,00	47,49	99%
Output 2	130,00	0,00	0,00	130,00	0%
Output 3	375.701,00	178.641,54	92.542,40	104.517,06	72%
Output 4	0,00			0,00	0%
General means	368.100,00	179.212,85	63.065,80	125.821,35	66%

1.3 Self-assessment performance

1.3.1 Relevance

	Performance
Relevance	A

Public Institutions as well as local NGOs and professional associations are lacking resources to fund short/medium term consultancies, technical assistance and seminars, particularly after the country's financial crisis. Therefore, the Fund remains relevant.

1.3.2 Effectiveness

	Performance
Effectiveness	C

The outcome will only be partially achieved as most of the reports were delayed and some were of poor quality.

1.3.3 Efficiency

	Performance
Efficiency	C

Due to limited consultancy market and technical capacity, the costs of outputs are very high. Moreover, the budget cuts and financial limits imposed by HQ obliged the intervention to revise its disbursement plans.

1.3.4 Potential sustainability

	Performance
Potential sustainability	C

Most of the reports are delayed because of lack of capacity of local partners to approve them and disseminate their results. Furthermore, there is a lack of resources to implement projects or activities to address the identified needs and or recommendations. Therefore, the intervention cannot ensure their sustainability.

1.4 Conclusions

The financial crisis faced by the country has affected severely the intervention as most of public institutions have been operating deficiently and the staff is losing its motivation and therefore not willing to follow up the fund's activities.

It has been very difficult to engage the partner's staff in following up the consultant's work and/or approval of reports, this affecting the timely delivery of studies results and the quality of the delivered reports.

As all funds were previously committed, the intervention focused only on the follow up of awarded consultancies/studies.

Most of the studies/consultancies were completed and their reports approved except the one regarding the assessment of the distribution chain/logistics of medical equipment at Centro de Abastecimento- MISAU and the 2nd phase of the training on macroeconomic econometrics. The delays in both cases were caused by the local partners (beneficiaries).

During the reporting period, the intervention has assessed a proposal for a Expertise intervention regarding the extension of the LTA (Local Technical Advisor) contract of the project "Water-Gaza" from March do December 2019. For this purpose the intervention will make a budget revision, which will allow it to transfer financial resources from general means into result area 3.

Due to above-mentioned reasons the workload has reduced significantly, therefore the local Admin and Finances Assistant's contract was terminated in November 18

National execution official ²	Enabel execution official ³

² Name and Signature

³ Name and Signature

2 Results Monitoring⁴

2.1 Evolution of the context

2.1.1 General context

The country still faces a severe financial crisis and most donors continued the suspension of their budget support, therefore all public institutions, including our partners, are facing problems regarding their functioning which affects obviously the staff's motivation. Therefore, it has been particularly difficult to engage government officials in following up the commissioned studies and in the approval process of reports, this causing long delays and affecting their quality.

2.1.2 Institutional context

After the disclosure of the so called "hidden debts", the Ministry of Economy and Finances was always under the pressure of IMF and other donors and deeply involved in the revision of undertaking any other activities, making it impossible to hold even the planned Steering Committee meetings.

On the other hand, the fact that most of the intervention's budget had already been committed and no further activities could be supported, this intervention was no longer relevant for the local partner.

2.1.3 Management context: execution modalities

As previously reported the execution modality is "Regie" and therefore all procurement processes referring consultancies/studies are done by Enabel and according to Belgian laws and regulations, which are of course not known by local partners and potential service providers.

As a result of above-mentioned it has been very difficult to get appropriate engagement/commitment of the partners in following up the consultants work and reporting activities, this causing long delays and very long time consuming processes for the interventions management.

⁴ Impact refers to global objective, Outcome refers to specific objective, output refers to expected result

2.1.4 Harmo context

As mentioned above, the financial crisis and the suspension of budget support programs has affected severely the partners functioning, making it extremely difficult to get government staff engaged in the interventions activities.

On the other hand the MEF's staff has been under pressure, having often to revise budgetary plans and reports and having therefore no time to call or attend the planned coordination and Steering Committee meetings.

2.2 Performance outcome

This intervention does not have a Logframe because its activities could not be planned beforehand since they were completely dependent on requests received. Nevertheless and in order to give a general overview of the progress made, below follows an attempt to answer to main performance questions:



2.2.1 Progress of indicators⁵

Outcome⁶: Institutional and organizational capacity building efforts have been supported through short and medium term consultancies and technical assistance, specific studies and seminars in the priority sectors and geographical areas of concentration of the Belgian Mozambican Cooperation					
Indicators⁷	Baseline value⁸	Value year N-1⁹	Value year N¹⁰	Target year N¹¹	End Target¹²
# of approved consultancies /studies	N/A	4	-		4
# of approved Technical Assistance	N/A	1	-	-	2

⁵ You can use the table provided, or you can replace it by your own monitoring matrix format. Add/delete columns according to the context (some interventions will need to add columns for previous years while other – new - interventions will not have a value for the previous year).

⁶ Use the formulation of the outcome as mentioned in the logical framework (TFF)

⁷ Use the indicators as shown in the logical framework (from TFF or last version of logical framework)

⁸ The value of the indicator at time 0. Refers to the value of the indicators at the beginning of the intervention (baseline)

⁹ The achieved value of the indicator at the end of year N-1

¹⁰ The achieved value of the indicator at the end of year N. If the value has not changed since the baseline or since the previous year, this value should be repeated.

¹¹ The planned target at the end of year N

¹² The target value at the end of the intervention

# approved Seminars/Study Tours	N/A	1	-	-	1
---------------------------------	-----	---	---	---	---

2.2.2 Analysis of progress made

The above-mentioned outcome was set under the assumption that the interventions total budget was 3 Mio EUR. However, this was cut down to only 750.000 EUR. This has limited significantly the intervention's ability to support the partners' capacity building efforts, particularly because consultancies/technical assistance services in the local market are very expensive.

On the other hand, most of the requests were referring consultancies to undertake studies and in many cases under the assumption that the beneficiary institution would get from the Fund an « envelop » and would use the disposed financial resources to support its staff involved in the studies. Therefore, the awarding of contracts to private consulting companies was not very well accepted by the partners and their motivation to follow up the consultants' work and approve their reports was no longer there, this resulting in long delays.

2.2.3 Potential Impact

Coordination team meetings allowed the joint assessment and approval process of received proposals.

The Procedures Manual has facilitated the good understanding of Project execution modalities, its mechanisms and systems by potential partners.

The Flyer was an important tool for dissemination of information regarding the Fund's existence amongst most of public institutions.

The proposal template helped the partners in developing their proposals and facilitated the approval process by the coordination team as all of them were presented in the same way.

2.3 Performance output 113



2.3.1 Progress of indicators

Output 1: Result 1: "The study and expertise Fund is set up and procedures are known among the institutions of the priority sectors at different levels"					
Indicators	Baseline value	Value year N-1	Value year N	Target year N	End Target
Procedures Manual	N/A	1	-	-	1
Project Flyer	N/A	1	-	-	1
Proposals Template	N/A	1	-	-	1

2.3.2 Progress of main activities

Progress of <u>main</u> activities ¹⁴	Progress:			
	A	B	C	D
1 Elaboration of a Procedures Manual	X			
2 Design and Production of a project Flyer	X			
3 development of a standard proposals template	X			

2.3.3 Analysis of progress made

As mentioned above this outcome has been fully achieved during the first year of project implementation.

¹³ The template accommodates up to 3 Outputs (chapters 2.2, 2.3, 2.4). If the intervention has more outputs, simply copy and paste additional output chapters. If the intervention has less than 3 outputs, simply delete the unnecessary chapters). As for the outcome level, you may also replace this table by the intervention's own format (e.g. from your operational monitoring tool)

¹⁴ A: The activities are ahead of schedule
 B: The activities are on schedule
 C: The activities are delayed, corrective measures are required.
 D: The activities are seriously delayed (more than 6 months). Substantial corrective measures are required.

2.4 Performance output 2

2.4.1 Progress of indicators

Output 1: Result 2: “Needs from the sectors are identified in line with their strategic and policy priorities and formulated into requests”					
Indicators	Baseline value	Value year N-1	Value year N	Target year N	End Target
Number of identified requests	N/A	15	1	0	1

2.4.2 Progress of main activities

During the reporting period the intervention identified only 1 potential request referring the contract extension of the Water Gaza LTA from March to December 2019.

Progress of <u>main</u> activities ¹⁵	Progress:			
	A	B	C	D
1 Extension contract LTA Water Gaza		X		

2.4.3 Analysis of progress made

The only expertise intervention identified during the reporting period refers to the extension of the Water Gaza LTA contract as from March to December 2019. However, by the end of 2018 the partner institution (DNAAS) had not yet submitted its proposal.

Despite the delays in submitting the proposal and considering that intended activities will only start in March 2019, it is possible to take necessary corrective measure in Q1-2019.

¹⁵ A: The activities are ahead of schedule
 B: The activities are on schedule
 C: The activities are delayed, corrective measures are required.
 D: The activities are seriously delayed (more than 6 months). Substantial corrective measures are required.

2.5 Performance output 3¹⁶

2.5.1 Progress of indicators

Output 1: Result 3: “Activities supported through the Study and Expertise Fund are implemented in a qualitative way”					
Indicators	Baseline value	Value year N-1	Value year N	Target year N	End Target
# of approved reports	N/A	-	-	4	1

2.5.2 Progress of main activities

Progress of <u>main</u> activities ¹⁷	Progress:			
	A	B	C	D
1 Revision and presentation of the report on agricultural commercialization in Zambezia			X	
2 Presentation of the report on gender based violence		X		
3 Presentation of the report on use of renewable energy for water pumping and treatment in arid and semi-arid areas by UEM				X
4 Presentation of report referring the distribution chain/logistics of medical equipment at MISAU			X	

2.5.3 Analysis of progress made

Out of the 4 expected reports 3 of them were presented despite several delays. However, the quality of the reports was in most cases not satisfactory. This could be a result of ambiguous and ambitious ToRs presented by the beneficiaries, or their limited capacity to follow up and to supervise and monitor the consultants work.

¹⁶ If the Logical Framework contains more than three Outputs, copy-paste the 2.4 chapter and create 2.6 for Output 4 , 2.7 for Output 5, etc.

¹⁷ A: The activities are ahead of schedule
 B: The activities are on schedule
 C: The activities are delayed, corrective measures are required.
 D: The activities are seriously delayed (more than 6 months). Substantial corrective measures are required.

The above-mentioned quality problems can also be a result of limited technical capacity of the local consultants, as often one company offers services in all expertise fields.

Limited availability of consultancy companies in the local market makes it also very difficult to get good technical and specialized services.

2.6 Transversal Themes

2.6.1 Gender

The project implemented a study on gender based violence in the provinces of Nampula and Gaza. The target group was women and girls above 15 years old. The Study delivered a significant contribution to the identification of potential causes of gender based violence and has also delivered important recommendations on how best can this issue be addressed by the government and NGOs.

2.6.2 Environment

A study referring the use of renewable energy for water pumping and treatment in arid and semi-arid areas was commissioned through a grant agreement with the main public university of the country – UEM.

Even though the report was not approved due to quality problems it contains strong recommendations for using renewable energy such as solar (photovoltaic) or bioenergy in the water projects, as the Enabel Water project is already doing in Gaza.

As worldwide known, the use of solar and all other renewable energy sources can be a great contribution to mitigate the effects of climate changes in those areas.

2.6.3 Other

2.7 Risk management

No furtherer risks were identified during the reporting period

Risk Identification			Risk analysis			Risk Treatment			Follow-up of risk	
Description of Risk	Period of identification	Risk category	Probability	Potential Impact	Total	Action(s)	Resp.	Deadline	Progress	Status
Unavailability of Ministry's staff to provide technical input in the ToR or follow up implementation	2016	OPS	Medium	Medium	Medium	Establish close relations and promote the fund among different technical directorates	Coordination Team	01-12-2018	done	terminated
Poor or too ambitious/ambiguous TORs	2016	OPS	Medium	Medium	Medium	ToRs revised and validated by Project Team and other experts (ITAS)	Project Manager	01-12-2018		terminated
Studies results/recommendations not being disseminated/used	2016	DEV	Medium	Medium	Medium	Project considering the upload of the studies in the BTC or MEF Web page	Coordination Team	01-12-2018		terminated
Resistance to follow BTC/Belgian procurement laws & rules	2016	OPS	Medium	Medium	Medium	Pro-active coordination of all procurement steps with the owners of studies/beneficiaries	Project Manager	01-12-2018		terminated
No Top Up Policy - No incentive for MEF staff to spend time for the intervention	2016	OPS	Medium	Medium	Medium	Make sure MEF staff understand BTC Policy	Coordination Team	01-12-2018		terminated
Requests only for studies	2016	OPS	Low	Low	Low	Encouraging potential partners to make use of the opportunities for providing Technical Assistance	Coordination Team	01-12-2018		terminated
Early closure of the intervention	2017	OPS	Medium	Medium	Medium	Ensure finalization of all reports	Coordination Team	01-12-2019		ongoing

3 Steering and Learning

3.1 Strategic re-orientations

During this period it has not been possible to call SC meetings due to unavailability of the coordinating institution (MEF). Therefore, no strategic decisions could be taken.

Nevertheless and taking into consideration that all funds allocated for activities have been committed/disbursed, the intervention management is due to approve a Budget revision, which can allow the transfer of funds from the foreseen balance for general means into the activities in order to support further interventions particularly those related to other Enabel running projects.

In order to save additional financial resources to be used to support future proposals the management has also decided for the no extension of the local Admin and Finances Assistant's contract which terminated in November 2018. It also intends to terminate the Project managers contract in May 2019, when his contract as the office PO will end due to his retirement.

3.2 Recommendations

Recommendations	Actor	Deadline
<i>Description of the recommendations</i>	<i>The actor responsible for (dis)approving the recommendation</i>	<i>e.g. Q1, Q2, Q3 or Q4 of year N+1</i>
Prepare a budget revision proposal	Project Manager	Q1
Call SC meeting	Coordination team	Q1
Approve budget revision and Technical Assistance for Water - Gaza project	SC	Q1
Prepare draft final report	Manager	Q2
Prepare hand over process	Manager	Q2

3.3 Lessons Learned

Lessons learned	Target audience
The intervention should have focused on technical assistance rather than on studies, in order to contribute immediately to the capacity building of beneficiary institutions	EST-HQ (Formulation team)
Consultancies/studies do not deliver immediate contributions to capacity building and their results quality depend fully from partners commitment/engagement	EST-HQ (formulation team)
Considering the limited budget and the execution modality (regie) of the Fund its management should have been endorsed to the Representation. This could have reduced the operational costs and avoided long consultations with partners and therefore sped up the procurement and approval processes	EST- HQ- Representation
For better and immediate results the Fund's resources should be used to support other Enabel interventions (as done with RERD I and is due to be done with Water – Gaza project)	EST- HQ

Annexes

3.4 Quality criteria

1. RELEVANCE: The degree to which the intervention is in line with local and national policies and priorities as well as with the expectations of the beneficiaries				
<i>In order to calculate the total score for this quality criterion, proceed as follows: 'At least one 'A', no 'C' or 'D' = A; Two times 'B' = B; At least one 'C', no 'D' = C; at least one 'D' = D</i>				
Assessment RELEVANCE: total score	A	B	C	D
X				
1.1 What is the present level of relevance of the intervention?				
X	A	Clearly still embedded in national policies and Belgian strategy, responds to aid effectiveness commitments, highly relevant to needs of target group.		
...	B	Still fits well in national policies and Belgian strategy (without always being explicit), reasonably compatible with aid effectiveness commitments, relevant to target group's needs.		
...	C	Some issues regarding consistency with national policies and Belgian strategy, aid effectiveness or relevance.		
...	D	Contradictions with national policies and Belgian strategy, aid efficiency commitments; relevance to needs is questionable. Major adaptations needed.		
1.2 As presently designed, is the intervention logic still holding true?				
	A	Clear and well-structured intervention logic; feasible and consistent vertical logic of objectives; adequate indicators; Risks and Assumptions clearly identified and managed; exit strategy in place (if applicable).		
x	B	Adequate intervention logic although it might need some improvements regarding hierarchy of objectives, indicators, Risk and Assumptions.		
	C	Problems with intervention logic may affect performance of intervention and capacity to monitor and evaluate progress; improvements necessary.		
	D	Intervention logic is faulty and requires major revision for the intervention to have a chance of success.		

2. EFFICIENCY OF IMPLEMENTATION TO DATE: Degree to which the resources of the intervention (funds, expertise, time, etc.) have been converted into results in an economical way				
<i>In order to calculate the total score for this quality criterion, proceed as follows: 'At least two 'A', no 'C' or 'D' = A; Two times 'B', no 'C' or 'D' = B; at least one 'C', no 'D' = C; at least one 'D' = D</i>				
Assessment EFFICIENCY : total score	A	B	C	D
			X	
2.1 How well are inputs (financial, HR, goods & equipment) managed?				
X	A	All inputs are available on time and within budget.		
	B	Most inputs are available in reasonable time and do not require substantial budget adjustments. However there is room for improvement.		
	C	Availability and usage of inputs face problems, which need to be addressed; otherwise results may be at risk.		
	D	Availability and management of inputs have serious deficiencies, which threaten the achievement of results. Substantial change is needed.		

2.2 How well is the implementation of activities managed?	
	A Activities implemented on schedule
	B Most activities are on schedule. Delays exist, but do not harm the delivery of outputs
X	C Activities are delayed. Corrections are necessary to deliver without too much delay.
	D Serious delay. Outputs will not be delivered unless major changes in planning.
2.3 How well are outputs achieved?	
	A All outputs have been and most likely will be delivered as scheduled with good quality contributing to outcomes as planned.
	B Output delivery is and will most likely be according to plan, but there is room for improvement in terms of quality, coverage and timing.
X	C Some output are/will be not delivered on time or with good quality. Adjustments are necessary.
	D Quality and delivery of outputs has and most likely will have serious deficiencies. Major adjustments are needed to ensure that at least the key outputs are delivered on time.

3. EFFECTIVENESS TO DATE: Degree to which the outcome (Specific Objective) is achieved as planned at the end of year N				
<i>In order to calculate the total score for this quality criterion, proceed as follows: 'At least one 'A', no 'C' or 'D' = A; Two times 'B' = B; At least one 'C', no 'D' = C; at least one 'D' = D</i>				
Assessment EFFECTIVENESS : total score	A	B	C	D
			X	
3.1 As presently implemented what is the likelihood of the outcome to be achieved?				
	A	Full achievement of the outcome is likely in terms of quality and coverage. Negative effects (if any) have been mitigated.		
	B	Outcome will be achieved with minor limitations; negative effects (if any) have not caused much harm.		
X	C	Outcome will be achieved only partially among others because of negative effects to which management was not able to fully adapt. Corrective measures have to be taken to improve ability to achieve outcome.		
	D	The intervention will not achieve its outcome unless major, fundamental measures are taken.		
3.2 Are activities and outputs adapted (when needed), in order to achieve the outcome?				
	A	The intervention is successful in adapting its strategies / activities and outputs to changing external conditions in order to achieve the outcome. Risks and assumptions are managed in a proactive manner.		
x	B	The intervention is relatively successful in adapting its strategies to changing external conditions in order to achieve its outcome. Risks management is rather passive.		
	C	The intervention has not entirely succeeded in adapting its strategies to changing external conditions in a timely or adequate manner. Risk management has been rather static. An important change in strategies is necessary in order to ensure the intervention can achieve its outcome.		
	D	The intervention has failed to respond to changing external conditions, risks were insufficiently managed. Major changes are needed to attain the outcome.		

4. POTENTIAL SUSTAINABILITY: The degree of likelihood to maintain and reproduce the benefits of an intervention in the long run (beyond the implementation period of the intervention).				
<i>In order to calculate the total score for this quality criterion, proceed as follows: At least 3 'A's, no 'C' or 'D' = A ; Maximum two 'C's, no 'D' = B; At least three 'C's, no 'D' = C ; At least one 'D' = D</i>				
Assessment POTENTIAL SUSTAINABILITY : total score	A	B	C	D
			X	
4.1 Financial/economic viability?				
	A	Financial/economic sustainability is potentially very good: costs for services and maintenance are covered or affordable; external factors will not change that.		
X	B	Financial/economic sustainability is likely to be good, but problems might arise namely from changing external economic factors.		
	C	Problems need to be addressed regarding financial sustainability either in terms of institutional or target groups costs or changing economic context.		
	D	Financial/economic sustainability is very questionable unless major changes are made.		
4.2 What is the level of ownership of the intervention by target groups and will it continue after the end of external support?				
	A	The steering committee and other relevant local structures are strongly involved in all stages of implementation and are committed to continue producing and using results.		
	B	Implementation is based in a good part on the steering committee and other relevant local structures, which are also somewhat involved in decision-making. Likelihood of sustainability is good, but there is room for improvement.		
x	C	The intervention uses mainly ad-hoc arrangements and the steering committee and other relevant local structures to ensure sustainability. Continued results are not guaranteed. Corrective measures are needed.		
	D	The intervention depends completely on ad-hoc structures with no prospect of sustainability. Fundamental changes are needed to enable sustainability.		
4.3 What is the level of policy support provided and the degree of interaction between intervention and policy level?				
	A	Policy and institutions have been highly supportive of intervention and will continue to be so.		
	B	Policy and policy enforcing institutions have been generally supportive, or at least have not hindered the intervention, and are likely to continue to be so.		
X	C	Intervention sustainability is limited due to lack of policy support. Corrective measures are needed.		
	D	Policies have been and likely will be in contradiction with the intervention. Fundamental changes needed to make intervention sustainable.		
4.4 How well is the intervention contributing to institutional and management capacity?				
	A	Intervention is embedded in institutional structures and has contributed to improve the institutional and management capacity (even if this is not an explicit goal).		
x	B	Intervention management is well embedded in institutional structures and has somewhat contributed to capacity building. Additional expertise might be required. Improvements in order to guarantee sustainability are possible.		
	C	Intervention relies too much on ad-hoc structures instead of institutions; capacity building has not been sufficient to fully ensure sustainability. Corrective measures are needed.		
	D	Intervention is relying on ad hoc and capacity transfer to existing institutions, which could guarantee sustainability, is unlikely unless fundamental changes are undertaken.		

3.5 Decisions taken by the steering committee and follow-up

No JLCB meeting took place during the reporting period. Therefore no strategic decisions were taken

Decision to take					Action			Follow-up	
Decision to take	Period of identification	Timing	Source	Actor	Action(s)	Resp.	Deadline	Progress	Status

3.6 Updated Logical framework

N/A

No Logical Framework

3.7 MoRe Results at a glance

N/A - No baseline

Logical framework's results or indicators modified in last 12 months?	
Baseline Report registered on PIT?	
Planning MTR (registration of report)	mm/yyyy (estimate)
Planning ETR (registration of report)	mm/yyyy (estimate)
Backstopping missions since 01/01/2012	

3.8 "Budget versus current (y – m)" Report

Budget vs Actuals (Year to Date, Last 5 years) of MOZ1302611											
Project Title :		Fund for Capacity Building									
FCB											
Budget Version :		D9									
Currency :		EUR									
YTD :		Report includes all valid transactions, registered up to today									
	Status	Fin Mode	Amount	Start to 2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total	Balance	% Exec
A	INSTITUTIONAL AND ORGANISATIONAL CAPACITY		381.900,00	129,24	8.249,04	176.284,77	92.542,40	0,00	277.205,45	104.694,55	73%
01	Study and Expertise Fund set up and		6.069,00	129,24	5.892,27	0,00	0,00	0,00	6.021,51	47,49	99%
01	Elaboration of an operational procedures		REGIE 69,00	68,42	0,09	0,00	0,00	0,00	68,51	0,49	99%
02	Promotion and communication		REGIE 6.000,00	60,82	5.892,18	0,00	0,00	0,00	5.953,00	47,00	99%
02	Needs from sectors are identified and		130,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	130,00	0%
01	Six-monthly meetings with key institutions		REGIE 130,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	130,00	0%
02	Support to the formulation of proposals		REGIE 0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?
03	Set-up of a system for processing requests		REGIE 0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?
03	Activities are implemented through various		375.701,00	0,00	2.356,77	176.284,77	92.542,40	0,00	271.183,94	104.517,06	72%
01	Finalisation of ToR and set-up of an		REGIE 0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?
02	ODA MOZ- Procedures Manual; Training		REGIE 0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?
03	Impact Assessment - Communication		REGIE 0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?
04	Long term technical expertise - Recruitment		REGIE 0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?
05	Consultancies MINAG - DE - different studies		REGIE 0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?
06	Consultancies/Studies for SETSAN		REGIE 0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?
07	Feasibility study on climate financing for		REGIE 0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?
08	Gender disaggregated data and planning –		REGIE 0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?
09	Impact of the Rural Families Schools in		REGIE 0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?
10	Monitoring and resolution of bottlenecks		REGIE 0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?
11	DPASA Zambezia - study on the agricultural		REGIE 44.000,00	0,00	20,51	10,85	37.542,40	0,00	37.573,77	6.426,23	85%
12	UEM- use of renewable energy for wter		REGIE 67.321,00	0,00	0,00	60.510,74	0,00	0,00	60.510,74	6.810,26	90%
	REGIE		750.000,00	38.164,45	77.016,40	248.695,05	111.540,67	0,00	475.416,58	274.583,42	63%
	COGEST										
	TOTAL		750.000,00	38.164,45	77.016,40	248.695,05	111.540,67	0,00	475.416,58	274.583,42	63%



Budget vs Actuals (Year to Date, Last 5 Years) of MOZ1302611 Printed on 29/01/2019

page: 1

Budget vs Actuals (Year to Date, Last 5 years) of MOZ1302611

Project Title : **Fund for Capacity Building**
FCB
 Budget Version : **D9**
 Currency : **EUR**
 YTD : **Report includes all valid transactions, registered up to today**

	Status	Fin Mode	Amount	Start to					Expenses		Total	Balance	% Exec
				2015	2016	2017	2018	2019					
13 Studies (MGCAS- Study on Gender based		REGIE	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	7%
14 FUNAE - RERD Expertise		REGIE	88.300,00	0,00	0,00	88.277,97	0,00	0,00	88.277,97	22,03	100%		100%
15 MGCAS- Study on Gender based violence		REGIE	56.010,00	0,00	1.010,38	0,00	55.000,00	0,00	56.010,38	-0,38	100%		100%
16 DPEF Maputo - Technical Assistance		REGIE	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	7%
17 DIPREME Gaza - Study on Bioenergy		REGIE	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	7%
18 MEF- Training macro-economic Econometry		REGIE	36.330,00	0,00	1.325,87	10.709,80	0,00	0,00	12.035,67	24.294,33	33%		33%
19 MISAU - State Medical Insurance		REGIE	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	7%
20 MCT - Study Tour to Belgium		REGIE	15.600,00	0,00	0,00	15.533,16	0,00	0,00	15.533,16	66,84	100%		100%
21 MISAU - Monitoring Audits		REGIE	53.740,00	0,00	0,00	1.242,25	0,00	0,00	1.242,25	52.497,75	2%		2%
22 MISAU - Elaboration procedure manual for		REGIE	14.400,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	14.400,00	0%		0%
X CONTINGENCIES			0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	7%
01 Budgetary reserve			0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	7%
01 Contingencies		REGIE	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	7%
Z GENERAL MEANS			368.100,00	38.035,21	68.767,36	72.410,28	18.998,27	0,00	198.211,13	169.888,87	54%		54%
01 Salaries			333.000,00	34.552,87	62.320,29	65.453,43	18.068,05	0,00	180.394,65	152.605,35	54%		54%
01 Project manager		REGIE	251.000,00	30.736,65	41.734,59	46.677,49	0,00	0,00	119.148,72	131.851,28	47%		47%
02 National coordinator (half time)		REGIE	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	7%
03 Administrative and financial assistant		REGIE	82.000,00	3.816,22	20.585,71	18.775,95	18.068,05	0,00	61.245,93	20.754,07	75%		75%
02 Investments			7.500,00	2.716,22	2.166,66	920,98	292,76	0,00	6.096,62	1.403,38	81%		81%
01 Desk supplies		REGIE	4.500,00	0,00	2.000,48	920,98	186,44	0,00	3.107,90	1.392,10	69%		69%
02 ICT Equipment		REGIE	3.000,00	2.716,22	166,17	0,00	106,32	0,00	2.988,72	11,28	100%		100%
		REGIE	750.000,00	38.164,45	77.016,40	248.695,05	111.540,67	0,00	475.416,58	274.583,42	63%		63%
		COGEST											
TOTAL			750.000,00	38.164,45	77.016,40	248.695,05	111.540,67	0,00	475.416,58	274.583,42	63%		63%



Budget vs Actuals (Year to Date, Last 5 Years) of MOZ1302611 Printed on 29/01/2019

page: 2

Budget vs Actuals (Year to Date, Last 5 years) of MOZ1302611

Project Title : **Fund for Capacity Building**
FCB
 Budget Version : **D9**
 Currency : **EUR**
 YTD : **Report includes all valid transactions, registered up to today**

	Status	Fin Mode	Amount	Start to					Expenses		Total	Balance	% Exec
				2015	2016	2017	2018	2019					
03 Running Costs			8.600,00	797,67	4.280,30	1.215,23	637,46	0,00	6.930,66	1.669,34	81%		81%
01 Fuel for MPD vehicle and taxi transport in		REGIE	1.000,00	0,00	432,53	0,00	0,00	0,00	432,53	567,47	43%		43%
02 Telecommunication costs		REGIE	4.100,00	501,97	1.786,50	975,02	637,46	0,00	3.900,95	199,05	95%		95%
03 Field Missions in Mozambique		REGIE	2.000,00	0,00	951,98	240,21	0,00	0,00	1.192,19	807,81	60%		60%
04 Training of the project manager		REGIE	1.500,00	295,70	1.109,29	0,00	0,00	0,00	1.404,99	95,01	94%		94%
04 Audit, Monitoring and Evaluation			19.000,00	24,15	0,11	4.820,64	0,00	0,00	4.844,90	14.155,10	25%		25%
01 Monitoring and evaluation costs		REGIE	10.000,00	24,15	0,00	4.820,64	0,00	0,00	4.844,79	5.155,21	48%		48%
02 Audits		REGIE	5.000,00	0,00	0,11	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,11	4.999,89	0%		0%
03 Backstopping		REGIE	4.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	4.000,00	0%		0%
99 Conversion rate adjustment			0,00	-55,70	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	-55,70	55,70	7%		7%
98 Conversion rate adjustment		REGIE	0,00	-55,70	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	-55,70	55,70	7%		7%
		REGIE	750.000,00	38.164,45	77.016,40	248.695,05	111.540,67	0,00	475.416,58	274.583,42	63%		63%
		COGEST											
TOTAL			750.000,00	38.164,45	77.016,40	248.695,05	111.540,67	0,00	475.416,58	274.583,42	63%		63%



Budget vs Actuals (Year to Date, Last 5 Years) of MOZ1302611 Printed on 29/01/2019

page: 3

Note: **44.067,53** EUR referring disbursements to cover SLAs not included in the FIT reports.

3.9 Communication resources

- Funds Flyer
- Report on agricultural commercialization in Zambezia
- Report on gender based violence in the provinces of Nampula and Gaza
- Report on the use of renewable energy for water pumping and treatment in arid and semi-arid zones (the case of Gaza province)