



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

## UNDP IN MOZAMBIQUE

Since the 1992 peace accords that ended the civil war, Mozambique has achieved remarkable success on a number of fronts. It has navigated the transition from war to peace, and sustained political stability while transforming its political system to a multi-party democracy. Steady economic growth rates have averaged 6 percent to 7 percent a year over the past several years. As a least developed country, however, Mozambique faces considerable development challenges. In tackling these, the role and

contributions of external partners remain important.

UNDP's programmes have straddled many themes, ranging from emergency relief to specialized development support and services designed to meet the long-term needs of economic growth, poverty reduction and increasing the capacity of the public sector. The Independent Evaluation Office of UNDP conducted an independent country programme evaluation that covered UNDP work from 1998 to 2004.

### TOTAL PROGRAMME RESOURCES, 1998-2006: \$207 MILLION

#### FUNDING SOURCES, 1998-2003



#### PROGRAMME ALLOCATION BY THEMATIC AREA, 1998-2006 (\$ MILLIONS)



## FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

UNDP in Mozambique has had an excellent record in helping to establish key institutions such as the Disaster Preparedness Institute and the National AIDS Council, and in driving key initiatives in demining. It was widely commended for its role in coordinating the donor response to the 2000 floods and the mobilization of more than \$450 million in aid.

A district planning model the organization piloted jointly with the United Nations Capital Development Fund in Nampula province was replicated with World Bank funds in four other provinces. The Ministry of Planning and Finance adopted it as a nationwide model; it is now the basis for national legislation on local government. UNDP has also been at the forefront of supporting the strengthening of the justice sector, and a credible electoral and court system.

Less impressive results resulted from support to key democratic institutions such as Parliament, prisons and police, given entrenched interests that hinder reform. A number of challenges arose from limited institutional capacities. In spite of considerable assistance, the National AIDS Council, for instance, had difficulty managing the considerable resources received from development partners. Institutional weakness and lack of transparency affected performance in disaster mitigation

and demining, and in the case of Environment Ministry programmes, led to the withdrawal of some key UNDP programme partners.

UNDP did not succeed in mainstreaming gender equality in its programmes. Poverty reduction projects were, with a few exceptions, localized and geographically isolated, with only a modest promise of being scaled up or replicated. One exception was the Poverty Observatory, which has potential to expand conceptual understanding of poverty, and nudge national initiatives closer to human poverty concerns and national Millennium Development Goal (MDG) targets.

Mozambique may have been an example of how UNDP does well in conflict and crisis situations, but finds it difficult to carve out a distinctive niche once the agenda shifts to long-term development perspectives. Inflexible programming procedures and the lack of resources outside five-year programming cycles may explain a lack of a flexibility, agility and forward thinking. UNDP was mostly absent from policy discussions between the government and its development partners, and may not be competitive or well placed enough to provide leadership and substantive capacities in current policy areas. These include, in particular, support for developing policy alternatives and enhanced government

capacities within the context of poverty reduction and the budget support modality. When expertise is needed on issues dealing with fiscal or monetary policy, administrative reform, tax policy or agricultural programmes, officials have partnered with other organizations with a comparative advantage and expertise.

Current UNDP programming, by contrast, lacks the necessary coherence for a clear strategic position. Many projects seem to be 'supply driven', kept on because resources or support are available, and not because they are part of an effective strategy for reducing poverty or enhancing human well-being. Demining, for example, uses significant resources, almost as much as the fight against HIV/AIDS, even though its contribution to the human development agenda may be far less.

Declining resources have aggravated the fragmentation of UNDP's focus because, as Mozambique restored peace, and funds available for emergency response fell, resources for regular programming were spread thinly across a number of remotely connected initiatives. UNDP needed to concentrate not just on what it does best, but also on linking projects and programmes so they explicitly build upon each other. The local governance and decentralization programme, for example, could incorporate components that support income generation, and

address both human and income poverty.

Changing modalities for development funding in Mozambique have meant that bilateral donors have more mechanisms for channeling their development assistance, including into the central treasury as direct budget support. UNDP has only recently begun to participate as an observer when budget support donors convene, but its presence and impact were modest. One priority could be support for a strategy to ensure that direct budget support achieves effective and sustained benefits in terms of poverty reduction and the MDGs.

Looking ahead, the nature of the strategic partnerships that UNDP forges with the Government and national development constituencies will be critical to the repositioning of its contributions. Success largely depends on anticipating national needs and redefining roles as priorities shift. Among other ways forward, the organization may find that informed advocacy to stake out strong positions on human rights and development will be more important than the existing relatively narrow focus on preserving a reputation for neutrality and generating resources. UNDP should take stronger stands in supporting programmes that are of strategic value and are in line with its core priorities.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

- Define a coherent and compelling vision and an effective communication strategy as a necessary first step in increasing UNDP's profile and relevance in a competitive environment.
- Develop an effective transition strategy from crisis response to long-term development.
- Develop a strategic response on how to support governments that have adopted direct budget support at corporate and country level.
- Support capacity building for development management and aid coordination to promote government leadership and national ownership of the process.
- Champion and strengthen UN system collaboration through joint programming and broaden non-traditional partnerships.
- Redouble efforts to enable civil society to have a genuinely independent input to the Action Plan for the Reduction of Absolute Poverty through the Poverty Observatory.
- Sharpen strategic focus, achieve greater coherence and enhance programme effectiveness by reducing the number of core areas.
- Promote a rural development focus and accord increased priority in UNDP programming to reducing human poverty and improving rural livelihoods.
- Build on past successes and increase initiatives to strengthen local government.
- Improve and diversify resource mobilization and partnership strategies.
- Increase in-house expertise by expanding the knowledge base.
- Improve business processes, including through strategic guidance from headquarters on challenges such as how to respond to direct budget support.

## ABOUT THE ICPEs

Independent country programme evaluations (ICPEs) are the backbone of the work of the Independent Evaluation Office. They capture evidence of UNDP's contributions to development results and the effectiveness of strategies supporting national development. They enable continued improvement in UNDP programmes, contribute to strengthened national ownership and evaluation capacity, and underpin accountability to national stakeholders and UNDP's Executive Board. To date, over 100 ICPEs have been conducted worldwide.

See the full reports at the Evaluation Resource Centre, [erc.undp.org](http://erc.undp.org)