

C'DIE
PD-ABC-448
93776

THE MOZAMBIQUE PVO SUPPORT PROJECT
(656-0217)

MID-TERM EVALUATION: FINAL REPORT
June 10, 1994

Submitted to:
USAID/Mozambique



600 Water Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20024
USA

202/484-7170
Fax: 202/488-0754

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
PROJECT IDENTIFICATION DATA SHEET	i
LIST OF ACRONYMS	ii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iv
I. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW	1
A. Evaluation Scope & Methodology	1
1. Evaluation Purpose and Objectives	1
2. Evaluation Approach and Methodology	1
3. Evaluation Structure and Content	3
B. The PVO Support Project	3
1. The Changed Project Setting	3
2. Project Background and Context	5
3. Updating Project Design	6
II. EVALUATION FINDINGS	10
A. Analyzing Project Inputs and USAID/Mozambique Project Management ..	10
1. Specifying Project Inputs	10
2. USAID Project Management	13
3. Summary of Findings	21
B. Analyzing Project Outputs and PVO Grantee Performance	23
1. Specifying Project Outputs	23
2. A Review and Analysis of Individual Project Grants	24
3. Consolidation of Individual Grants by Project Outputs	31
4. Assessing Grantee Performance	42
5. Summary of Findings	50
C. Analyzing Progress Towards the Achievement of Project Purpose	50
1. Specifying the End of Project Status	50
2. Progress and Achievements to Date	54
3. Constraints to Further Progress	57
III. EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS	59
A. Assessing Impact of Project Inputs in the Achievement of Project	
Outputs	59
1. The Quantity and Quality of USAID Inputs	59
2. Effectiveness of USAID Management Structures and Procedures ..	61
3. Validity of Project Design Parameters	65
4. The Appropriateness of the Project Strategy & Approach	65
B. Assessing Progress Made Towards Achievement of Project Outputs	66
1. Building Indigenous Capacity for Planning, Management and	
Delivery of Relief Services	66

a

2.	Facilitating the Transition from Relief to Rehabilitation	66
3.	Grant Contributions Towards Project Output Objectives	67
4.	PVO Absorptive Capacity and Contribution Towards Project Outputs	73
5.	Appropriateness of PVO Rehabilitation Strategies and Approaches	74
C.	Assessing Progress Made Towards Achievement of Project Purpose	74
1.	As a Result of USAID Project Inputs and Management	75
2.	As a Result of PVO Grant Activities and Performance	76
3.	Unexpected Results	79
D.	Specific Issues and Requirements	79
1.	Coordinated PVO/NGO Development Strategic Plan	79
2.	Sustainability	80
3.	Gender Issues	85
4.	Effects of Import Restrictions on Mobilization of Resources	85
5.	Delays in Award of Grants	86
6.	PVO Technical Capacity in the Water Sector	86
7.	Environmental Issues	87
IV.	EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS	88
A.	Through the Project Agreement Completion Date	88
1.	Project Level Actions	88
2.	Concerning USAID/Mozambique Project Management	89
3.	Concerning PVO Grantee Performance	91
4.	Concerning USAID - PVO Relationships with the GRM	93
B.	For a Possible Follow-on Project	93
1.	Concerning Project Purpose and Strategy	94
2.	Concerning the Nature of Project Management	95
3.	Concerning Project Beneficiaries	95
4.	Concerning Project Components	95
5.	Concerning LOP Funding and PACD	96
6.	Choice of Procurement Instruments	96
C.	Lessons Learned	96

ANNEXES

- Annex A. Detailed Scope of Work
- Annex B. Detailed Review of Individual Project Grants
- Annex C. List of Individuals and Organizations Interviewed
- Annex D. List of Reference Documents
- Annex E. Questionnaire Forms
- Annex F. Evaluation Team

b

PROJECT IDENTIFICATION DATA SHEET

1. **COUNTRY:** MOZAMBIQUE
2. **PROJECT TITLE:** MOZAMBIQUE PVO SUPPORT PROJECT
3. **PROJECT NUMBER:** 656-0217
4. **PROJECT DATES:**
 - a. **First Project Agreement:** June 6, 1990 (Authorized)
September 1, 1990 (Orig Agr Date)
July 30, 1991 (PROAG with GRM)
 - b. **Final Obligation Date:** FY 1994
 - c. **Most Recent PACD:** September 30, 1996
5. **PROJECT FUNDING:**
 - a. **AID Bilateral Funding:** \$90,000,000 (Grant)
 - b. **Other Major Donors:** None
 - c. **Host Country CP Funds:** None

TOTAL \$90,000,000
6. **MODE OF IMPLEMENTATION:** Direct Mission Managed
7. **PROJECT DESIGNERS:** USAID/Mozambique
8. **RESPONSIBLE MISSIONS OFFICIALS:**
 - a. **Mission Director(s):** Roger Carlson (Current)
Julius Schlotthauer (Former)
 - b. **Project Officers(s):** Sidney Bliss (Current)
Aileen Marshall (Former)
9. **PREVIOUS EVALUATION(s):** None

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ADO	Agricultural Development Officer
ADRA	Adventists Development Relief Agency
AICF	Action Internationale Contre La Faim
USAID	Agency for International Development
CA	Cooperative Agreement
CMH	Childhood and Maternal Health
CPSP	Country Program Strategic Plan
DDS	District Health Directorate
DFA	Development Fund for Africa
DNA	National Directorate for Water
DPCA	Provincial Directorate for Construction and Water
DPCCN	Dept. for Disaster Prevention & Emergency Relief
EOPS	End of Project Status
EPAR	Provincial Rural Water Supply Programme
EPI	Essential Program for Immunization
FHI	Food for the Hungry International
FFW	Food for Work
GACD	Grant Activity Completion Date
GEOMOC	State Water Drilling Company
GRM	Government of Mozambique
HIDROMOC	State Hydraulic Equipment Company
IEE	Initial Environmental Examination
INIA	National Agronomic Research Institute
IQC	Indefinite Quantity Contract
KAP	Knowledge, Attitudes, Practices
LOGFRAME	Logical Framework
LOP	Life of Project
MCA	Ministry of Construction and Water
MCD/I	Medical Care Development International
MCH	Maternal and Child Health
MHC	Mozambique Health Committee
MOH	Ministry of Health
NGO	Non-government Organization
NRM	Natural Resource Management
ODA	Overseas Development Administration
OFDA	Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance
O/E	Operating Expenses
ORT	Oral Rehydration Therapy
PACD	Project Activity Completion Date
PC	Project Committee
PID	Project Identification Document
PIO/T	Project Implementation Order/Technical Services
PDO	Project Development Officer

PIL	Project Implementation Letter
PIR	Project Implementation Report
PMT	Project Management Team
PP	Project Paper
PROAG	Project Agreement
PRONAR	National Rural Water Supply Program
PSC	Personal Services Contractor
PVO	Private Voluntary Organization
QIP	Quick Implementing Projects
RCO	Regional Contracts Officer
RFA	Request for Applications
RFP	Request for Proposals
RLA	Regional Legal Advisor
RSA	Republic of South Africa
SCF	Save the Children Federation
SEMOC	Mozambique Seed Company
SSE	Small-scale enterprise
STD	Sexually Transmitted Disease
TA	Technical Assistance
USAID	U.S. Agency for International Development
USDH	U.S. Direct Hire
USG	United States Government
WID	Women in Development
WRC	World Relief Corporation
WVRD	World Vision Relief and Development

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I. OVERVIEW

The Mozambique PVO Support Project (656-0217) represents an extraordinary commitment on the part of the United States to support an African country which has undergone nearly two decades of massive suffering and misery. The flexibility demonstrated by the project in being able to rapidly respond to the evolving needs and opportunities which mark the Mozambican context of the past five years has been one its strongest and most positive attributes.

It has, at the same time however, led to a number of management and programmatic shortcomings that has impeded the ability of both USAID/Mozambique and concerned PVOs, as well as the Evaluation Team, to adequately evaluate the progress and assess the impact made by the project to date. The principal problem relates to the lack of specificity concerning output targets and the End of Project Status (EOPS) provided in the initial project Logical Framework and subsequent project amendments, and the failure of PVO Grantees to adequately specify outputs and an EOPS in their individual grants. This is unfortunate because it has certainly led to significantly under-reporting individual grant and thus overall project progress and impact progress.

The Evaluation Team has concluded that the project is on-track and should attain most of its objectives by mid-1997. This will require an extension to the current Project Activity Completion Date (PACD). For the project to be able to provide measurable and demonstrated impact by the new PACD, it will need to up-date project purpose and output parameters at both the project and PVO grant levels.

II. EVALUATION OBJECTIVE

This is the first evaluation of the PVO Support Project since its approval and authorization on June 6, 1990; the scheduled PACD is September 30, 1996. As such, the purpose of this "mid-term evaluation" is to provide USAID/Mozambique with an overall set of Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations to be used in improving project and PVO grant level performance through the remainder of the implementation phase. In addition, USAID/Mozambique will soon be designing a follow-on project and is also currently engaged in drafting a new CPSP which will cover the five-year period, 1995 - 2000; it is intended that this evaluation inform both of these design processes.

III. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The approach taken by the team was to focus at the individual grant level of project execution, and to derive from information gathered at this level, an indication as to whether project level objectives were being met and were likely to be fully achieved by the PACD. A significant amount of the team's time was thus spent in trying to determine individual grant progress. Summary grant data sheets were prepared for each of the twenty-two individual grants

funded to date (20 grants and two Cooperative Agreements). Data used in assessing individual grant progress was collected from:

- Review of core project documentation found in USAID files;
- PVO questionnaires administered during interviews with Grantee representatives responsible for a particular grant activity;
- USAID trip reports;
- Grantee financial and progress reports;
- Mid-term and final grant evaluations; and
- Field trips made by evaluation team members.

In addition, the team interviewed key members of USAID/Mozambique, other donors and several local NGOs.

IV. PROJECT PURPOSE

The PVO Support Project was designed to provide USAID/Mozambique with a mechanism to respond to the growing numbers of the absolute poor, principally among rapidly expanding population of displaced persons, resulting from the heightened rural insurgency of the late 1980s and early 1990s. It thus represented in tangible terms, USAID/Mozambique's desire to shift away from strictly emergency relief operations that aimed at mitigating the worst effects of poverty, to a more developmental program -- although still rehabilitation in orientation -- that considered the underlying or structural causes of poverty.

The most easily identifiable changes in design parameters, in addition to the significant increase in USAID/Mozambique inputs and extended PACD, are the expanded beneficiary groups and eligible grant activities. Project level outputs and the EOPS, to the extent they were initially specified, have remained unchanged on paper but have obviously taken on new dimensions as the project has expanded its scope and coverage. The flexibility and adaptability demonstrated by the project, which is one of its most evident strengths, has had a less positive effect, at least as far as measuring anticipated or planned for project progress and achievements. It is this tension between the planned and unplanned which has provided the primary challenge to the Evaluation Team.

V. MAJOR FINDINGS

Project Inputs

Although input targets were neither specified in the PP nor in subsequent amendments, overall, USAID inputs -- that is, in each of the four input categories - PVO grant fund, USAID/Mozambique project management, technical assistance, and evaluations -- are more than adequate to attain stated project objectives. Nearly 90 percent of total LOP funding has been obligated to date; over 60 percent of this amount, however, remains in the pipeline, the majority of which (88 percent) is under the PVO grant fund. Assuming full obligation of the PVO Grant Fund to \$83 million (it is currently at \$73 million), there still remains over \$20 million in unearmarked and uncommitted funding.

Relationships with USAID and the GRM

- The majority of PVOs speak highly of the USAID project managers and vice versa. In general both parties view their interaction as very collaborative, with positive effects on grant design and implementation.
- PVO contacts with GRM departments at the national level are mixed. Most of the PVOs are coordinating extensively at the provincial and district levels with their counterpart agencies in health, water and sanitation, and agriculture. However, this collaboration is hampered by insufficient GRM capacity, poor motivation and training, and trust/accountability problems.
- The GRM cannot compete with salaries offered by PVOs, thus their presence contributes to a professional drain on GRM human resources. Nor can government compete with the tremendous resources that pass through PVOs for relief and rehabilitation purposes.

Sustainability

- PVOs have varying degrees of dependency on USAID funding. The majority could not sustain their current level of operations, or even significantly reduced ones, without continued Project funding.
- The short time period for grants, and incremental funding in many cases, makes it difficult to plan and achieve sustainable activities, whether relief or rehabilitation.

VI. MAJOR CONCLUSIONS

Quantity and Quality of USAID Inputs

It is the overall conclusion that the level of USAID inputs have been sufficient to obtain the overall project objectives of:

- Contributing to the improvement of the food security and well-being of those most seriously affected by the insurgency (goal);
- Reducing vulnerability to absolute poverty, within targeted population groups (purpose); and
- Facilitating the transition from emergency relief to rehabilitation.

Effectiveness of USAID Management Structures and Procedures

The Project Management Team (PMT) has been severely understaffed and under-supported despite the fact that adequate resources have existed to address this fundamental

problem. Obligating grant funding, i.e., getting proposals developed and approved, has been the overriding concern of the PMT in particular, and USAID in general, and has overshadowed all other project management responsibilities. However, it must also be pointed out that the PMT has accomplished a herculean task in keeping the project on-track, while obligating roughly \$60 million in project grants. The PMT has been universally praised by PVOs and their USAID/Mozambique colleagues alike for establishing and maintaining an open and supportive environment and conducting themselves professionally while, at times, under great stress. This has been no small accomplishment.

It must also be pointed out that within the larger context of the USAID Mission to Mozambique, there has been, until just recently, a severe shortage of personnel. This has led to using all available human resources, including those on the PMT, to undertake the full range of management and implementation responsibilities associated with the current Transition Program. While this fact is not intended as a justification for the inability of PMT staff to devote sufficient time to other management responsibilities, the evaluation would be remiss in not taking into account the larger setting, including constraints, under which the Mission has labored for the past three years.

Assessing Progress Made Towards Achievement of Project Outputs and Purpose

Despite the problems encountered when trying to measure progress towards achievement of grant level outputs, as well as attributing aggregated grant level output achievements to project level output achievement, there has been a sufficient level of activities under project outputs to date to provide a notional idea of progress in this regard.

The Evaluation Team has not been able to make any conceptual distinction between relief and rehabilitation. In practical terms, what we can say about the types of activities undertaken through project-financed grants is that they have probably been more developmental than relief and, while they may, in fact, be laying the foundation for development, it could just as easily be said that they are continuing a dependence on relief. What can definitely be said, however, is that without the activities being carried out by PVOs under the project there would have been continued and widespread suffering, and there would have been no opportunity, whatsoever, for longer-term development to have taken place. In these terms, and with the definition of rehabilitation as portrayed in project documentation, i.e., as being "more developmental" than relief, there has in fact been a transition from relief towards development. In a future project, however, we would suggest that the conceptual framework of a relief to development continuum be abandoned in favor of either relief or development. A final point to note is that the degree to which activities have promoted the transition from relief to rehabilitation has largely been a function of the particular understanding and approach of development which a given PVO grantee has put into practice.

The general conclusion of the Evaluation Team is that PVO Grantee activities have contributed to the attainment of the project-level output objectives. However, the degrees of attainment by category or within sectors is impossible to determine objectively based upon the existing project documentation and our interviews with Grantee and Cooperative Agreement Recipients. This is so primarily because the anticipated output objectives were not stated

precisely and quantitatively in many of the agreements and, consequently, they do not constitute a comprehensive basis against which actual outputs can be measured.

The project's monitoring system for PVO grant activities has, unfortunately, not produced accurate and cumulative statements of actual outputs despite the frequent reports demanded of the PVOs as Grantees and Cooperative Agreement Recipients. In this regard, both USAID/Mozambique and the PVOs have done themselves a considerable disservice in that many of the activities appear to have contributed significantly to the transition from relief to rehabilitation of Mozambicans but their outputs have not been recorded in a systematic and coherent manner.

The project has had a significant impact to date in mitigating the worst effects of, and decreasing vulnerability to, absolute poverty on target groups both specified in the PP and those later included and significantly amplified under Amendments Two and Three.

It has only been in the last year that the project has been able to begin addressing the underlying, structural causes of absolute poverty and, thus, begin the transition from a purely relief program and reactive strategy to a longer-term, more developmental and proactive approach to poverty alleviation. This, of course, has had nothing to do with the nature of the inputs provided or the strategy undertaken by USAID/Mozambique; rather it has been the result of the context in which the project was conceived and later evolved. With peace and an increased degree of stability achieved since late 1992, the remaining years of the project can be more fully focused on approaches and strategies which promote the increased movement towards a developmental program. The challenge which thus faces USAID/Mozambique at this point is making a commitment to taking sufficient time to reflect on the new conditions which have been obtained, and to decide how remaining funds can best advance the project's transition strategy.

Overall it can be said that PVO Grantees have performed competently and professionally in the management and execution of their grant activities. It has not been an inexpensive undertaking, but largely warranted under the set of circumstances which has defined the Project context over the past three years. From the logistical point of view, both poor transportation infrastructure and the dangers associated with mined roads, raised individual grant costs considerably and were a major factor in the delays associated with grant start-up and implementation.

Compared to other countries, the large number of expatriates required under each grant would seem excessive, but in the Mozambique context appears to be entirely the norm. There are simply too few Mozambicans with the skills and expertise required to manage large scale relief and rehabilitation efforts. This is particularly true for the requirements of accountability that each of the grants necessitated considering the tremendous volume of goods which were transferred from PVOs to final beneficiaries. Finally, working with the poor who are socially marginalized and geographically isolated in the best of circumstances, has always been an expensive proposition to begin with, and one which has traditionally been left to PVOs to tackle within the hierarchy of donor organizations. This has been the primary reason why PVO programs have often been criticized for being costly. In general, the Team believes that PVOs

and their grant activities have been effectively managed and that this has contributed to the achievement of the Project purpose.

VII. MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall, the remainder of the project should be looked at as a transition period to a new follow-on project and an opportunity to re-institute what might be called "best practices" within both project and PVO grantee management.

Project Design

- Extend the current PACD of September 30, 1996 to at least June 30, 1997 to ensure that current and future grants have time to be fully implemented and to permit a Project close-out period of six months including the conduct of a final evaluation.
- Prepare a new project budget and financial plan which takes into consideration the new PACD.
- Reformulate the project Logical Framework to reflect changes presented in each of the project amendments.

Project Management

- Strengthen PMT capacity by adding a new Activity Monitor, as called for in the PP (adequate funds exist) and/or through a substantial increase in short-term technical assistance for which significant unutilized funding remains.
- Maintain current responsibility for overall project management including grants management with the PMT, but with increased and structured involvement of technical offices in grants monitoring.
- Eliminate monthly grantee reporting and adopt quarterly (or semi-annual when feasible) reporting requirements which provide necessary information for USAID semi-annual and API reporting requirements.
- Standardize reporting formats and require PVOs to adhere to them.
- To ensure consistency with the Second Project Amendment, take a proactive approach to including Mozambican NGOs in project activities either through the award of direct grants and/or in the provision of targeted technical assistance and training interventions.

Concerning PVO Grantee Performance

- Re-analyze PVO Support Project support for water supply development with the objective of undertaking those activities which are commensurate with demonstrated PVO capacities and which enhance the sustainability of improved water supplies.

Concerning USAID - PVO Relationships with the GRM

- Seek to reduce perceived tension among PVOs/NGOs and GRM related to lack of GRM involvement in project activities and the perception that their legitimacy is being undermined by significant resource distribution through PVOs.

VIII. LESSONS LEARNED

- Project management is highly labor intensive in PVO projects even when using a grant instrument with "grant worthy" PVOs. This is even more pronounced in developmental versus relief and rehabilitation activities in which capacity building becomes a major project objective. This has relevance to the new follow-on project.
- While current thought within donor circles posits a "relief-to-development" continuum, there seems to be no way to conceptually or practically distinguish between relief and rehabilitation on the one hand, and between rehabilitation and development on the other. The distinction can be made between relief and development. Projects should promote either one or the other; if not, experience has shown that developmental objectives are usually subjugated to relief imperatives.
- While issues of sustainability and participation are essential to developmental activities, relief and rehabilitation programs should not be conditioned by the same standards in terms of the degree to which these principles are practiced.

I. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

A. Evaluation Scope & Methodology

1. Evaluation Purpose and Objectives

This is the first evaluation of the PVO Support Project since its approval and authorization on June 6, 1990; the scheduled Project Assistance Completion Date (PACD) is September 30, 1996. As such, the purpose of this "mid-term evaluation" is to provide the Mission with an overall set of findings and recommendations to be used in improving Project and Grant level performance through the remainder of the implementation phase, thus ensuring the achievement of Project objectives. In addition, USAID/Mozambique will soon be designing a follow-on project and is also currently engaged in the drafting of a new Country Program Strategic Plan (CPSP) which will cover the five-year period, 1995 -2000; it is intended that this evaluation will inform both of these design processes.

The Scope of Work (see Annex A), lists four main evaluation objectives:

- ▶ Review the appropriateness, timeliness and quality of project inputs. Assess the validity of design assumptions, eligible activities and impact indicators. Provide a descriptive analysis of project status relative to the inputs provided;
- ▶ Review Project outputs and evaluate progress made towards achieving outputs. Provide a detailed explanation of those areas where project outputs have been exceeded, or are not likely to achieve project targets over the life of project;
- ▶ Review the Project purpose and assess the extent to which project inputs and outputs are, or are not, leading to the achievement of purpose by the project assistance completion date; and
- ▶ Make recommendations for the next phase of project implementation.

In order to achieve these four evaluation objectives, the SOW provided a set of nine "specific requirements," or questions and issues which the evaluation team was expected to address. These specific requirements are found in Annex A.

2. Evaluation Approach and Methodology

The evaluation team consisted of four development specialists with a mix of skills and experience in the areas of PVO/NGO organizational development, development management, food aid and relief operations, sectoral knowledge in primary health care, water and sanitation, rural development and small-holder agriculture. USAID/Mozambique supplied one resource person, the REDSO/ESA Project Development Officer.

The in-country component of the evaluation was conducted from April 4, to May 3, 1994. A draft report and oral briefing were presented to the Mission on April 25 and a draft final report

on April 29, 1994 in conformance with the requirements of the SOW. Review of project documentation, interviews with concerned parties, and field visits were conducted during the first two weeks of the assignment, with draft report writing taking place during the third and fourth weeks. Annexes 3 through 5 provide a list of persons interviewed, documents reviewed, and site visits made during this period.

The evaluation provided a particular challenge for the team given: (i) the initial lack of specificity provided in the PP, and particularly the Logical Framework, in terms of project level outputs and EOPS; and (ii) the extensive modifications made to the original project design during project implementation, which were not reflected in a corresponding set of updated LogFrame parameters. The challenge which thus faced the team was how to reconcile the lack of baseline data and updated project documentation against which to evaluate project progress to date, with a project context that was undergoing significant, if not dramatic, change during the first two years of project implementation; and which ultimately required adaptation to address new opportunities and expanding needs. The problem can be thought of in terms of constitutional interpretation, that is, taking a strictly "constructionist" approach to the evaluation, i.e., strict adherence to and interpretation of the fundamental law (the Project Paper and its amendments), versus a "context-based" approach which assumes that change is inevitable and, thus, assessment and interpretation must take into consideration situations which could not have been previously foreseen.

The solution, not wholly satisfactory, taken by the team was to focus at the individual grant level of project execution, and to derive from information gathered at this level, an indication as to whether project level objectives were being met, and were likely to be fully achieved by the PACD. Such an approach requires several "leaps of faith." First, that achievement of project-level outputs can be determined by measuring the achievements of an aggregated set of individual grants. That is, given the three categories of Project level outputs specified in the PP, does the sum total of those individual grants (and their achievements) which fall within a certain output category, equate with progress towards achievement of the Project level output itself? The assumption made by the team was that it did. Secondly, given the fact that most grants have not yet been completed -- half the grants funded to date have less than a year of implementation under their belt -- there was no sense in trying to assess the EOPS or impact of an individual grant in order to establish its overall achievements. The assumption thus made by the team was that evaluating progress towards achievement of grant-level outputs would have to be used to determine overall grant-level achievement and, thus, its contribution towards achievement of Project-level outputs.

The discussion immediately above, relates to the second evaluation objective, i.e., an evaluation of progress made towards achieving Project-level outputs. The third evaluation objective focuses on assessing the extent to which Project inputs and outputs are leading to the achievement of the Project purpose. Given the fact that the PP did not specify an expected end of project status (EOPS) at any level, and given the problem with trying to evaluate progress towards achievement of Project level outputs already discussed, the team made the assumption that the only way to assess progress towards the achievement of the Project purpose was to again use grant-level output achievement. This is perhaps the greatest of the leaps of faith taken in this evaluation.

A significant amount of the team's time was spent in trying to determine individual grant progress. Summary grant data sheets were prepared for each of the twenty-two individual grants funded to date. Annex B contains copies of each of these data sheets. Data used in assessing individual grant progress was collected from (i) a review of core project documentation found in USAID files; (ii) from PVO questionnaires (see Annex F) administered during interviews with Grantee representatives responsible for a particular grant activity; (iii) USAID trip reports; (iv) Grantee financial and progress reports; (v) mid-term and final grant evaluations; and (vi) field trips made by evaluation team members (see Annex E). In addition, the team interviewed key members of the USAID/Mozambique Mission, other donors and several local NGOs.

3. Evaluation Structure and Content

The remainder of the evaluation report is structured in terms of Findings (found in Part II), Conclusions (Part III), and Recommendations (Part IV). Individual chapters covering findings and conclusions are further divided into sections corresponding to each of the three evaluation objectives, i.e., assessments of: (i) project inputs, (ii) project outputs and (iii) the project purpose. The final chapter on recommendations is divided into sections dealing with recommendations for: (i) the remaining phase of Project implementation, (ii) a follow-on project, and (iii) lessons learned. Each of the "specific requirements" detailed in the mid-term evaluation SOW have been covered through incorporation into these relevant sections or through a special section on "issues" found in Part III, Conclusions.

B. The PVO Support Project

This section provides an overview of the setting and context in which the Mozambique PVO Support Project (656-0217) has evolved and currently operates. It also discusses and updates the original Project design which has changed in several significant ways since it was initially conceived in late 1989. The section begins with a summary of the major changes which Mozambique has undergone in the past five-to-six years. It then moves to a brief review of USAID/Mozambique's Country Program Strategy, thus providing the framework within which the Project is grounded. Finally, the discussion turns to the Project design, and specifically its logical framework, which has been substantially transformed over the past four years through three separate amendments to the Project Paper.

1. The Changed Project Setting

The current mood of guarded optimism that one encounters in Mozambique today belies a history as brutal and depressing as anywhere in the world. Two centuries of Portuguese colonial domination did nothing to prepare the country for independent rule and has ultimately led to nearly two decades of fierce civil war aimed primarily at the civilian population. Superimposed on this tableaux of misery, was a socialist political system denoted by a one party regime and extensive state intervention in both economic and social life. Exacerbating these internal problems well into the 1980s was the enmity of two powerful neighboring countries, Rhodesia and South Africa, which viewed an independent Mozambique as a threat to their own flawed political regimes.

By the mid-1980s, nearly a decade of failed economic policies had led the country to the brink of economic collapse, the subsequent moderation of its revolutionary ideology, and the acceptance of economic reform in exchange for western financial aid and emergency assistance. Although the implementation of a reform package by the Government of the Republic of Mozambique (GRM) had led to significant improvements in the economy by the late 1980s, it coincided with a renewed program of destabilization and intensification of fighting by rebel RENAMO forces. By mid-1990, Mozambique was in the midst of a national emergency which saw well over a million refugees flee to surrounding countries, the internal displacement of several million more, and a food crisis of unparalleled proportions. The insurgency had thus precipitated or, at least aggravated, the decline of living standards to levels below absolute poverty for the vast majority of Mozambique's rural population.

The donor community responded to the Government of Mozambique's initial request for humanitarian assistance with an outpouring of food aid, logistical support and technical assistance. By the beginning of 1992, however, the GRM and its international partners were facing the consequences of one of the worst droughts to hit southern Africa in the past century. Mozambique, because of the on-going effects of civil war, including rapidly increasing numbers of the displaced was, perhaps, the least able to deal with the added devastation brought on by the drought. Large swathes of the country-side were inaccessible to emergency relief efforts as they were under the control of RENAMO or subject to frequent incursions. This led to further displacements of the rural population towards both urban and peri-urban locales, as well as to main transportation corridors, in search of food, water and a measure of security that came with the government's control of these areas.

If the drought can be said to have had a positive impact amidst this suffering, it was in forcing RENAMO to realize that it could not provide for the accelerating needs of people in areas under its nominal control. With pressure from the international community, negotiations between the GRM and RENAMO, on-going since 1990, intensified in mid-1992, which came to fruition with the signing of the Rome Peace Accords in October 1992. The past 18 months have thus seen the first phase in the demobilization of some 200,000 soldiers; steadily increased numbers of returning refugees and the internally displaced to their homes of origin; and preparations for the first multi-party elections in the country's history, scheduled to take place in October 1994. Such positive developments have not, however, meant a decrease in the need for external assistance; to the contrary, the process initiated by the Peace Accords has brought with it increased demands for relief and rehabilitation assistance necessary to facilitate the reintegration and recovery of millions of people into the social and economic life of their country.

2. Project Background and Context

a) **The USAID Country Program**

In many ways, the levels and nature of USAID assistance to Mozambique have been a reflection of the series of calamities and their effects -- both man-made and natural¹ -- which have plagued the country since independence in 1975. With the near collapse of the economy in the mid-1980s, and the corresponding adoption of economic reforms and accommodation with the West, USAID has moved steadily towards the development of a long-term, bi-lateral program and permanent presence in Mozambique. From limited and discrete emergency relief interventions handled by the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) in the early 1980s, a full-scale Mission has established a more comprehensive program which includes emergency food assistance, commodity-supported policy dialogue, primary health care, and support for emerging democratic institutions and the electoral process. The 1991/1992 southern African drought elicited an impressive response on the part of the United States to Mozambique in particular, with over \$225.0 million in USAID-provided food aid and financial support in FY 1992.

The Mission's Country Program Strategic Plan (CPSP) covering the period FY 1990 - 1992 has had the primary goal of promoting food security and, particularly through the second strategic objective, reducing dependence on external food aid to meet subsistence requirements among the country's most vulnerable groups. The development of a new five-year CPSP was overtaken by the events leading up to and culminating in the signing of the Peace Accords in October 1992. This radical change in the overall Mozambican context has occasioned the formulation of a three year (FY 1993 - 1995) Transition Program focussing USAID resources in support of GRM efforts to: (i) reintegrate some four-to-six million displaced persons, including demobilized soldiers, into national life; (ii) support up-coming multi-party elections and the process of democratization; and (iii) deal with the significant relief and rehabilitation requirements in the aftermath of the 1991/1992 drought. In short, the Transition Program is designed to lay the foundation for a longer-term effort that moves beyond emergency relief and attendant rehabilitation activities, to programs that support the Agency's new strategy of sustainable development. The success of this strategy in Mozambique will depend, to a large extent, on the performance of U.S. PVOs and their support through the PVO Support Project.

b) **The PVO Support Project**

The PVO Support Project (the Project) was designed to provide the Mission with a mechanism to respond to the growing numbers of the absolute poor, principally among the rapidly expanding population of displaced persons, resulting from the heightened rural insurgency of the late 1980s and early 1990s. It represented in tangible terms, the Mission's desire to shift away from strictly emergency relief operations that aimed at mitigating the worst effects of poverty, to a more developmental program -- although still rehabilitation in orientation -- that considered the underlying or structural causes of poverty. In practical terms it meant shifting away from Office

¹ Just prior to the design team's arrival in early April 1994, a devastating cyclone, Nadia, struck the country destroying much of the port city of Nacala and hundreds of smaller towns and villages along the coast, leaving an estimated 200,000 homeless.

of Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) funding to the use of normal Development Fund for Africa (DFA) financing. The Project was thus conceived of as a means to contribute to the achievement of both the Mission's CPSP goal of promoting food security and its second Strategic Objective of reducing dependence on external food aid for subsistence requirements. Both of these CPSP objectives are reflected in the PVO Support Project goal: to improve the food security and well being of those population groups most seriously affected by the insurgency.

The Project strategy supports U.S. PVOs in their efforts to assist Mozambicans -- individuals and institutions -- to (i) develop their capacity to manage and provide basic humanitarian assistance to the destitute and needy; and (ii) facilitate the transition from dependence on food aid (relief) to a more developmental and self-reliant approach which seeks to lay the foundation for "self-provisioning" in household food requirements. Underlying this strategy is the assumption that the knowledge and experience that PVOs developed during their participation in initial emergency relief operations in Mozambique, particularly at the grassroots level, would translate into a capability to attain the more developmental objectives promoted under the PVO Support Project. In this regard, PVOs were seen as the primary vehicle for attaining the overall Project purpose: to reduce vulnerability to absolute poverty induced by the rural insurgency, within targeted population groups.

As the overall situation in Mozambique has evolved since the renewed declaration of emergency in 1989/1990, so too, has the PVO Support Project. While the overall Project Goal and Purpose have remained unchanged, the focus on both target groups and beneficiaries has expanded considerably, as have the activities which are eligible for Project funding. With the effects of the 1991/1992 drought came an additional focus on urban and peri-urban populations, many of whom were the initial target group of rural people affected by the insurgency, but forced to move to higher population "security" zones where food distribution and the provision of basic services were relatively unhampered. The drought also increased the emphasis on water supply activities and particularly, larger-scale, and more technically sophisticated urban water supply schemes.

The October 1992 Peace Accords introduced an entirely new dimension to the Project, as it did in the calculations of all forms of donor assistance, not to mention the new demands placed on the GRM within the larger context of Mozambique's political economy. In conformity with the Mission's Transition Program, the PVO Support Project turned to supporting the GRM's efforts at reintegration of millions of the displaced into the rural communities which they were forced to abandon as a result of the insurgency and drought. The expanded target group of vulnerable people included repatriating refugees from surrounding countries; the internally displaced particularly from those areas previously under RENAMO control; children of war separated from their families, orphans, the elderly and female-headed households; and demobilized soldiers and their families. New activities considered eligible under these changed circumstances emphasized interventions which facilitated reintegration of these target groups into their new environments.

3. Updating Project Design

The purpose of this section is to discuss the significant changes to the original Project design that have taken place since Project approval in 1990. As there have been no corresponding revisions made to the Project Paper Logical Framework (LogFrame), and since this document normally

provides the initial specifications and baseline data used to measure progress towards achievement of project objectives, a brief update of LogFrame parameters is presented. Suffice it to note here that neither the Project Goal nor Purpose have changed from those specified in the Project Paper.

a) Project Overview

The PVO Support Project was approved and authorized on June 6, 1990. Since that time the Project Paper (PP) has been amended three times increasing Life of Project (LOP) funding from \$19,850,000 to \$90,000,000, and extending the Project Assistance Completion Date (PACD) from March 31, 1994 to September 30, 1996. Amendment number one, signed on July 30, 1991, had the sole purpose of changing the method of obligating project funding, i.e., from direct grants to PVOs on an annual basis, to the signing of a Project Grant Agreement (PROAG) with the Government of Mozambique; the PROAG was also signed on July 30, 1991. Obligations for individual grant activities and other Project requirements, i.e., project management, technical assistance and evaluations and audits, have been achieved through the GRM's approval of Project Implementation Letters (PILs); there have been 23 to date. This change in obligation modalities was undertaken to reflect and recognize the GRM's development of a coherent program of emergency relief and rehabilitation, and a perceived change in its commitment to a more open and transparent process of accountability in the utilization of public resources - including donor funding.

b) The Project Paper

As noted above, the Project Paper was approved on June 6, 1990 with life of project funding in the amount of \$19,850,000 and a PACD of March 31, 1994. As previously discussed, its purpose was to address the growing poverty witnessed among Mozambicans as a result of the insurgency. In this regard, it also contributed directly to the achievement of the CPSP goal of promoting food security and the second Strategic Objective of reducing dependence on external food aid. The primary target groups identified in the PP were those population groups which had become increasingly vulnerable to absolute poverty as a result of the insurgency. Given the nature of the insurgency, i.e., primarily rural, vulnerable groups were also considered to be predominately rural. While no specific geographic region was excluded per se, it was clear that those areas under RENAMO control, and thus inaccessible, were practically, and in many cases for security reasons, out of bounds in terms of Project coverage.

The Project Paper specified three principal output categories and a corresponding set of eligible grant activities:

Category I : Improved food aid planning and logistics capability within GRM institutions (capacity building objective);

Category II : Increased coverage of preventive health care and availability of basic services among target groups (social welfare objective); and,

Category III: Increased rural employment, production capacity and cash incomes among target groups (self-provisioning objective).

Although the PP provides these general output categories and a corresponding set of indicators as part of the Project LogFrame, it clearly indicates that they "should be considered generic in nature, and that specific targets would be identified in each of the individual grants made to PVOs." Specific targets normally associated with End of Project Status (EOPS) were also to be defined under each of the grants to be executed under the Project. In short, the design team did not deem possible or appropriate during project design to state with any precision the specific activities to be undertaken or the number of people that would be reached by the Project.

c) Amendment Number Two

Amendment Two, signed on September 9, 1992, was a direct response to the 1991/1992 drought. It committed an additional \$30.0 million in USAID inputs, increasing LOP funding to \$50.0 million, and extending the PACD to September 30, 1996. Although this amendment did not formally change the three categories of Project outputs defined in the PP, it did specify additional output objectives through the expansion of potential beneficiary groups and eligible grant activities. Specifically, it targeted the increasing number of rural people who had fled to peri-urban and urban centers as a result of the drought and continued fighting. It was estimated that the absolute poor, with no means to secure food and, thus, in need of food aid, had increased as a result of the drought from roughly 1.3 in 1990 to 3.1 million in 1992. Additional eligible activities provided for under this amendment included:

- Under output Category I, activities which increased reliance on the private sector in food distribution and marketing;
- Under output Category II, activities which increased the availability to potable water and sanitation facilities in urban and peri-urban centers in addition to rural areas; and,
- Under output Category III, activities which increased reliance on markets for the distribution of inputs and the marketing of produce.

Finally, the amendment added indigenous Mozambican NGOs as potential grant recipients either through the award of subgrants made by Project-funded PVO grantees or through direct USAID grants for those NGOs which received USAID certification as local PVOs and met "grant worthiness" criteria. This inclusion of Mozambican NGOs also provided for Project-funded support to build institutional capacity and thus promoted greater NGO responsibility in Mozambican "civil society."

d) Amendment Number Three

The third amendment to the Project Paper, signed on September 15, 1993, addressed a radically changed context, including an array of new opportunities and needs occasioned by the signing of the Peace Accords in October 1992. The principal impact of this amendment has been through the commitment of additional and significant USAID/Mozambique resources to Project activities.

An additional \$40.0 million was provided to the Project thus increasing total LOP funding to \$90.0 million. The newly "amplified" Project was consistent with the Mission's recently initiated Transition Program, specifically contributing to the achievement of new program objectives focussing on: (i) the provision of humanitarian assistance to address the continuing aftermath of the war and drought; and (ii) the reintegration and rehabilitation of an expanded group of beneficiaries.

New target groups included returning refugees, internally displaced persons, demobilized soldiers and their families, and the particularly vulnerable among them including orphans, children under five, the elderly and female-headed households. The planned increase level of Project funding provided for through amendment three focused on activities capable of restoring input supply and the provision of basic services in the areas of health, water and sanitation and education, as well as the re-establishment of infrastructure which provides greater access by these targeted beneficiaries to improved services. Geographical coverage was automatically increased as a result of the opening of previously inaccessible areas formerly under RENAMO control.

e) Summary of Design Parameter Changes

In global terms, the PVO Support Project has increased from a \$20.0 million, 45-month project aimed at alleviating the worst effects of war-induced poverty, to a \$90.0 million, 75-month project addressing the historic opportunities and expanded problems brought about by peace. The Project has remained the one of the most significant operational vehicle for advancing Mission program objectives under the original CPSP, and the later Transition Program. What has remained constant throughout the dramatic changes of the past four years, has been the Project strategy which viewed PVOs, and later NGOs, as the most likely instruments capable of operating under and adapting to these changed circumstances.

The most easily identifiable changes in design parameters, in addition to the significant increase in USAID inputs and extended PACD, are the expanded beneficiary groups and eligible grant activities. Project level outputs and end of project status, to the extent they were initially specified, have remained unchanged on paper, but have obviously taken on new dimensions as the Project has expanded its scope and coverage. The flexibility and adaptability demonstrated by the Project, which is one of its most evident strengths, has also made measuring anticipated or planned for Project progress and achievements difficult. It is this tension between the planned and unplanned which has provided the primary challenge to the Evaluation Team.

II. EVALUATION FINDINGS

Part II provides evaluation findings based on each of the first three evaluation objectives, i.e., analyzing the appropriateness of Project inputs in Section A; progress made towards the achievement of Project outputs in Section B; and assessing the degree to which Project purpose has been achieved, Section C.

A. Analyzing Project Inputs and USAID/Mozambique Project Management

In this section, a review of USAID-provided inputs is undertaken as the initial step in addressing the **first evaluation objective**: determining the appropriateness, timeliness and quality of Project inputs. Included as well, is a review of USAID/Project Management, considered to be a major input factor determining the achievement of overall Project objectives. The section begins with an identification and review of the inputs made available for Project implementation. Section 2 reviews the Project Management structure established to allocate and manage the use of dedicated resources, while the concluding section presents a summary of overall findings.

1. Specifying Project Inputs

The Project Paper specifies four sets of Project inputs: (i) the PVO Grant Fund, (ii) USAID Project Management, (iii) Short-term Technical Assistance, and (iv) Project-level Evaluations and Audit. The PP and its three subsequent amendments, provided in accompanying financial plans, the level of funding and, in some cases, the corresponding units and level of resources committed. It should be noted that the PP Logframe includes neither Government of Mozambique nor PVO contributions as Project inputs as is customary in similar design documents. The following table traces the evolution of Project inputs through the financial plans contained in the Project Paper and relevant Project Amendments.

TABLE 1: PROJECT INPUTS AS EXPRESSED BY FINANCIAL PLANS

Financial Plan	Project Paper	Amendment #2	Amendment #3	Total Input Category
PVO Grant Fund	\$ 17,290,000	\$ 27,215,000	\$ 38,683,000	\$ 83,188,000
Project Management	\$ 1,710,000	\$ 1,855,000	\$ 412,000	\$ 3,977,000
Short-term TA	\$ 480,000	\$ 880,000	\$ 905,000	\$ 2,265,000
Evaluation & Audit	\$ 370,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 0	\$ 570,000
Total LOP Funding	\$ 19,850,000	\$ 30,150,000	\$ 40,000,000	\$ 90,000,000

As is readily noted, total LOP funding has increased by over four and one-half times between the approval and authorization of the Project Paper in June 1990, and the signing of the Third Amendment in September 1993. For comparative purposes, excluding the USAID program in

South Africa, the Mozambique PVO Support Project is the largest such PVO project in sub-Saharan Africa (the Mali Co-financing Project is authorized at \$50.0 million over ten years), if not the world.

Table 2 below, provides figures, by Project input category, for the financial status of the Project through March 31, 1994.

TABLE 2: FINANCIAL STATUS REPORT BY PROJECT INPUT CATEGORY

PROJECT ELEMENT	OBLIGATIONS TO DATE	EARMARKS TO DATE	COMMITMENTS TO DATE	EXPENDITURES TO DATE	PIPELINE TO DATE
Project Management	\$ 3,758,497	\$ 1,155,205	\$ 1,139,541	\$ 932,164	\$ 2,826,333
PVO Grant Fund	\$ 73,573,725	\$ 46,568,719	\$ 43,663,325	\$ 31,052,615	\$ 42,521,110
Short-term TA	\$ 2,342,573	\$ 670,866	\$ 360,103	\$ 155,512	\$ 2,187,061
Evaluation & Audit	\$ 570,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 570,000
Total Project	\$ 80,244,795	\$ 48,544,790	\$ 45,162,969	\$ 32,140,291	\$ 48,104,504

Since the signing of the Project Grant Agreement (PROAG) on July 30, 1991, there have been five amendments leading to a total of \$73,990,936 in Project obligations through this instrument. Prior to the signing of the PROAG, a total of \$6,253,857 was obligated through direct USAID grants to three PVOs and the issuance of individual contracts to engage Project Management staff and provide for their related support. Total obligations to date are, therefore, \$80,244,793² of which (i) total earmarks amounted to \$48,544,790; (ii) total commitments amounted to \$45,162,969; (iii) total expenditures amounted to \$32,140,291; and (iv) total in the pipeline amounted to \$48,104,504.

The following four sections discuss the status of each of the four input categories utilizing data presented in the two preceding tables.

a) PVO Grants Fund

The PVO Grant fund has increased from \$17,290,000 under the Project Paper to \$83,188,000 under Amendment Three, and now represents slightly more than 92% of total LOP funding. Out of the more than \$83,000,000 approved and authorized under the PP and relevant supplements for the PVO Grant Fund, a total of \$73,573,725 has actually been obligated to date. Of this obligated amount, \$46,568,719 has been earmarked; with \$43,663,325 in commitments; and \$31,052,615 in total expenditures as of the end of March 1994. Of particular note is the \$42.5 million still in the pipeline.

² Unless otherwise stated, all figures used in this report are based on Financial Status Reports dated March 31, 1994, issued by the USAID Controller.

To date, 20 grants³ and two Cooperative Agreements (CA) have been awarded to 11 different PVOs totaling roughly \$61,000,000. While there was approximately \$12,500,000 of obligated grant funds still uncommitted and available as of end of the last reporting period, some 11 new grant proposals totalling well over \$20,000,000 -- including three from new PVOs -- are currently in various stages of development. Funding of all these grants would exceed not only LOP funding for this input category, but the amount actually obligated to date. As neither the PP nor the subsequent Project supplements specified the number or type of grants anticipated over the life of project, there is no way to evaluate whether targets have been met in terms of the number of grants issued.

b) Project Management

USAID's input to Project Management is reserved for the engagement of long-term technical assistance (TA) to staff the Project Management Team (PMT). Costs associated with this budget category include, the salaries and benefits of long-term TA, as well as their related support costs (e.g., travel and transportation, equipment, etc.). The LOP budget has increased from \$1,710,000 under the PP, to \$3,977,000 under Amendment Three. Of this amount, \$3,758,497 has been obligated, with earmarked funds in the amount of \$1,155,205; commitments of \$1,139,541; and expenditures of \$932,164 through March 31, 1994.

There are currently four long-term TA PMT staff⁴ funded under this input category, i.e., Project Manager, Rural Development Specialist, Secretary and Driver, which has been the approximate number funded from this budget category since 1991. The Project Paper initially specified 136 person months of long-term TA under this input category and, while the budget has more than tripled through subsequent amendments, no comparable increase in person months was stated. Given this fact, it is not possible to evaluate whether this input category has met planned targets. However, at the same staffing level as currently in force, there appears to be more than adequate funding for the remaining 30 months to the PACD.

c) Short-term Technical Assistance

Short-term technical assistance which is managed by the USAID PMT was intended to support various Project level needs including training of PVOs in a range of different areas. Authorized LOP funding for this input category has increased from \$480,000 under the PP, to \$2,265,000 as of the approval of Amendment Three. The latest Project Financial Status Reports shows that a total of \$2,342,573 has been obligated to date, which, in fact, exceeds both the authorized level shown in Amendment Three to the PP, as well as the amount shown in Amendment Five to the Project Grant Agreement. To date, a total of \$670,866 has been earmarked under the short-term TA budget category; with \$360,103 in commitments; and \$155,512 in total expenditures.

³ A twenty-second grant was approved at the beginning of the evaluation period and has been included in the review and assessments that have been undertaken.

⁴ In this evaluation, the Project Management Team is considered to include both the four Personal Service Contractors (PSC) hired with Project funds and the Supervisory Direct-hire Project Development Officer.

The Project Paper specifies 24 person months of short-term TA at an average of \$20,000 per person month. No comparable specifications were undertaken in any of the subsequent Project amendments thus inhibiting an evaluation of this input category. It is evident, however, that substantial funds remain uncommitted as of this writing, and should be able to finance virtually any identified TA or training requirements through the PACD. It should be noted, however, that the recently hired Project Management Water Engineer's costs have been charged to the short-term TA line item.

d) Evaluation and Audit

The Project Paper specified both a mid-term and final evaluation, as well as funds for a Project-wide audit. The PP authorized LOP funding of \$370,000 for this Project input requirement which was increased to \$570,000 under subsequent amendments. To date, the full \$570,000 has been obligated with \$150,000 earmarked -- presumably for the current mid-term evaluation -- although no commitments or expenditures have as yet been made. Each of the Project documents provides an evaluation plan designating a date for both mid-term and final evaluations. The most recent amendment indicates a mid-term evaluation date of November 1993 and a final evaluation date of August 1996. No Project-wide audit has yet been undertaken nor is one scheduled, although a REDSO/ESA Program audit was conducted in March 1994. There appears to be adequate funding for both scheduled evaluations and a final end-of-project audit.

2. USAID Project Management

The Project Paper provides several justifications for the Mission to assume direct responsibility for the management of the PVO Support Project. Chief among them were the centrality of the Project to the Mission's overall country program strategy; the rapidity of change within the country and the corresponding need to be able to direct and control project activities; and cost considerations. It is not the purpose of this evaluation to assess the validity of this choice of Project Management structures but rather, to evaluate the effectiveness of the structure that does exist in terms of several critical functions. In this regard, Project Management is considered to include not only the discrete project management unit defined in the PP, but also its relationship to (i) several new entities within the Mission established to guide Project activities; (ii) other Mission offices and staff which have played a role, whether formal or informal, in the management of Project activities; (iii) USAID Regional Offices; and (iv) the Government of Mozambique. While PVOs are obviously involved in management functions, it is at the grant rather than at the Project level, and is discussed in the following section. In addition to these structures, a number of systems and procedures have been established, either as called for in the PP or initiated later during project implementation to ensure sound management of project resources; these are also reviewed and assessed for their contribution to effective project management.

a) The Project Management Team (PMT)

(i) Level of Effort

The PP details a Project Management unit of five team members including a Project Manager, Rural Development Specialist, Activity Monitor, Secretary, and Driver, supervised by and responsible to the General Development Office. A total of 136 person months of long-term TA were specified over the LOP as follows: Project Manager: 48 person months; Rural Development Specialist: 44 person months; and Activity monitor: 42 person months. No person months were specified for either the secretary or driver positions. Of the three professional positions only the first two were filled, although a direct-hire Project Development Officer joined the Mission in late 1991 and, since that time, has spent a significant amount of his time involved in project management activities.

Under the second Project amendment (September 1992), with an authorized increase in LOP funding of \$30.0 million, two new project management positions were added, i.e., an NGO Institutional Development Specialist and Rural Recovery and Rehabilitation Specialist. The addition of these two new positions reflected the Mission's desire to include and promote Mozambican NGO participation in Project activities, as well as formulate more coherent strategies that addressed the recovery and rehabilitation needs brought on by the drought. Neither of these two positions had attached to them a specified number of person months, and ultimately, they were never filled.

With the addition of \$40.0 million under Amendment Three (September 1993), one new Project Management position was added, i.e., a Water Engineer, while it appears that the two previous positions were either cut or forgotten. The justification for engaging a water engineer was based on the expanded emphasis placed on water development detailed in the second amendment. The water engineer joined the Project Management Team in early 1994. As noted previously, her costs have been allocated to the Short-term TA budget category.

(ii) Functions and Responsibilities

The description of tasks provided in the PP placed primary day-to-day responsibility for Project implementation with the PMT. General categories of responsibility included:

- Management of the proposal review and approval process, including preparation of required documentation, (e.g., PIO/Ts, Action Memoranda, Project Implementation Letters) leading to the negotiation and signing of individual grant agreements with PVOs;
- Preparation of annual implementation (action) plans, including monitoring and evaluation plans, the drafting of Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) on semi-annual basis, undertaking visits to grantee activity sites and the preparation of trip reports following these monitoring visits;

- **Preparing for and hosting: semi-annual "roundtable discussions" with PVO grantees to share experiences and information; and scheduling and chairing the PVO "Issues Committee" meetings;**
- **The identification of short-term TA needs related to grantee capacity building, as well as other Project-level requirements identified during the implementation phase; preparation of relevant contractual documentation (e.g. scopes of work, PIO/Ts) and the management of short-term consultants; and,**
- **Reassessing strategies to facilitate the transition from emergency to rehabilitation and development; and assessing, periodically, the relevance of grant selection criteria.**

In discussions with PMT staff, other concerned Mission officers, and Grantee personnel the following findings were noted:

- ▶ **That the vast majority of PMT staff time was spent in tasks related to the first set of responsibilities, i.e., grants administration. This is reflected in the fact that some 21 grants totaling over \$61.0 million have been approved in the first three years of the Project, and another 10-to-12 PVO proposals, totaling roughly \$20.0 million are in various stages of development;**
- ▶ **That the quality of grant related documentation prepared by PMT staff was universally regarded as exceptional, with the sole exception being the lack of useful output and EOPS indicators contained in grant agreements; this latter "lacuna" being verified by the evaluation team itself;**
- ▶ **That the comprehensiveness and quality of core project documents, i.e., amendments to the PP and Project Grant Agreement were of a similarly high quality with the sole exception being that no updates to the project design, including Logframe, were undertaken;**
- ▶ **The organization and quality of Project files and related documentation was exceptional with the single exception of grant numbers not being affixed to various PVO reports;**
- ▶ **According to PMT staff, grantee site visits for the purpose of progress monitoring were undertaken on average once every three-to-four months, although frequent communications were held with grantee representatives at their headquarters offices in Maputo. It does not appear that any impact monitoring was undertaken;**
- ▶ **Grant activity monitoring was primarily undertaken through the review of PVO progress and financial reports and grant mid-term and final evaluations. Considerable time was, in fact, spent in the review of these reports as many grantees were required to submit monthly as well as quarterly progress updates;**
- ▶ **Although mention was made of a 1994 implementation plan, the team saw no evidence to indicate that any annual implementation, monitoring or evaluation plans were ever**

prepared by PMT staff over the course of Project implementation. Only one PIR has been prepared to date (this is, however, common to the entire mission);

- ▶ It does not appear that either PVO roundtable discussions or USAID Issues Committee meetings as detailed in the PP were ever held; other forums and meetings which partially fulfilled the functions of these meetings were noted;
- ▶ That few PVO or Project level needs were identified during project implementation which could have benefitted from the intervention of short-term technical assistance;
- That the only reassessment of Project strategies intended to facilitate the transition from emergency relief to rehabilitation appears to have taken place as a result of the need to prepare the several amendments to the Project Paper. It does not appear that a review and assessment of grant selection criteria was undertaken, or if it was, that it was ever documented and made known to potential grantees; and,
- ▶ While PVO grantees were expected to provide evidence of GRM provincial or district level approval for proposed grant activities as required by both the PP and the Project Grant Agreement, the team found only four written documents in the Project files to indicate that these approvals had, in fact, been received. Discussions with PVO and Project Management staff did, however, indicate that significant discussions between PVOs and concerned GRM authorities had taken place during proposal preparation.

The Project Management team in its current composition, including the core team of five PSCs (includes recently hired Water Engineer) and the supervisory position of Project Development Officer, has been together for roughly 21 months. Although job descriptions were detailed in the Project Paper, it appears that they were either not clearly translated into individual contracts, and/or that responsibilities contained therein were interpreted differently by the several professionals on the team. The ensuing confusion concerning individual responsibilities generated by this situation, as reported by a number of the concerned parties, has led to unnecessary friction with uncertain results on the effectiveness of the unit as a whole.

b) Other Project Management Structures

In addition to the PMT, the PP included several other structures and key participants that would be involved in the overall management of Project implementation. They are described below, as are relevant findings concerning their operation and performance.

(i) The Project Committee

The primary responsibility for undertaking "general funding decisions" related to PVO grant submissions resides with a Project Committee (PC) composed of Project Management Staff and senior Mission officers. The PC was intended to meet annually to review proposals and make funding recommendations accordingly. Findings include:

- ▶ The Project Committee did in fact carry out this responsibility as intended. Rather than meeting annually, however, it has met periodically over past three years to review and approve PVO proposals on an "as come" basis. It is unclear whether this change reflects an overall modification to the review and approval process as detailed in the PP.

(ii) PVO Issues Committee

The PVO Issues Committee was intended to facilitate coordination and complementarity between Project activities and other PVO initiatives funded from other Mission or centrally-funded USAID sources. This Committee was open to all interested Mission officers, and was scheduled to meet every two months. Findings include:

- ▶ There does not appear to have been any formal PVO Issues committee meetings held during the course of the Project, although, because of the centrality of the Project to the Mission's country program, other fora including Project Committee meetings seem to have been used to fulfill the intent of the Issues Committee.

(iii) Mission Technical Staff

Project design anticipated the participation of Mission technical staff in both the review of PVO proposals -- to ensure technical soundness -- and in the eventual monitoring of approved grant activities. Relevant findings include:

- ▶ As most of the Mission's technical offices have been represented on the Project Committee, there has been extensive involvement of technical staff in the review and approval process.
- ▶ Technical staff have also made numerous field visits to grantee sites, although it is questionable whether these could be strictly considered formal monitoring visits as there was no indication in trip reports as to whether they engaged in the measurement of grant progress or impact as per stated objectives.
- ▶ It is also evident from the comments of PVO grantees that USAID technical staff, during their field visits, as well as in discussions with headquarters staff in Maputo, provided a range of useful technical advice concerning implementation issues arising during grant implementation.

(iv) Other Mission Offices

The Project Paper designated the Mission Director as the "Grants officer" for the PVO Support Project. After preparation of the grant agreements by the Regional Contracts Officer (RCO) and clearance by the Regional Legal Officer (RLA), the Mission Director was empowered to sign the individual grants. It was not anticipated that other Mission offices would have any direct involvement in Project activities except through their participation on the two committees discussed above. Relevant findings include:

- ▶ The Mission Director has in fact acted as the Grants Officer, but has increased his involvement in grant approval and authorization process to include signing of a new category of Grants, Quick Implementing Projects (QIPs), without having to await RCO and RLA actions on the PIO/T's submitted to them.
- ▶ A far greater role has been assumed by the Controller's office than foreseen in the Project design. This has included the review and assessment of "grantee worthiness" for a number of PVOs, as well as review and analysis of PVO financial reports submitted locally and by head offices in the United States.

(v) USAID Regional Offices

A fairly significant role was expected to be played by the RCO and, to a lesser extent, by the RLA, in terms of the review of PIO/Ts and the preparation and clearance of grant agreements. In addition, REDSO/ESA staff were expected to provide an unspecified degree of technical assistance to both Project Management and individual grantees. Relevant findings include:

- ▶ Both the RCO and RLA have spent considerable time in undertaking tasks noted above. In fact, the two-month average in fulfilling these tasks has, according to both Mission and PVO staff, led to considerable delays in the startup of grant activities.

(vi) Short-term Technical Assistance

Short-term TA is considered a Project Management resource since it was to be managed by the PMT which was intended to identify those areas at the both the Project and grant levels where needs existed but were not being met by other means. The PP identified two general categories where short-term TA could be utilized: (i) to help PVOs deal with analytical issues outside their normal realm of expertise; and (ii) to ensure that the Project established adequate mechanisms for project and grant level monitoring, evaluation and impact measurement, including the collection and use of baseline data. Relevant findings include:

- ▶ Short-term TA has been very sparingly used to date, although the needs for which it was initially intended, continue to exist.

c) The Government of Mozambique

The original Project Design intended minimal GRM involvement in Project activities at the national level. Because the obligation of Project funds was to take place through direct grant agreements with PVOs, USAID/Mozambique initially signed a Memorandum of Understanding with GRM, through the Ministry of Cooperation, which essentially called for periodic updates on the part of the Mission, and the exoneration of import fees on Project financed goods and services by the GRM. The primary level of participation was to take place at the provincial and district levels between PVOs and local authorities, the latter responsible for providing concurrence in grant activities proposed by the former.

The first amendment to the PP, however, significantly changed the nature of the relationship at the national level. For reasons discussed previously, the Mission decided to formalize this relationship through the signing of a Project Grant Agreement (July 30, 1991). The principal change effected through the PROAG was that the GRM was now required to provide its approval for individual grant activities before USAID could authorize funding to the concerned PVO. The procedure, which has been in effect since that time, is the Project Implementation Letter. Relevant findings include:

- ▶ The GRM has approved all but one of the PVO proposals submitted to it, thus fulfilling its obligation in this regard.
- ▶ As concerns the exoneration of USAID-financed resources provided under PVO grants, there has been a continuing problem -- the delay and/or refusal to grant exonerations by concerned GRM agencies -- which has seriously affected the execution of individual grant activities.
- ▶ PVOs have indicated that there were extensive discussions with local GRM officials, in most cases, concerning the contents of individual grant proposals. There were, however, only a few cases where the written concurrence requirements stipulated in the PP were being met in practice.
- ▶ There does not appear to have been any formal presentation by USAID to the concerned national level GRM agency (Ministry of Cooperation) of reports updating Project progress. Nor is there any forum in which concerned GRM staff meet with PMT staff to discuss on a regular basis Project issues, problems or progress.

d) The Proposal Review and Approval Process

The proposal review and approval process was intended to operate as follows:

- The RCO would solicit grant applications from eligible PVOs on an annual basis through a Request for Applications (RFA) either sent directly to targeted PVOs or through an announcement in the CBD. PVO eligibility was based on USAID registration and the negotiation of an operating agreement with the Government of Mozambique.
- Proposals were to be received from eligible PVOs during a six month period every year, and reviewed and evaluated annually over the course of one month by the Project Committee. The PC review and evaluation was to take place after an initial review by the PMT to ensure that proposals conformed to criteria established during project design and included in the Project Paper.
- Selection criteria included categories designed to assess (i) organizational capability, that is, dealing with PVO experience, development philosophy and approach, and sensitivity to social factors; (ii) project design soundness, including strategy and certain economic and financial considerations relative to cost efficiency and technical appropriateness of

activities; and (iii) consistency with one or more of the three eligible categories of activities specified in the PP.

- It was expected that the Project Committee would annually develop its priorities in terms of the three categories of eligible activities and provide these to interested PVOs through the annual RFAs that were sent out.
- The PP also included the format in which proposals were to be submitted. It is not actually clear whether the proposal format was a requirement or guideline to be followed. At a minimum, proposals were to contain monitoring, baseline data collection and evaluation components; written concurrence of the activity from either provincial or district government; and demonstration of PVO matching contributions.
- The PP indicates that after evaluation and preliminary funding decisions were made by the Project Committee, the PMT was to assist prospective grantees to further develop their proposals assuring, as noted above, that they included adequate benchmarks, and monitoring and evaluation plans. This requirement implies a two step proposal review and approval process, and seems consistent with the understanding of Project Management staff that PVOs were expected to first submit a "concept" paper prior to development of a full-scale proposal.
- Once finally approved, the PMT was responsible for (i) negotiating the general terms and conditions of the grant agreement with the concerned PVO; and (ii) preparing both an Action Memorandum and PIO/T for the Director's approval. These documents were then to be sent to the RCO and RLA in Swaziland for preparation of the Grant Agreement and clearance; they would then be returned to the Mission and signed by the Director and the concerned PVO.
- Once Grant Agreements were signed by the Director, PMT staff were to prepare a PIL for the concerned grant and send it to the Ministry of Cooperation for approval.
- Financing was intended to be undertaken through incrementally funded direct grants, the amounts of which were to be determined on an annual basis depending on the availability of funds and the performance of the grantee.

Based on a review of this process after nearly four years of use, the following findings are presented:

- ▶ Two meetings, a one-day workshop held in Washington and organized under the PVO Initiatives Project in 1990, and a one-day workshop sponsored by the Mission in Maputo in 1993, were held to inform PVOs about the Project including guidelines for proposal submission and grant selection criteria.
- ▶ It does not appear that Requests for Applications were ever used as a means to solicit proposals from PVOs. Nor were eligible categories of activities ever prioritized and communicated to PVOs by the Project Committee on an annual or other basis.

- ▶ It appears that a modified two-step review and approval process was finally adopted for use by Project Management. The first step was the preparation of a concept paper -- or in most cases, discussion with Project Management staff of a concept -- which was reviewed by the PMT to ensure conformity with the general objectives of the Project. The second step included full-scale proposal development which was the document that the Project Committee was expected to review and approve. This process was deemed by both PVOs and the PMT to be a labor intensive and iterative effort involving a high level of collaboration between the two parties.
- ▶ Proposals were reviewed and approved on an "as come" basis rather than annually as specified in the PP. It does not appear that selection criteria were ever revised or modified as the Project evolved. It is unclear also as to whether any set of criteria, either to assess PVO capability or eligible activities, was used to evaluate concept papers and proposals; or if so, what system was used when applying the criteria (e.g., weighting criteria, ranking proposals and establishing a minimum threshold for approval) by the PMT or the PC.
- ▶ Mid-way through the Project, the Mission permitted PVOs to participate in Project Committee meetings and defend their proposals.
- ▶ No uniform proposal format was ultimately adopted for use under the Project. Consequently, many proposals and subsequent grant agreements failed to include the minimum benchmarks, i.e., outputs & EOPS, monitoring and evaluation plans as stated in and required by the PP.
- ▶ The average length of the review and approval process, i.e., from a PVO's initial contact with the Mission, to the signing of the Grant Agreement was eight months. The average delay in Swaziland with the RCO was two months, although this could have been longer as grants were often backdated. Conversely, the Quick Implementing Projects which required only the Director's signature on the Grant Agreement took an average of two months to negotiate.

3. Summary of Findings

a) **Project Inputs**

- ▶ Although input targets were neither specified in the PP nor updated in subsequent amendments, overall, USAID inputs -- that is, in each of the four input categories -- can be reasonably stated to be more than adequate to attain stated Project objectives;
- ▶ Nearly 90 percent of total LOP funding has been obligated to date; over 60 percent of this amount, however, remains in the pipeline, the majority of which (88 percent), is under the PVO grant fund;
- ▶ Assuming full obligation of the PVO Grant Fund to \$83.0 million (it is currently at \$73.0 million), there still remains over \$20.0 million in unearmarked and uncommitted funding;

- ▶ Adequate funds have existed and continue to exist to engage additional Project Management staff as anticipated in the Project Paper and each of the subsequent amendments;
- ▶ Inputs made available to engage short-term TA to address Project level needs have not been made use of as evidenced by the significant funding still available, and the lack of adequate benchmarks and monitoring and evaluation plans found in grant agreements;
- ▶ While the number and type of grants to PVOs was not specified, the fact that 22 grants totaling some \$60.0 million have been approved over the past three years, is indicative of a herculean attempt having been made in this regard; and,
- ▶ No direct grants have been made to Mozambican NGOs and only one U.S. PVO has awarded a subgrant to an indigenous NGO; it should be noted that the number of grants or subgrants to NGOs was never specified.

b) USAID Project Management

- ▶ USAID Project Management has performed exceptionally well in obligating and committing project resources related to the PVO Grant Fund;
- ▶ Inadequate time has been spent in both progress and impact monitoring of approved grant activities;
- ▶ Inadequate time has been devoted to either implementation or strategic planning, including the preparation of annual workplans, the updating of grant selection criteria, and the prioritizing of eligible activities;
- ▶ There are no mechanisms in place for the involvement and participation of concerned national level GRM agencies in Project activities, from just sharing of information to helping in the resolution of problems which arise during Project implementation; conversely, a number of PVOs, especially those working in the health sector, reports extensive and close working relationships with GRM ministry representatives at the Provincial and District levels;
- ▶ The roundtable discussions between USAID and PVO grantees specified in the Project Paper have not been held; while other fora have been used and partially off-set this problem, there is still no regularized meeting mechanism for the sharing of information among grantees or between them and USAID;
- ▶ USAID Project Management has created an extremely supportive and open environment for PVO grantees related to both the development of proposals and in sharing problems encountered during implementation; Project Management has been universally praised for its willingness to respond to problems encountered by PVOs and in expediting grant applications; and,

- ▶ Project Management staff has not required a standard reporting format for grantee reporting, thus leading to either inadequate or non-reporting on grant outputs and EOPS, the basis for determining Project level progress and achievements.

c) The Grant Review and Approval Process

- ▶ Few of the procedures stated in the Project Paper detailing the review and approval process have been used in practice; there does not appear to have been an updated set of instructions concerning the review and approval process made available to PVOs or, more recently, NGOs, given the fact that the RFA system has not been used;
- ▶ It takes, on average, eight months from the initial submission of a concept paper to or discussions of a concept with USAID, to the final approval and signing of a grant; much of the delay in this process is due to the issuance and clearance of PIO/Ts and grants by the Regional Contracts and Legal Officers in Swaziland;
- ▶ Few, if any attempts have been made to advise Mozambican NGOs of USAID registration requirements which are a precondition to the receipt of PVO Support Project funding; this appears to be Mission policy;
- ▶ The grant review and approval process is predicated on USAID's announcement, at the beginning of each year, of priority areas in which it wants to encourage grant submissions; this does not appear to have happened, thus, leaving grant selection open to evaluation against a very general set of criteria and on a first come, first serve basis;
- ▶ Criteria used in the selection of grant recipients, especially for those PVOs with no ongoing programs in Mozambique, has not been particularly clear;
- ▶ The participation of the PVOs in Project Committee meetings can be said to have speeded up the review and approval process;

B. Analyzing Project Outputs and PVO Grantee Performance

As discussed above and elaborated upon below, the means for assessing the degree to which Project outputs have been attained to date is undertaken through a review of all 22 grants and then aggregating the individual attainment of grant outputs. This has been a laborious exercise, but a necessary one. The presentation of this section may appear to be inordinately lengthy, but the team strongly feels that it is the only way to adequately convey the types and magnitude of activities undertaken through PVO grant implementation. In the later section on "Conclusions," a series of tables are presented condensing the information presented here.

1. Specifying Project Outputs

Both the Project Paper and the Project Grant Agreement stated that the anticipated outputs of the PVO Support Project [656-0217] were:

- ◆ Improved food aid planning and logistics capability with Government of Mozambique institutions, i.e., improved logistics, coordination and commodity accountability and promotion of increased utilization of private transportation in food distribution;
- ◆ Increased coverage of preventive health care and availability of basic services among target groups; and
- ◆ Increased rural employment, production capacity, and cash incomes among target groups.

Amendment # 2 to the original Project Grant Agreement, although it did not formally change the original output objectives, did clarify the understanding of them as follows:

- ◆ Under Category I, activities were to increase reliance on the private sector in food distribution and marketing;
- ◆ Under Category II, activities in water development and sanitation were permitted in urban and peri-urban areas, in addition to rural sites; and
- ◆ Under Category III, activities were to promote increased reliance on markets for the distribution of inputs and the sales of produce.

Amendment # 3 to the original Project Grant Agreement, although it did not formally change the original output objectives, did clarify of Category II as follows:

- ◆ Activities, as feasible, were to target assistance to vulnerable groups, i.e., returnees and orphans, children under five years of age, the elderly, and woman-headed households at transit and arrival points; and
- ◆ Targeted assistance, as feasible, was to facilitate reintegration of returnees into the social and economic life of Mozambique, preferably at their homes of origin.
- ◆ Improved food aid planning and logistics capability;
- ◆ Increased coverage of preventive health care and availability of basic services among target groups; and
- ◆ Increased rural employment, production capacity and cash income among target groups.

2. A Review and Analysis of Individual Project Grants

Under the PVO Support Project through 31 March 1994, 20 grant agreements and 2 cooperative agreements (CA) had been signed between the USAID Mission and eleven participating PVOs. Six of these PVOs have one grant each. CARE has had five grants and one CA. Save the Children Federation-USA has signed three grants. AFRICARE and World Vision Relief and Development (WVRD) have signed two grants each, and the Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA) has signed one grant and one CA with the USAID Mission.

One grant proposal, i.e., Save the Children Federation Gaza Health and Rural Development Project -- Phase II Grant No. 656-0217-G-SS-4017 -- was just approved prior to the Team's arrival. Although start-up had not yet commenced it was included among the grants reviewed during this evaluation.

Text Table 3, on the following page summarizes the 22 operational grants under the Project. Detailed data sheets on each of the grants can be found in Annex B of this report.

To place grant initiation and administration in chronological order, it should be noted that six grant agreements had effective start dates in 1990, one was initiated in 1991, three in 1992, eleven in 1993, and two were ready to start in 1994. Of grants initiated to date, one was completed in 1992, two in 1993, and 11 currently are scheduled to reach their Grant Activity Completion Dates [GACDs] in 1994.

The remainder of this section presents an overview of the grants reviewed by, first, classifying them by Project-level output Category, i.e., in Category I, II or III -- and then discussing the allocation of grant resources between sectoral activities, (e.g., preventive health, water development, agricultural, etc.) and by region of the country.

a) Grants by Output Category

The majority of grants are classified below wholly within one of the three USAID Mission Project-level output Categories. Four grants, however, support activities with both Category II and Category III outputs, i.e., the Salesian Mission Orphanage and Training Project; the SCF Gaza Health and Rural Development Project, both Phases I and II; and the WVRD Child Survival and Agricultural Recovery Project.

(i) Category I

CARE DPCCN Logistical Support Project -- Phase I [656-0217-G-SS-0013-00]
CARE DPCCN Logistical Support Project -- Phase II [656-0217-A-00-2037-00]

Text Table 3
Description of Operational PVO Support Project Grants [1990-1994]

PVO and Grant Title	Grant Number	Effective Starting Date	Grant Activity Completion Date	Funds Obligated To Date
CARE DPCCN Logistical Support Project -- Phase I	G-SS-0013	12/1/90	3/22/93	\$ 3,059,371
CARE DPCCN Logistical Support Project -- Phase II	A-00-2037	3/26/92	6/30/94	\$ 4,899,533
CARE Food Security and Rural Rehabilitation in Manica Province	G-00-4005	11/1/93	4/30/95	\$ 1,104,843
CARE Agricultural Recovery (Seed Distribution)	G-00-3047	9/1/93	2/28/94	\$ 484,933
CARE Manica Potable Water Project	G-00-3046	9/1/93	5/15/93	\$ 233,861
CARE Inhambane Water and Sanitation Project	G-00-0217	9/1/93	5/31/94	\$ 867,468
SCF Children and War Project -- Phase I	G-SS-2053	9/1/91	3/31/93	\$ 1,820,503
SCF Children and War Project -- Phase II	G-SS-3016	4/1/93	3/31/95	\$ 2,200,000
SCF Gaza Health and Rural Development Project -- Phase I	G-SS-0015	8/20/90	3/31/94	\$ 2,823,446
SCF Gaza Health and Rural Development Project -- Phase II	G-SS-4017	4/1/94	9/30/96	\$ 3,743,000
WVRD Child Survival and Agricultural Recovery Project	G-SS-0014	7/3/90	9/30/94	\$ 9,216,960
WVRD Child Survival Project	G-00-4006	10/1/93	9/30/96	\$ 2,095,158
AFRICARE Water and Sanitation Project in Sofala Province	G-SS-0018	7/31/90	12/31/92	\$ 256,111
AFRICARE Wells and Sanitation	G-00-3022	7/1/93	6/30/94	\$ 1,357,529
ADRA Chimoi Water Supply Project -- Phase I	A-00-4007	12/17/93	6/10/94	\$ 589,532
ADRA Inhambane Rural Rehabilitation Project	G-SS-0017	7/31/90	3/31/94	\$ 1,233,849
AICF Preventive Health Care Project in Sofala Province	G-00-3048	10/1/93	9/30/94	\$ 436,052
Salesian Mission Orphanage and Training Project	G-00-4003	11/23/93	9/30/96	\$ 565,000
MCD Water and Sanitation Project	G-SS-3011	4/30/93	4/1/95	\$ 1,213,122
WRC Integrated Rural Response (Water Supply & Ag Recovery) Project	G-SS-3003	10/1/92	9/30/95	\$ 2,915,115
MHC Preventive Health Project	G-SS-2051	5/28/92	12/31/94	\$ 2,040,820
FHI Sofala Rural Rehabilitation Project	G-SS-0016	7/1/90	6/30/94	\$ 6,470,101

(ii) Category II

ADRA Chimoio Water Supply Project -- Phase I [656-0217-A-00-4007-00]
AFRICARE Water and Sanitation Project in Sofala Province [656-0217-G-SS-0018-00]
AFRICARE Wells and Sanitation Project [656-0217-G-SS-3022-00]
AICF Preventive Health Care Project in Sofala Province [656-0217-G-00-3048-00]
CARE Inhambane Water and Sanitation Project [656-0217-G-00-3029-00]
CARE Manica District Potable Water Project [656-0217-G-00-3046-00]
CARE Machaze Nutritional Education and Health Monitoring Project [656-0217-G-00-4005-00]
MCD Water and Sanitation Project [656-0217-G-SS-3011-00]
MHC Preventive Health Project [656-0217-G-SS-2051-00]
Salesian Mission Orphanage and Training Project [656-0217-G-00-4003-00]
SCF Gaza Health and Rural Development Project -- Phase I [656-0217-G-SS-0015-00]
SCF Gaza Health and Rural Development Project -- Phase II [656-0217-G-SS-4017-00]
WRC Preventive Health, Water and Sanitation Project [656-0217-G-SS-3003-00]
WVRD Child Survival and Agricultural Recovery Project -- Phase I [656-0217-G-SS-0014-00]
WVRD Child Survival Project -- Phase I [656-0217-G-SS-4006-00]

[NOTE: The following two projects were funded under a special Congressional set-aside funding allocation within the PVO Support Project for special assistance to Mozambican children severely affected by war. As such, these projects do not fit conveniently within any of the Categories.]

SCF Children and War Project -- Phase I [656-0217-G-SS-2053-00]
SCF Children and War Project -- Phase II [656-0217-G-SS-3016-00]

(iii) Category III

ADRA Inhambane Rural Rehabilitation Project [656-0217-G-SS-0017-00]
CARE Machaze District Food Security Project [656-0217-G-00-3047-00]
FHI Sofala Rural Rehabilitation Project [656-0217-G-SS-0016-00]
Salesian Mission Orphanage and Training Project [656-0217-G-00-4003-00]
SCF Gaza Health and Rural Development Project -- Phase I [656-0217-G-SS-0015-00]
SCF Gaza Health and Rural Development Project -- Phase II [656-0217-G-SS-4017-00]
WVRD Child Survival and Agricultural Recovery Project -- Phase I [656-0217-G-SS-0014-00]

b) Grant Resources by Sectoral Activity

(i) Food Logistics and Relief Operations

CARE DPCCN Logistical Support Project -- Phase I [656-0217-G-SS-0013-00]
CARE DPCCN Logistical Support Project -- Phase II [656-0217-A-00-2037-00]

(ii) Health

AICF Preventive Health Care Project in Sofala Province [656-0217-G-00-3048-00]
CARE Machaze Nutritional Education and Health Monitoring Project [656-0217-G-00-4005-00]

MHC Preventive Health Project [656-0217-G-SS-2051-00]
SCF Gaza Health and Rural Development Project -- Phase I [656-0217-G-SS-0015-00]
SCF Gaza Health and Rural Development Project -- Phase II [656-0217-G-SS-4017-00]
WRC Preventive Health, Water and Sanitation Project [656-0217-G-SS-3003-00]
WVRD Child Survival and Agricultural Recovery Project -- Phase I [656-0217-G-SS-0014-00]
WVRD Child Survival Project -- Phase I [656-0217-G-SS-4006-00]

(iii) Water and Sanitation

ADRA Chimoio Water Supply Project -- Phase I [656-0217-A-00-4007-00]
AFRICARE Water and Sanitation Project in Sofala Province [656-0217-G-SS-0018-00]
AFRICARE Wells and Sanitation Project [656-0217-G-SS-3022-00]
CARE Inhambane Water and Sanitation Project [656-0217-G-00-3029-00]
CARE Machaze District Potable Water Project [656-0217-G-00-3046-00]
MCD Water and Sanitation Project [656-0217-G-SS-3011-00]
SCF Gaza Health and Rural Development Project -- Phase I [656-0217-G-SS-0015-00]
SCF Gaza Health and Rural Development Project -- Phase II [656-0217-G-SS-4017-00]
WRC Preventive Health, Water and Sanitation Project [656-0217-G-SS-3003-00]

(iv) Agricultural Recovery

ADRA Inhambane Rural Rehabilitation Project [656-0217-G-SS-0017-00]
CARE Machaze District Food Security Project [656-0217-G-00-3047-00]
FHI Sofala Rural Rehabilitation Project [656-0217-G-SS-0016-00]
SCF Gaza Health and Rural Development Project -- Phase I [656-0217-G-SS-0015-00]
SCF Gaza Health and Rural Development Project -- Phase II [656-0217-G-SS-4017-00]
WVRD Child Survival and Agricultural Recovery Project -- Phase I [656-0217-G-SS-0014-00]

(v) Education and/or Vocational Skills Training

Salesian Mission Orphanage and Training Project [656-0217-G-00-4003-00]
SCF Gaza Health and Rural Development Project -- Phase I [656-0217-G-SS-0015-00]

(vi) Children and War

SCF Children and War Project -- Phase I [656-0217-G-SS-2053-00]
SCF Children and War Project -- Phase II [656-0217-G-SS-3016-00]
Salesian Mission Orphanage and Training Project [656-0217-G-00-4003-00]

Text Table 4 on the following page presents the distribution of sectoral investments by PVO.

Text Table 4
Distribution of Sectoral Investments by PVO
[in thousands of US \$]

PVO/Sector	Agricultural Recovery	Water and Sanitation	Health	Children and War	Disaster Assistance	Total
ADRA	1,234	590	0	0	0	1,824
AFRICARE	0	1,481	1,225	0	0	2,706
AICF	0	310	310	0	0	620
CARE	0	1,101	2,256	0	7,959	11,316
FHI	6,470	0	0	0	0	6,470
MCD	0	607	607	0	0	1,214
MHC	0	0	2,041	0	0	2,041
Salesian Mission	0	0	0	565	0	565
SCF	941	2,813	2,813	3,626	0	10,193
WRC	972	972	972	0	0	2,916
WVRD	4,609	0	7,428	0	0	12,037
Total	14,226	7,874	17,652	4,191	7,959	51,902

c) Distribution of Grant Activities by Region

(i) Water and Sanitation Activities

A number of wells are being developed and rehabilitated in the Massingia and Machaze Districts, a semi-arid region in southern Mozambique. Water point development is a key constraint to repopulating the zone. Hydro-geological conditions are difficult in this zone. Two sizeable regional towns, i.e., Beira and Chimoio, in the Sofala Province are receiving assistance through PVOs for rehabilitating municipal and community water supplies. PVO grants are generally located in areas identified by the UNOHAC as being high or medium level priorities.

To achieve health benefits from investments in water supply, improvements must be made in hygiene and community sanitation. All the water development activities have accompanying public health training activities, with the exception of the Chimoio town water system.

(ii) Health Activities

The locations of health activities are less important than with water point development as the health activities of the Project tend to be basic primary health care, with an emphasis on child survival. Problems being addressed are generally located throughout the country. However most of the activities are taking place in districts which have relatively lower ratios of population to primary health care unit, i.e., ratios of between 2,000 to 20,000 persons per health unit. Exceptions are Gaza Province and the Machaze District of Manica Province where Save the Children Federation and CARE are working in areas having ratios of 20,000 to 40,000 people per health unit.

(iii) Agricultural Recovery and Rural Rehabilitation

Most of the agricultural and rural rehabilitation activities financed by the PVO grants are taking place in the central part of the country, i.e., the lower parts of Zambezia, Tete and Sofala Provinces. In general, this area is typified by relatively high agricultural potential. UNOHAC maps note that areas covered by the PVO grants are expected to have relatively high rates of returning refugees, i.e., estimated 600,000 returnees. There does not seem to be a lot of overlap between agricultural recovery/rural rehabilitation activities and water and sanitation activities, with the exception of the Machaze District.

d) Regional Distribution of Investment

Presently, PVO grant investments are spread over seven of ten Provinces in Mozambique. Sofala Province presently is receiving the largest amount of assistance -- a factor not unanticipated given its large population centers like Beira, still functioning infrastructure -- ports and railroad -- and relatively fertile soils. Text Table 5, shows PVO sectoral investments by Province.

Text Table 5
Distribution of PVO Sectoral Investments by Province
[in thousands of US \$]

Province/ Sector	Agricultural Recovery	Water and Sanitation	Health	Children and War	Disaster Assistance	Total
Niassa	0	1,614	1,614	0	0	3,228
Tete	2,877	0	4,537	0	0	7,414
Zambesia	2,877	0	4,537	0	0	7,414
Manica	685	824	3,361	0	0	4,870
Sofala	11,300	2,854	2,148	0	0	16,302
Inhambane	1,637	1,292	0	0	0	2,929
Gaza	1,138	6,869	3,642	0	0	11,649
National Programs	0	0	0	5,932	8,519	14,451
Total	20,514	13,453	19,839	5,932	8,519	68,257

- NOTES:
- (i) Investment is defined as the total of USAID and PVO investment.
 - (ii) The Children and War and Disaster Assistance Grant Project are national in scope. Activities are not specifically defined by Provinces.

3. Consolidation of Individual Grants by Project Outputs⁵

The anticipated outputs of the PVO Support Project were presented in Section 1 above. This section attempts to aggregate the outputs of the grant-level activities through March 1994 to determine to what degree Project-level output objectives have been accomplished. It should be noted, however, that there are four constraints to accomplishing this task in an entirely satisfactory manner. They are:

- ◆ Five of the 21 operational grant agreements contain no statements of output objectives;
- ◆ Several of the remaining grant agreements contain statements of output objectives by general category but make no attempt quantify those outputs;

⁵ Since no records were kept by the PMT concerning Project-level outputs or their achievement, the team was required to undertake the process of aggregation itself. This required a review of each individual grant and grantee report. Extracting information from these documents was both tedious and, in some cases, required a degree of divination. However, the results presented in this and following sections, could contain some errors and omissions, although, not enough in our opinion to call into question the overall conclusions arrived at in Part III.

- ◆ The majority of the grant agreements contain statements of output objectives which confuse anticipated grant outputs with grant end-of-project status conditions and, in some cases, routine grant implementation activities; and,
- ◆ The inadequate reporting, in most cases, by PVOs on their individual grant activities.

The programmatic deficiencies in the existing grant agreements may mean that the aggregated project-level outputs presented in the following sub-sections are understated. Or, conversely, that the actual reported outputs to date are necessarily evaluated against an inaccurate representation of the anticipated outputs actually negotiated between the USAID Mission and the individual grantees.

a) Improved Humanitarian Assistance Planning and Management

This category is comprised of two CARE grant projects. Neither grant agreement contains a specific statement of anticipated output objectives. It should be noted that the rephrasing of this objective in later amendments, includes the larger objective of improving indigenous capacity to manage and distribute humanitarian assistance, i.e., not simply limited to food aid and the DPCCN.

As far as can be determined, both CARE and the DPCCN played very important roles in the distribution of relief food during the recent periods of civil strife and drought. Now that both emergency situations have abated, the operational systems developed for DPCCN between 1990 and 1994 are judged by interviewees as simply too costly to keep in place when they have no continuing functions.

Under the two grants, the following conditions were obtained and findings presented:

- ◆ Food aid reception and trans-shipment operations were contracted to private sector agents by both the DPCCN and the World Food Program.
- ◆ An estimated 30 % of relief food transport, i.e., port to District level, handled by the DPCCN was contracted to private transporters during 1992 and 1993. Work contracted out to private transporters declined late in the second grant period when the DPCCN's existing truck fleet could easily handle the greatly reduced levels of relief food. By contrast, the World Food Program contracted out most of its relief food distribution operations to private transporters during the emergencies.
- ◆ Systems were put in place to secure adequate and reliable sources of fuel, and CARE was involved in the more formal systems developed.
- ◆ Local procurement systems for spare parts were put in place but many problems plagued their use. In many cases, necessary parts were not available locally.
- ◆ The DPCCN procured private storage services during peak relief food inflows and is now contracting out its own storage capacity.

- ◆ Policies and procedures have been designed for the downsizing of the DPCCN vehicle fleet by the end of the grant period, i.e., second or Phase II grant, but the DPCCN has been moving slowly to divest itself of these resources.
- ◆ A major part of emergency assistance coming into Mozambique was distributed at the local level by non-governmental organizations.

b) Facilitating the Transition from Relief to Rehabilitation

INCREASED COVERAGE OF BASIC SERVICES AMONG TARGET GROUPS

(i) Health

The purpose of activities undertaken in this category comprises all or part of the outputs of eight grant activities. The anticipated output objectives of these grants include:

- ◆ Thirteen health posts rehabilitated and operational.
- ◆ 1,120 latrines constructed and in use.
- ◆ 115 community facilitators, mobilizers and animators trained.
- ◆ DDS staff trained to plan, supervise, implement and evaluate MCH programs.
- ◆ Six-to-eight health post government staff trained in preventive medicine.
- ◆ Health Committees formed in four pilot villages in each district.
- ◆ 80 community volunteers trained in preventive health education.
- ◆ Various health management seminars and workshops conducted.
- ◆ Screening and health services for repatriated populations in target areas.
- ◆ Three villages to receive intensive training on malaria prevention.
- ◆ 3,000 mosquito nets distributed.
- ◆ Six village-wide clean-up campaigns conducted each year.
- ◆ Increased community coverage by traditional birth attendants.
- ◆ Monthly prenatal visits to pregnant women conducted on, at least, 1,400 women per year.
- ◆ Various growth monitoring programs conducted on children under 5 years of age, with counseling given to mothers of children who exhibit growth faltering.

- ◆ **Pilot nutritional educational program developed and implemented in three Machaze District towns.**
- ◆ **Initiation of Community Immunization Tracking System and expansion to four rural target communities in Manica Province.**
- ◆ **Bi-monthly vaccination rounds of children under two years of age and, at least, 1,000 children from 0 to 1 year of age vaccinated each year.**
- ◆ **Six health campaigns on diarrheal disease control conducted.**
- ◆ **Community education program developed and implemented on control of diarrheal disease in Manica Province.**
- ◆ **Baseline maternal and child health surveys conducted.**
- ◆ **EPI "Missed" Opportunity Study conducted.**
- ◆ **Diarrheal disease management studies conducted.**
- ◆ **Special Attention evaluation conducted.**
- ◆ **Study to identify major health problems and barriers to women, with analysis of their use of health services.**
- ◆ **Study of the prevalence of sexually transmitted diseases in women seeking pre-natal consultations in Chimoio and target rural community, with recommendations.**
- ◆ **Various KAP surveys conducted.**
- ◆ **Financial/sustainability study conducted.**

The actual outputs from these grants reported to date include:

- ◆ **Twenty-two health centers rehabilitated and operational.**
- ◆ **Medical kits, supplies and drugs are now being received regularly every two or three months.**
- ◆ **4,676 latrines and five washing areas constructed and in use.**
- ◆ **17 community health workers contacted and links re-established with nearest health post.**
- ◆ **Thirty-two government health assistants trained.**
- ◆ **64 community facilitators trained.**

- ◆ Mothers of 0-3 year olds, pregnant women, women of child bearing age, health committees and residents of the target communities participated in training programs.
- ◆ Local level health/sanitation committees have been established and work sites have been identified.
- ◆ Two cholera centers and one house completed with MHC support to support health services.
- ◆ About 25 community councils formed and active.
- ◆ A minimum of five new theater groups in four districts and Chimoio trained to deliver health messages and training activists in sanitation, diarrhea and AIDS education.
- ◆ More than 11,000 condoms distributed by the preventive medicine team and the AIDS theater group.
- ◆ 173 village health volunteers trained in basic health care.
- ◆ Culturally-appropriate curricula, training methods, and audio-visual training materials were produced on selected aspects of basic health care including: diarrhea, breast-feeding/weaning, nutrition, malaria, AIDS, and vaccination.
- ◆ Three refugee screening sessions done with MHC assistance.
- ◆ Village health education program started with training of trainers and village health surveys.
- ◆ Three district traditional birth attendant programs evaluated; 15 new attendants trained in Manica; 48 attendants given in-service training; and 48 attendants receiving quarterly supervision and material to do deliveries in 1993.
- ◆ 1,236 births assisted by trained attendants in three districts in a six-to-eight month period in 1993.
- ◆ Pre-natal registry developed and supported.
- ◆ 142 traditional birth attendants trained in AIDS/STD prevention.
- ◆ 402 women tested for syphilis in three target districts [43 % of total antenatal clinic attendance] and an average 343 women tested per month.
- ◆ Almost 17,000 infants less than 3 years of age were weighed two or more times in a growth rate monitoring program.
- ◆ Three supplementary feeding programs newly linked to HPs/DDSs.

- ◆ Approximately 76,220 immunizations were administered.
- ◆ Community leaders trained in oral rehydration therapy in health-promotion seminars.
- ◆ Baseline MCH/EPI survey completed in September 1992.
- ◆ EPI "missed opportunities" study completed in May 1993.
- ◆ Survey about community knowledge of oral rehydration therapy completed in three districts in September 1992.
- ◆ Provincial nutritional surveys conducted in 1992 and 1993.
- ◆ Evaluation of Special Needs underway.
- ◆ Consulting report completed April 1994 identifying major health problems and barriers to women and analyzing women's use of health services.
- ◆ Study of sexual transmitted disease prevalence in women of child-bearing age in Chimoio and rural communities initiated November 1993 and continuing.
- ◆ Survey conducted to measure improvement in AIDS knowledge before and after theater presentations in selected audiences.
- ◆ To date, enumerators have been trained and a KAP health baseline survey has been completed, with survey data from over 300 wells.
- ◆ Community education programs developed on CDD and implementation ongoing.
- ◆ Growth monitoring is ongoing. The number of children monitored twice within a 90-day period is averaging about 1,700 per month.
- ◆ Prenatal examinations by CSP from 1 October 1993 to 30 January 1994 are estimated at 924. An annual rate of 2,772 can be projected.

(ii) Water and Sanitation

This category comprises all or part of the outputs of nine grant activities. The anticipated output objectives of these projects include:

- ◆ Construction or rehabilitation and equipping of 325 shallow wells.
- ◆ Construction or rehabilitation and equipping of 318 boreholes.
- ◆ Construction and/or rehabilitation of 500 water cisterns able to hold up to 24,500 gallons of clean water.

- ◆ Construction or rehabilitation of 50 water standpipes in Beira City with capacities from 8,000 to 15,000 liters.
- ◆ Training of well/borehole three drilling teams and 13 mechanics.
- ◆ Training of 24 other types of workers, 5,000 village women in basic water and hygiene education, and eight health workers.
- ◆ Organization of 805 village water user committees and 500 well/borehole caretakers.
- ◆ Organization of 90 functioning user-fee systems for wells and boreholes.
- ◆ Conduct eight baseline surveys of water needs and potential.
- ◆ Technical studies on existing borehole test results, cost-effective supply systems; and a hydro-geological survey of southern Machaza District.
- ◆ Install one water quality and other factor monitoring system for 40 water points.
- ◆ Tender document(s) for reconstruction of the Chimoio water supply system.

The actual outputs from these grants reported to date include:

- ◆ Construction, rehabilitation and/or equipping of 78 shallow wells has been completed.
- ◆ Construction, rehabilitation and/or equipping of 108 boreholes has been completed.
- ◆ Construction and/or rehabilitation of 1,000 water cisterns able to hold an average of 1,500 gallons of clean water each has been completed.
- ◆ No construction or rehabilitation of the 50 water standpipes in Beira City has been reported to date.
- ◆ Training of well/borehole up to four drilling and maintenance teams may have been completed but reporting is unclear.
- ◆ Basic health and hygiene training has been given in thirty villages where cisterns and deep wells have been repaired. An estimated 3,000 to 4,000 women have been trained.
- ◆ Organization of 38 village water user committees and training of 171 well/borehole caretakers has been reported.
- ◆ No organization of functioning user-fee systems for wells and boreholes has been reported.
- ◆ Seven baseline surveys of water needs and potential have been completed.

- ◆ **One Rapid Needs Assessment and one Knowledge, Attitudes, Perception and Beliefs are reported to have been completed. A hydrogeological survey of southern Machaze District has also been completed.**
- ◆ **Water quality specialists have performed water quality testing of wells and town reservoir. Training of local technicians to implement a water quality monitoring system has been undertaken.**
- ◆ **A number of design consultancies have been undertaken related to production of the required tender document(s) for the Chimoio water system.**

(iii) Children and War

This category is comprised of two grant projects and elements of a third. The anticipated output objectives include:

- ◆ **30,000 unaccompanied children registered, with 25,000 reunited with their families or guardians.**
- ◆ **Follow-up assistance received by 15,000 reunited children.**
- ◆ **5,000 former child soldiers assisted, with 2,000 young demobilized soldiers receiving skill training and follow-up assistance.**
- ◆ **1,000 children participated in job and life skills programs.**
- ◆ **20,000 traumatized children received community-based interventions.**
- ◆ **One organizationally-autonomous and operational Mozambican non-governmental organization created and trained in assistance for war-affected children.**
- ◆ **Five-to-10 formal community associations from the informal volunteer network created and registered with the government.**
- ◆ **Twenty Mozambican interns trained.**
- ◆ **The Salesian Mission orphanage will be repaired and returned to its normal operation.**
- ◆ **Basic social services provided to 80 boys between the ages of 11 and 15 who have been orphaned or abandoned.**

The actual outputs reported to date by Save the Children Federation and the Salesian Mission are:

- ◆ **SCF Project -- Phases I and II -- has documented 10,000 children separated from their families and affected by the war.**

- ◆ Projects has documented 15,800 families reporting missing children.
- ◆ Projects have been instrumental in reunifying 3,712 children with their families.
- ◆ Projects have documented 5,155 spontaneous reunifications of children with families.
- ◆ Project has identified populations of 12,000 traumatized children and 6,000 demobilized soldiers in need of assistance.
- ◆ SCF has provided job/life skills training to an average of 16 persons per month under Phase II.
- ◆ SCF has assisted 28 traumatized children under Phase II.
- ◆ SCF has assisted an average of four demobilized soldiers per month under Phase II.
- ◆ Projects have created networks for reunifying families comprising 35,831 volunteers to date.
- ◆ 1,722 Community Volunteers and 22 Children at War interns have been trained under Phase II.
- ◆ Six orphans currently reside at the Salesian Mission.

INCREASED RURAL EMPLOYMENT, PRODUCTION CAPACITY AND CASH INCOMES

(i) Agricultural Recovery

This category is comprised of all or elements of six grant activities. The anticipated output objectives include:

- ◆ 72,000 ag-paks and veg-paks distributed to farmers.
- ◆ 2,500 hand sickles and 5,000 water cans distributed.
- ◆ 200 kilometers of roads rehabilitated.
- ◆ 6,000 farmers with improved access to extension training.
- ◆ Fifteen-to-25 extension workers trained with grant resources.
- ◆ Two technical studies conducted.
- ◆ Ten new small scale vegetable oil production businesses operating without direct subsidy.
- ◆ Small ruminant production pilot activities functioning in two districts.

The actual outputs from agricultural recovery grant reported to date are:

- ◆ Approximately 6,000 families received ag-paks prior to the 1990/1991 agricultural season. Approximately 56,000 families received ag-paks prior to the 1993/1994 agricultural season. An additional 60,000 ag-paks have been purchased for delivery to farmers prior to the 1994/1995 agricultural season. Approximately 80,000 Veg-Paks of selected vegetable seeds have been purchased for free delivery to farm families in May and June 1994.
- ◆ 60,000 ag-paks and 30,000 veg-paks were distributed for crop year 1993/1994. 100,000 ag-paks and 60,000 veg-paks distributed over the life of the two grants.
- ◆ 4,000 ag-paks [cereal and pulse seeds and one hoe] distributed to families in Southern Machaze District.
- ◆ Seeds, simple hand tools, domestic utensils and food packages distributed to a total of 19,500 displaced families.
- ◆ 1,400 farmers on one village provided with seed on credit and access to agricultural extension and marketing services.
- ◆ 40 cattle distributed as traction animals in one village. [Note: the final evaluation states that 50 percent of these animals died in the first year.]
- ◆ One grant project distributed 1,322 metric tons of traditional crop seeds and 1,571 kilograms of vegetable seed to displaced families.
- ◆ Four fruit nurseries established and 11,416 fruit tree seedlings distributed.
- ◆ One grant project reported approximately 116,000 tool-paks, with appropriate agricultural hand tools varied by region and crop mix, were delivered free of charge to farm families prior to the 1993/1994 agricultural season.
- ◆ Two grant projects reported 2,500 hand sickles and 4,500 watering cans distributed in 1993/1994. A total of 5,700 watering can distributed over the life of the two grants. 90,000 hoes and axes distributed in 1993/1994. A total of 130,000 hoes and axes distributed over the life of the two grants. 30,000 machetes distributed in 1993/1994. A total of 50,000 machetes distributed over the life of the two grants.
- ◆ Another grant project reported 5,407 agricultural tools distributed. 6,400 hoes and 6,300 sacks (40 kgs each) of seeds distributed in Northern Machaze District.
- ◆ Approximately 10,000 Survival Kits, i.e., bucket, cooking/eating utensils and a blanket, have been purchased for free distribution to the neediest individuals. Most, but perhaps not all, of these have been distributed.

- ◆ FHI extension agents have provided training to 10,311 displaced persons who are presently farming small plots adjacent to the temporary settlements.
- ◆ To provide extension education, FHI has hired and trained 40 extension agents. In addition, they have trained 22 agents from the District agricultural service and given some extension training to 13 agents serving RENAMO-controlled areas. It should be noted that the 22 agents from the government agricultural service represent about 60 percent of District agents. In total, FHI has trained about 75 extension agents working in the region.
- ◆ In another grant project, four supervisors and 36 agents were trained and at the time of evaluation, 25 extension agents still working on the project.
- ◆ Assessments of the potentials for producing oilseeds and small ruminants have been carried out.
- ◆ Pilot activities in producing and processing oilseed crops and small ruminant production are underway and will continue over the next several months. Small ruminant production pilot activities functioning in two districts.
- ◆ Two shelters for maize grinding mills rehabilitated.
- ◆ Agricultural research and extension activities in Zambezia, Tete, Nampula, and northern sections of Sofala provinces on-going. Sixteen demonstration plots for traditional crops planted. Eleven demonstration plots for vegetables planted.

(ii) Education and/or Vocational Skills Training Outputs

This category is comprised of elements from two grant projects. The anticipated output objectives include:

- ◆ To provide skills training for 80 orphans and approximately 60 youth (targeting primarily young girls) from the surrounding community in the first year, 75 in the second year, and 100 in the third year.
- ◆ To rehabilitate a building adjacent to the Salesian Mission orphanage as a community center and an area for workshops, classrooms, offices and library.
- ◆ To provide apprenticeship/skills-training courses in tailoring, sewing, typing and carpentry for orphans and out-of-school youths in the community.
- ◆ To rehabilitate and make operational nine primary schools, each with approximately 300 students.
- ◆ To rehabilitate seven public structures used for community purposes.

The actual outputs reported to date include:

- ◆ Nine classrooms have been rehabilitated in Nhakutse and two new classroom blocks have been completed in two other villages.
- ◆ Thirty-six children from the surrounding community were observed in two classes at the Salesian Mission, i.e., 17 teenagers in a typing class and 19 children under twelve in a basic literacy class. Of these students, 12-to-14 were female.

4. Assessing Grantee Performance

The ten U.S. and one French PVO which have received grants and or CAs under the Project are, like USAID at the Project level, considered key inputs into each individual grant. In this section, the absorptive capacity of this set of PVOs is assessed in terms of their management, technical and strategic planning skills and experience.

a) Overview

Under the Mission's CPSP the PVO Support Project is seen as supporting the transition from relief to rehabilitation by taking advantage of the knowledge and experience the PVOs have acquired by working in relief at the local level over the emergency period in Mozambique. More specifically, the project is to (i) support PVOs in their efforts to develop Mozambican capacity to manage and provide basic humanitarian assistance, and (ii) facilitate the transition from dependence on food aid to self-provisioning and more developmentally-oriented activities, by building local indigenous capacity, including Mozambican NGOs.

This strategy relies upon the previous expertise and experience of PVOs who were invited to provide emergency assistance, first to improve food security and the well-being of those affected by the war, later as a result of drought, and more recently as a result of the reintegration of displaced persons as well as demobilized soldiers and their dependents after the signing of the General Peace Accord in October 1992.

An important factor in implementing this strategy is PVO absorptive capacity, broadly interpreted here to include the capacity for management, planning and technically sound implementation. Capacity is also measured by the nature of PVO relationships with USAID, the GRM, PVOs and NGOs, and the degree of sustainability of PVOs and their Project-financed grant activity in Mozambique.

Each of these elements is examined below.⁶

⁶ Data used in compiling the findings presented in this section has come from the administration of a questionnaire to all eleven PVO Grantees.

b) Grantee Management and Planning

(1) Planning, Project Design and Approval

Quality of Proposals & Grants

- ▶ Guidelines for preparation of proposals are provided in the Project Paper, but the quality of submission varies significantly depending on the particular PVO. Most PVOs have not followed the guidelines closely in preparing their proposals. This has resulted in inconsistent quality and a wide variation in the way the actual grant agreements are structured. In part, this inconsistency was a function of the emergency, the funding amounts made available in response to demand for emergency assistance, and the need for rapid response. Also, the quality of proposals has varied depending on the PVOs broader management and technical capacity and previous experience with USAID grant processes.⁷ The absence of standardization meant that many of the early grants lack clearly specified and appropriate outputs or quantifiable EOPS. Five grants had no output statements.⁸ Care was not taken in many cases to separate outputs from EOPS or to develop appropriate indicators of change with technical experts in water/sanitation, health or agricultural development. For example, MHC's EOPS and Outputs were combined under one heading many of which were not quantifiable.

Effect of Grant Issuance Delays on Project Implementations

- ▶ Grants approved by the USAID Director as QIPs take 2-to-3 months from initial USAID/PVO concept discussions to issuance of a grant. Larger grants which have required approval from the Regional Contracts Office in Swaziland have often taken 6 to 8 months to be approved. In some cases the delays between proposal submission have significantly affected grant implementation. For example, Africare's second grant signing was delayed (April 93 to September 93) by a change in Contract Officers in Swaziland. According to Africare/Maputo the grant was backdated to July, but the actual receipt of funds and start of activities was October 1993. MHC's concept paper was prepared in December 1990 as a follow-up to their Manica District grant. The proposal was submitted in May 1991. A year later, in June 1992 the grant was finally awarded.

⁷ USAID Project Management considered World Vision's proposal for Child Survival to have been well-conceived. AICF's proposal was also considered reasonably well done. In contrast, the first draft of SCF's Children in War II required major restructuring. According to the Mission Project Manager there had not been enough discussion between USAID and SCF prior to submission. As a result the proposal had to be redone, creating an unanticipated delay in start-up (the follow-on to Children in War I was to have begun January 1, 1993 but the actual start is April, requiring USAID to provide SCF with a 3 month no-cost extension on their previous grant). SCF learned from this experience, bringing in an outside consultant to assist them in preparing the Gaza II proposal, which the Mission Project Manager thought was well done. Africare's Beira proposal appeared good conceptually, but now they are downsizing outputs and EOPS; thus concepts do not always match reality.

⁸ For example, SCF's Children and War I grant (\$1,820,503) completed in March 1993 provided final outputs, but no EOPS.

- ▶ According to grantees, proposal preparation has been an iterative and constructive process with USAID project managers. This process has improved further in recent months with a change in procedure, instituted by the Project Management Team, in which PVOs submitting proposals now participate in proposal review meetings.

Baseline Surveys

- ▶ Baseline data against which to measure progress toward meeting outputs and EOPS were often not collected at grant start-up, particularly in those cases where PVOs were still involved in emergency relief activities. Others paid only limited attention to developing objectively verifiable indicators and sustainability. Thus surveys did not collect appropriate baseline data for monitoring success. Virtually none of the grantees attempted to measure improved cost-effectiveness over time (flow indicators).
- ▶ All grantees have collected some form of baseline information, but the quality and appropriateness varies greatly.⁹ Those PVOs who have made an effort to develop meaningful baseline information point out the difficulty of using percentage improvements in knowledge, attitudes or practice when population figures are unavailable or suspect (e.g. Renamo held areas) or when the population being surveyed are highly mobile and are not likely to remain in the grant area over the course of the grantee's activities. Further, many of the PVO grants are of no more than two years duration, which is often too short to show evidence of truly measurable change in community organization and practices (e.g. the formation of water user groups with workable water fee collection and pump repair and maintenance programs.) Nevertheless, some of the PVOs have overcome the moving population issue through periodic resurvey of target groups, and they believe even if baselines provide insufficient EOPS measurements they are still valuable and necessary because they inform implementers of the needs, attitudes and environment affecting beneficiary populations. In passing, PVOs stated to the Evaluation Team that, if in the future, baseline surveys were to be required prior to approval of PVO proposals, they would not be enthusiastic about paying the costs of the surveys themselves.

(ii) Implementation Planning

- ▶ While most grantees developed implementation plans as part of their proposals, which were included in their grants, there is little evidence of the use of annual workplans for on-going planning purposes. Where workplans have been submitted they are normally quarterly and not matched against annual workplans in a manner which allows tracking of accomplishments. Neither grantees nor USAID have focused on the use of PVO workplans as an effective tool for project planning.

⁹ World Vision's Child Survival Project baseline was carried out as part of their final evaluation was considered by USAID to be well done and detailed. It is to be used as baseline for their follow-on activity. According to USAID SCF did an excellent baseline for the original Gaza proposal, but then RENAMO activities forced them to leave the area where they were to work. According to a WASH consultant to Africare, Africare did some survey work at project start-up, but it did not qualify as a baseline. USAID believes FHI did a useful impact survey prior to their final evaluation.

(iii) Monitoring and Evaluation

Appropriateness and Quality of Reporting to USAID

- ▶ Current reporting requirements and the PVO management response appear to be a function of how USAID structured early grants under the project. Most of these were related to relief and humanitarian assistance with monthly reports required to track distribution of inputs. For more recent developmentally-oriented activities, with grants of a longer duration, the Mission has shifted to requiring quarterly reporting. However, reporting requirements are neither consistent nor standardized, and the actual reporting from PVOs is also highly variable.
- ▶ The majority of the grants were issued without a clear format for reporting that includes cumulative and quantifiable output and EOPS tables to allow tracking of progress over time.¹⁰ Not only do most quarterly reports not present cumulative output totals, many do not pay attention to the need to present quantifiable outputs.
- ▶ In response to the output and EOPS tracking problem, more recent grants (those developed from March/April 1993 on and signed in June/July) have specific quarterly reporting forms attached to the grant agreements. However, these forms have not required tracking cumulative total outputs or EOPS achieved against final outputs and EOPS.
- ▶ The majority of PVOs are not submitting gender specific data in quarterly reports as required by their grants.
- ▶ Most of the grantees are complying with overall grant requirements and do not find them excessive (a major contrast to most other countries). Other minor deficiencies were noted by the Team such as:
 - late submission of quarterly reports (MHC submitted no quarterly progress reports during their first year of implementation).
 - reports submitted without grant numbers to identify them (World Vision evaluations).

Appropriateness and Quality of Internal Monitoring and Evaluation

- ▶ Several of the PVOs have carried out internal evaluations which USAID considered useful for grant shake-down and mid-point corrections (FHI, World Vision, World Relief, AICF).

¹⁰ For example, MCD's grant does not even specify a reporting format, stating only that "these quarterly reports, in a format and at a schedule to be agreed upon by A.I.D. and the Grantee at a later date, will contain narrative and statistical information, as well a schedule of activities to be undertaken in the next period." The result to date has been that MCD progress reports have been combined with their financial reports, and these do not present quantitative outputs in a cumulative fashion.

Certain deficiencies were noted. Africare had no evaluation or final report on their first grant: Water & Sanitation in Sofala Province (0018).

(iv) Staffing and Administration

- ▶ Some of the PVOs have suffered from staffing problems that have affected achievement of grant objectives.¹¹ The most serious problem for PVOs is that expatriate staff are in constant turnover. Without a long-term Mozambican professional staff, institutional memory suffers.

(v) Financial Management Capability

- ▶ For the most part, the PVOs have adequate financial management capacity, although the USAID Controller's Office staff has assisted PVOs with a regular schedule of visits and consultations on issues of compliance with USAID financial regulations and standards of accountability.¹² Deficiencies have either been corrected, or are in process.

(vi) Mobilizing Resources

- ▶ Several grantees have had slow starts, in a few cases due to insufficient management capacity¹³. However the most serious mobilization constraints stem from GRM policies and procedures related to the importation of vehicles and equipment for grant purposes.
- ▶ A continuing misunderstanding exists between development agencies and the Ministry of Finance over taxation policies on vehicles and equipment brought into Mozambique for relief and development purposes. In April 1992, this misunderstanding led to a joint proposal by donors and NGOs to the Ministry of Finance to streamline the clearance process and ensure the exemption from duty and taxes of goods imported by PVOs/NGOs with donor financing. This effort proved unsuccessful. The Ministry of Finance continues to hold the position that certain taxes (which they consider minimal) are to be

¹¹ e.g. MHC had a virtually complete turnover in expatriate staff in the first year, precipitated in part by the delay of one year in project start-up. Africare's country office in Maputo had difficulty providing timely support to field operations in Beira, and Medical Care Development's Water and Sanitation Project may have insufficient staff to achieve anticipated outputs.

¹² According to the USAID/Controller's Office CARE and World Vision appear to have the strongest systems for accountability and management. Two of the PVOs with the least experience with AID requirements (MHC and MCD) have required the most assistance from USAID/Mozambique in developing systems which comply with USAID standards. ADRA's Inhambane Rural Rehabilitation Project (0017) and SCF's Children at War - Phase I (2053) have also had more compliance difficulties than other grantees.

¹³ According to USAID Project Managers - AICF, FHI, World Vision, World Relief and ADRA Chimoio have been particularly effective in mobilizing resources for their activities. MHC had a difficult start-up related to internal management capacity. MCD has had difficulty related to insufficient support from counterpart agencies. Africare is running behind schedule, and CARE Machaze activities both in water/health and food security have had slow starts in hiring, with a six month delay in establishing their base camp. A nutritionist is still being recruited for the CARE food security project.

paid on imported vehicles and equipment whether or not they are for relief or development purposes, and that these fees, if not paid by the PVO or donor are to be paid by the appropriate GRM counterpart agency.

It is not clear to the lower levels of Government (especially Customs and port of entry officials) that PVO/NGO activities are exempt from duty and taxation. They expect payment, if not from the PVO/NGO, then from their counterpart agencies. Counterpart agencies usually are unable to pay and often do not come to the defense of the PVO/NGO, so vehicles and equipment may languish in Customs, or at the port of entry, for weeks or months while GRM storage charges mount. At least three of the USAID PVO grantees have had vehicle clearance delays of over five months, seriously affecting project start-up.¹⁴ AICF, considered by USAID Project Managers to be one of the most effective of the PVOs operating under the Project, identified importation problems as the greatest constraint to timely implementation of their activities. It took three and one-half months to clear AICF medical kits through customs. AICF now has developed step-by-step procedures for getting approvals.

(vii) PVO Contribution

- USAID has not developed a mechanism for tracking PVO contributions as specified in their grants.

c) Technical Capacity

- U.S. PVOs began operating in Mozambique primarily in response to the emergency conditions in the country caused by war and drought, and later the re-integration of displaced populations. These PVOs relied on staff with strong logistic skills who oversaw the emergency relief activities that included the distribution of food, tools, seeds, construction of wells and catchments, immunization, ORT, and basic community education in health/sanitation. As USAID and the PVOs make the transition to more developmentally oriented projects, considerable logistic expertise is still needed; however, good logistic support by itself will not result in more developmentally-oriented programs. Straight delivery of inputs and services and rehabilitation work has been the norm in the past. It is what the current set of PVOs does best. But building indigenous capacity and putting in place sustainable self-provisioning systems, requires quite different sets of skills, many of which have not been available previously among the PVOs operating in

¹⁴ Custom's disputes with Africare over payment of import taxes have resulted in a 5 month delay in clearing vehicles, equipment and materials (vehicles were stored on the Beira compound but could not be driven because clearances were still in process and without the vehicles Africare was forced to rent vehicles and delay all construction related activities). Clearance procedures apparently date from the colonial period and are applied without questioning their utility. There are detailed requirements, not just for format but also style. One official rejected Africare applications several times because of their failure "to respect the papers," e.g. for failure to appreciate *how* to fill out the application. These importation problems were identified by Africare as the greatest constraint to timely implementation. MHC and MCD's problems with importing vehicles mirrored those of Africare, with a 5 month delay on clearance and a deleterious impact on project implementation.

Mozambique. The Evaluation Team found that many PVOs are continuing to rely heavily on logistic personnel for implementation of their grant activities, when different kinds of expertise are now needed.

- ▶ Overall PVOs have been most effective in the health sectors and slightly less so in agriculture (FHI, World Vision, World Relief, AICF). Water development has been more problematic. PRONAR's technical office considers most PVO/NGO current activity in the water sector to be of dubious merit; only AICF's work in the Beira area and World Relief's activities were mentioned in a positive vein. According to PRONAR, Africare and CARE Machaze have not coordinated well with PRONAR in Maputo for technical support or in obtaining drilling and well data. Under CARE's Inhambane grant there was coordination, but PRONAR questioned CARE's engineering competence on that activity. On the other hand, many of the PVOs operating in the water sector believe the water development parastatals (EPARs and HIDROMOC) have severe limits to their technical and financial capacity (with accountability problems as well) which impede effective PVO water development activities.

d) Relationships with USAID and GRM Institutions

(i) Relationships with USAID

- ▶ The majority of PVOs speak highly of the USAID project managers. In general they consider USAID interaction very collaborative, with positive effects on implementation of their grants, a satisfactory number of site visits (they would appreciate longer visits and more technical input) and useful feedback on reports.

(ii) Relationships with GRM institutions

- ▶ PVO contacts with GRM departments and agencies at the national level are mixed at best. Some coordinate well (AICF, World Vision, World Relief, FHI). Others seem less sensitive to the need for coordination or accountability (e.g. CARE and Africare on water development). Most of the PVOs are coordinating extensively at the provincial and district levels with their counterpart agencies in health, water/sanitation and agriculture. However, this collaboration is hampered by insufficient GRM capacity (technical and financial resources), poor motivation and training, and trust/accountability problems within some local agencies.
- ▶ The GRM cannot compete with salaries offered by PVOs (or donors or the Republic of South Africa); thus donor and PVO presence contributes to a professional drain on GRM human resources. Nor can government compete with the tremendous resources that pass through PVOs for relief, rehabilitation or developmental purposes.

(iii) Relationships with Mozambican Institutions

- ▶ There is collaboration among PVOs/NGOs at the local level, usually through District level monthly meetings and informal contacts. CARE and MHC attend monthly NGO meetings

in Chimoi. AICF, Africare and FHI participate in similar meetings in Beira. The meetings were originally organized primarily to coordinate relief activities, but they are now serving as a means for organizing working committees to address common needs and impediments to implementation. There are also monthly coordination meetings at the national level arranged by LINK.

- ▶ USAID and PVOs have paid limited attention to building indigenous capacity, either in local organizations or among indigenous NGOs, perhaps because professionally qualified Mozambican personnel are so limited that very few of these organizations exist.

f) Sustainability

(i) PVO Sustainability in Mozambique

- ▶ PVOs with USAID/Mozambique grants have varying degrees of dependency on USAID funding (WV has a \$70 million program in Mozambique of which USAID funding represents 17% On the other hand, PVOs like MHC depend on continued USAID support for 90 per cent or more of their operations), although the majority could not sustain their current level of operations, or even significantly reduced ones without continued Project funding.
- ▶ The first PVO Support Grants provided millions of dollars to help deliver inputs under emergency conditions. In the newer grants this pattern has continued, purchasing capacity to carry out rehabilitation and limited development activities, adding more expatriates, more vehicles, more buildings, more equipment. The continued presence of existing PVOs depends on their ability to purchase capacity indefinitely and this infusion can not be maintained without continued funding from USAID or other donors. However, most of the PVOs consider themselves capable of expanding their programs if they were to receive funding to do so.

(ii) Sustainability of PVO Interventions

- The short-time period for grants, and incremental funding in many cases, makes it difficult to plan sustainable activities, whether rehabilitation or development, which may require ten to twenty years to show significant results.
- ▶ Activities under the current PVO Support Project with potential for long-term sustainability are limited. They include:
 - Agriculture: Seed improvement, agricultural improvements and village/community level training.
 - Health: Community education in health, nutrition, STD/AIDS.
 - Water: Sanitation education.

- ▶ Most of the current grantees anticipate submitting new proposals to USAID in the future, with activities continuing to concentrate on the same sectors of specialization: improved agricultural production, water/sanitation, Mother/Child Health & Nutrition, and Primary Health Care. Several are also considering expanding existing activities into new geographic areas.
- Most of the grantees consider their work to be located on a continuum between relief and development, believing that they will continue to meet emergency needs in varying degrees over the foreseeable future.

5. Summary of Findings

The Project has successfully elicited the active participation of eleven PVOs in 19 grant activities and two Cooperative Agreements. A twentieth grant agreement was signed at the beginning of the evaluation period. Grant and CA activities have been initiated under all of the Project-level output categories specified in the Project Agreement and in six general activity sectors. The financial allocations between sectors and activities between regions of Mozambique have been made with the active collaboration of the PVOs.

In many instances, the actual outputs of the various activities undertaken have matched or exceeded the anticipated output objectives in the grant agreements. However, it is difficult to determine whether this is so because the anticipated output objectives were poorly formulated or whether some activities have been more productive than anticipated.

C. Analyzing Progress Towards the Achievement of Project Purpose

This section, and its corresponding number in Part III, Conclusions, addresses the third evaluation objective: "to review the Project purpose and assess the extent to which project inputs and outputs are, or are not, leading to the achievement of the purpose by the project assistance completion date (PACD)." The Project Paper, and specifically the Project LogFrame, did not provide an End of Project Status against which to assess actual progress towards the achievement of the Project purpose and overall impact. As it did for Project outputs, the PP stipulated that quantifiable indicators at the purpose level, and the means for measuring them, would be determined through targets developed for each of the grants financed by the Project. The PP did provide some general indicators at the purpose level and it did discuss the general kind of impact that the Project was intended to achieve. In reviewing the Project purpose we will, as stated in the introductory section of this report, focus at the individual grant outputs level to gain an idea of Project level impact to date. These findings are unfortunately, to a large extent, illustrative at this point in the Project life and should be taken as such. While this is not the most satisfactory means of evaluating Project level objectives, it does immediately provide an indication of the direct people-level impact which the Project is having.

1. Specifying the End of Project Status

The PP defines the Project purpose as: to reduce vulnerability to absolute poverty, induced by the rural insurgency, within targeted population groups in Mozambique. Attainment of this

purpose would contribute to: (i) the achievement of the **Project goal** of improving the food security and well-being among this target group, which directly corresponds to (ii) the **CPSP goal** of ensuring access for all Mozambicans, at all times, to sufficient food for a healthy and productive life; and (iii) to the second **CPSP strategic objective** of reducing dependence on food aid to meet subsistence requirements. The three categories of Project outputs: (i) improved food aid planning and logistics capability; (ii) increased social welfare coverage; and (iii) increased capacity for self-provisioning, all contribute to the achievement of the Project purpose. The following presentation attempts to chart the amplification of the Project purpose over the course of two major amendments to the PP.

a) The Project Paper

The Project Paper indicates that **Project impact** should be seen in terms of the contribution the Project makes to increasing rural employment, production capacity and cash income; and increasing coverage of preventive health care and the availability of basic services among target groups. In this regard, specific activities should be seen to lead EOPS and measurable impacts in the two major output categories as follows:

CATEGORY I: RELIEF EFFORTS

- The result of Project interventions in this area should lead to increased capacity among Mozambicans to manage and provide basic humanitarian assistance to persons most seriously affected by the insurgency. Mozambican institutions in this regard, include the GRM's emergency assistance agency, DPCCN; and local government entities involved in relief efforts at the provincial and district levels. Specific indicators of EOPS identified in the PP include:
 - Increased regularity and timeliness in emergency food aid distribution;
 - Reduced year to year instability in district level food supplies;
 - Improved food aid targeting; and,
 - Increased private sector involvement in the transportation and distribution of emergency supplies.

CATEGORIES II & III: TRANSITION TO REHABILITATION

- ▶ The result of Project interventions in these two categories should have contributed to and facilitated the country's transition from a situation dominated by emergency relief to one in which increased attention is focused on rehabilitation efforts at the individual, family and community levels; and that are more developmental in nature. The principal target group is rural people displaced or severely affected by the insurgency. Specific indicators of EOPS identified in the PP fall into two subcategories:

Improved Availability of Social Welfare Services

- Reduction in growth faltering rates, decreased malnutrition and infant mortality and increased family planning coverage;
- Increased percentage in immunization coverage in target areas;
- Increased percentage in numbers of women able to use ORT in target areas;
- Increased availability of basic services as measured by a higher ratio of latrines and/or clean water per number of families in target areas; and,
- Increased access to rehabilitation from trauma, particularly in the case of children.

Increased Self-provisioning and Productive Capacity

- Increased reliance on local production and markets, rather than emergency food aid, to meet food requirements;
- Increased number of households with cash incomes in target areas;
- Increased number of households with full or part-time wage-earning family members in target areas; and,
- Increased total household agricultural production for own consumption or sale in target areas.

b) Amendment Two

Amendment number two to the PP notes that activities under the Project should have a long-term developmental impact, as well as short-term drought mitigation effects. In addition to target groups rendered vulnerable to absolute poverty due the rural insurgency, the Project has increased targeting to include rural people displaced by the 1991/1992 drought; specifically urban and peri-urban populations, as well as those migrating to government controlled safe zones along the major transportation corridors. Additional activities to be promoted with supplemental funding made available through the amendment included water supply development and sanitation, particularly in selected urban centers; family planning activities; and increased provision of agricultural inputs to replace productive assets lost as a result of the combined effects of the insurgency and drought. Finally, the amendment expanded eligible grant recipients to include indigenous NGOs, while recognizing their still limited institutional capacity. As such, the amendment does make provisions for limited capacity strengthening of Mozambican NGOs insofar as it contributes to their ability to deliver the range of relief and rehabilitation services considered eligible for Project funding.

While no specific EOPS or indicators were presented in this amendment, it clearly stated that the result of interventions undertaken with additional inputs provided by the supplement were

intended to contribute substantially to creating the base for longer term human and physical development. In addition to the EOPS and indicators "reconstructed" in the previous section, the following are added as a result of Amendment Two:

- increased participation of the private sector and voluntary community self-help groups in the provision of water supply and sanitation systems;
- increased participation of Mozambican NGOs in the provision and delivery of relief and rehabilitation assistance to meet human, social welfare and economic needs within a civil society; and,
- a significantly increased availability of potable water points and sanitation facilities in rural and urban areas.

c) Amendment Three

Amendment Three responded to the new opportunities and needs occasioned by the signing of peace accords in October 1992. The purpose of the Amendment was to provide additional funding to support both the peace process and reintegration efforts that the peace made possible. New groups targeted through the amendment included homeward bound populations as follows: (i) roughly 1.5 million returning refugees from camps in six neighboring countries; (ii) some 4.5 million internally displaced by the insurgency and drought and, particularly, those in areas under RENAMO control; and, 200,000 demobilized soldiers and their dependents. Specific vulnerable groups among the returnees identified by this amendment included the elderly, children under five, and female-headed households.

Overall the amendment and new funding it provided would support the Mission's new Transition Program helping to ensure a durable peace and a successful transition to democratic governance. While no EOPS or indicators accompanied Amendment Three, it does imply a significant change in the overall status at the end of the Project, that is, facilitating the longer term process of restoring a rural farm economy through the reintegration of a significantly expanded beneficiary population of the displaced to their former homes of origin and, thus, a more productive and self-reliant way of life. Overall it can be said that the conditions which led to the amplification of the Project and the significant increase in resources which it supported, has, for the first time, laid the foundation for attaining the Project purpose, i.e., from a situation of mitigating the worst and most immediate effects of poverty among a relatively limited population of the internally displaced, to one that provides the opportunity to begin dealing with underlying structural causes of poverty within a context of national reintegration and recovery.

The increased level of funding made available by the amendment concentrates on providing the returnees with basic agricultural inputs necessary to begin the process of self-provisioning on their own land; increasing basic services in agriculture, health care, and education; and the restoration of infrastructure permitting greater access by the targeted beneficiaries to improved services. Additional EOPS indicating achievement of Project purpose resulting from this amendment include:

- Increased access to rural areas (# of tertiary roads and small bridges rehabilitated);
- Increased self-provisioning (reliance on local production) on resettled homesteads (# of ag paks and veg paks distributed to returnees in their homes of origin); and,
- Increased availability of health, agriculture and education services in areas with the largest population of returnees;

2. Progress and Achievements to Date

The Project has progressively expanded target groups and thus numbers of beneficiaries since the signing of the second Project amendment in July 1992. One of the overall problems with trying to determine whether there has been a reduction in absolute poverty within these targeted groups is that no numbers or percentages of the absolute poor to be assisted were ever specified at the PP stage or in subsequent amendments. The second difficulty, identified previously, is in trying to associate Project level impact with the aggregation of grant level outputs and, particularly, given the fact that less than one-quarter of the grants have been completed to date. Finally, attempting to distinguish between causal factors related to Project induced impact and those due to other factors, on the attainment of the Project purpose presents a problem common to all evaluations. Based on the findings portrayed in the preceding section on outputs, and information found in Table 6, below, which provides a summary profile of individual grants and the output categories to which they correspond, we can make the following statements concerning progress and achievements to date:

TABLE 6: PROFILE OF PROJECT-FINANCED GRANT ACTIVITIES

PVO	GRANT #	OUTPUT CATEGORY	DATES/LOP	GRANT AMOUNT
CARE LSU/I	G-SS-013	I	12/01/90-03/22/93 = 28 MO	\$ 3,059,371
CARE Agricultural Recovery	G-00-3047	III	09/01/93-02/28/94 = 05 MO	\$ 484,933
CARI/LSU II	A-00-2037	I	03/26/92-06/30/94 = 30 MO	\$ 4,899,533
CARE Inhambane Wells	G-SS-3029	II	07/01/93-12/31/94 = 18 MO	\$ 867,468
CARE Food Security	G-00-4005	III	11/01/93-04/30/95 = 16 MO	\$ 1,104,843
CARE Manica Water	G-00-3046	II	09/01/93-05/15/94 = 10 MO	\$ 233,861 \$10,460,009
AFRICARE	G-SS-0018	II	07/30/90-12/31/92 = 29 MO	\$ 256,111
AFRICARE	G-00-3022	II	07/01/93-06/30/96 = 36 MO	\$ 2,450,113 \$ 2,706,224
ADRA	G-SS-0017	III	07/31/90-05/31/94 = 46 MO	\$ 1,233,849
ADRA/Chimoio	A-00-4007	II	12/17/93-06/10/94 = 05 MO	\$ 589,532 \$ 1,823,381
AICF	G-00-3048	II	10/01/93-09/30/94 = 12 MO	\$ 618,635
FHI	G-SS-0016	III	07/01/90-06/30/94 = 48 MO	\$ 6,470,108
MCD	G-SS-3011	II	04/30/93-04/01/95 = 24 MO	\$ 1,213,122
MHC	G-SS-3030	II	05/26/92-12/31/94 = 31 MO	\$ 2,040,820
SALESIANS	G-SS-3030	II	11/22/93-09/30/96 = 34 MO	\$ 565,000
SCF/C&W-I	G-SS-2053	II	09/01/91-03/31/93 = 25 MO	\$ 1,820,503
SCF/C&W-II	G-SS-3016	II	04/01/93-03/31/95 = 24 MO	\$ 3,626,205
SCF/GAZA-I	G-SS-0015	II	08/20/90-07/31/94 = 43 MO	\$ 2,823,446
SCF/GAZA-II	G-SS-4017	II	04/01/94-09/30/96 = 30 MO	\$ 3,743,000 \$12,013,154
WRC	G-SS-3003	II	10/16/92-09/30/95 = 36 MO	\$ 2,915,115
WVRD	G-SS-0014	III	07/03/90-09/30/94 = 51 MO	\$ 9,216,960
WVRD/Child Survival	G-00-4006	II	10/01/93-09/30/96 = 36 MO	\$ 2,818,846 \$12,132,075
TOTALS	22 GRANTS	I=2; II=15; III=5	O1=92; O2=93; 11=94; O4=95; O4=96	\$ 53,051,374

Project funded grants, i.e., Project inputs, have addressed stated objectives in each of the three categories of Project outputs with the great majority (17) concentrating on Categories I and II, and the remainder (5) having targeted Category III objectives. In terms of committed grant funding to date, 15 percent (\$8.0 million) has gone to Category I activities; 50 percent to Category II (\$23.0 million); and 35 percent to Category III (\$18.5 million). While it is difficult, if not impossible, to quantify the number of people benefiting from Category I activities, it can

readily be observed that, in a number of areas of Category II and III grant activities, such as the distribution of agricultural inputs (e.g., tools, ag and veg packs) survival kits and immunizations, tens and hundreds of thousands of targeted beneficiaries, i.e., the most vulnerable groups, have been reached by Project interventions.

As the findings presented in the preceding section on Project outputs indicate, grant activities (the flow of Project inputs through CARE) undertaken to address Category I objectives have had a considerable impact on DPPCN capability in food aid planning and logistics, although the conditions under which the CARE grants were made no longer exist and thus throw into question the long-term impact of this activity. What is not easily determined is whether there has been an overall increase in the capacity of local level government agencies to deliver humanitarian assistance as amplified in the later Project amendments. The principal reason for this is that most grants did not specify such an outcome as an EOPS, nor provide a corresponding indicator to measure it. It was, however, evident from discussions with Grantees, as well as a review of their progress reports and evaluations, that a great deal of collaboration has taken place at the subnational level with line ministries and local administrations. As in many other areas, important contributions to Project level impact have gone unnoticed as a result of the initial failure to specify outputs and/or the inadequacy of Grantee reporting.

The overall objective of Category II and III activities has been to facilitate the transition from relief to rehabilitation among Project beneficiaries. As noted above, the great majority of Project inputs (65 percent) have gone to Category I and Category II activities which have been essentially undertaken to address the relief and social welfare needs of target groups. This is not only understandable but justified given the tremendous needs associated first with the insurgency, and later with the drought and reintegration. The massive increase in resources provided by Amendments Two and Three was designed to address the problems resulting from these latter two events. It has only been since the displaced have begun to return to their homes of origin that Category III objectives have had any chance of being obtained, viewed in the longer-term sense of rehabilitation.

The majority of Category III inputs (35 percent of total Project funding) have been used under the setting of the insurgency and drought. While they have mitigated the worst effects of poverty among the vulnerable groups targeted, it is questionable as to whether their impact has had a more long-lasting effect in terms of providing the "pre-condition" for sustained agricultural production and thus self-provisioning. Again, this is to be expected with displaced populations that, in the majority of instances, were not living in their original homes and working their own land. There is little question, however, that Project inputs have had the overall impact of increasing agricultural production and reducing dependence on external food aid under the emergency situation of both the insurgency and the drought ... key Project level EOPS specified in the Project Paper. The problem, as previously discussed, is (i) the number of beneficiaries that were actually reached with Project assistance; and (ii) how many were intended to be reached. The first issue is a result of inadequate reporting at the Grantee level; while the second was the failure to specify EOPS at the Project level. While this may be an outputs level issue, because we have relied on this set of Project objectives, especially at the grants level, it has to be included as a purpose level issue as well.

In terms of the additional EOPS reconstructed from the two Project amendments discussed above, it is not possible to evaluate in any quantitative manner the extent to which they are contributing to the achievement of Project purpose. However, a few notional observations can be made as follows:

AMENDMENT TWO EOPS

- PVOs have engaged private sector firms and promoted the use of community level self-help groups in the provision of water supply and sanitation systems, thus increasing participation of the private and voluntary sectors in areas previously dominated by government;
- There has been minimal involvement of Mozambican NGOs in individual grant activities thus lessening the possibility of increased effectiveness in the use of Project inputs and coverage of target groups in the provision and delivery of relief and rehabilitation assistance as anticipated in Amendment Two; or to meet human, social welfare and economic needs within a civil society; and,
- From individual grantee reports, it is possible to determine that there has been a significant increase in the availability of potable water points and sanitation facilities in rural and particularly urban areas as expected under Amendment number Two.

AMENDMENT THREE EOPS

- As a result of grant-financed rural road rehabilitation activities there has been increased access to rural areas thus providing a precondition for increased access to agricultural inputs and the marketing of saleable agricultural surplus;
- With the significant increase in agricultural inputs made available through Amendment Three, there are signs that increased agricultural production and thus self-provisioning from own sources has taken place among returnees; and,
- The effect of additional Project inputs provided through Amendment Three have been transformed by Grantees into significantly increased outputs expressed in terms of more health, agriculture and education services, including infrastructure, thus increasing their availability in areas with the largest population of returnees.

3. Constraints to Further Progress

The primary condition which has permitted the transition from relief to rehabilitation has been the signing of the Peace Accords and the end of the historic 1991/1992 drought. While natural disasters can be expected (witness Nadia) and coped with, the breakdown of peace and a return to a war setting would seriously inhibit further movement towards a more developmental (rehabilitation) situation among beneficiaries and the country as a whole. In short, with the commencement of the return home of the displaced, the precondition has been achieved for the attainment, on a more sustained basis, of Project purpose.

In practical terms, the principal constraint to the achievement of the Project purpose, is the continued lack of specificity of outputs and EOPS found in both Grant and Project level documentation, as well as, the inadequacy of Grantee reporting on their activities and the targets which do exist. If grant activities cannot be measured, then there is little likelihood of being able to evaluate either the attainment of grant outputs and achievements or their impact on Project level objectives. It is the position of the team that achievements to date, at the grant level are most likely significantly under-reported. There is also a likelihood, albeit at a significantly lower level, of grant and grantee deficiencies being under-reported as well.

Problem

III. EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS

A. Assessing Impact of Project Inputs in the Achievement of Project Outputs

This section attempts to demonstrate the linkage between Project level inputs and the achievement of Project level outputs. This undertaking is done at the most general level in terms of the three general categories of outputs previously discussed. The emphasis is on the input side of the equation without drawing quantitative conclusions about the actual achievement of individual Project output objectives. This latter issue is taken up in the following section on achievement of Project purpose and impact.

1. The Quantity and Quality of USAID Inputs

It is the overall conclusion of the evaluation team that the level of USAID inputs was sufficient to obtain the overall Project objectives of: (i) contributing to the improvement of the food security and well-being of those most seriously affected by the insurgency (goal); (ii) reducing vulnerability to absolute poverty, within targeted population groups (purpose); and (iii) facilitating the transition from emergency relief to rehabilitation (output). This would have been the case, however, for an amount half or even twice what was finally supplied, given that specific targets including EOPS and outputs, were never specified at the Project level. PVOs were assessed in the PP to be able to absorb Grant funding at the level of \$18.0 million over a 45-month Project life. With little additional assessment of this capacity, and after two amendments which extended the PACD by 30 months and increased the PVO Grant Fund by \$65.0 million, it appears that the Project will have been able, in fact, to supply, and that the PVOs will have been able to absorb, a total of \$83.0 million in grant funds in roughly four years. Ultimately, this says less about either the quality or quantity of USAID inputs, than it does about the "perfect elasticity" of PVO demand, and the ability of most of them to "purchase" absorptive capacity using these inputs and ultimately transforming them into outputs for beneficiary groups.

This elasticity has been a positive and necessary factor overall, given the context within which the Project took place and, in fact, reflects a level of demand that would not likely have been met by the combined inputs of all donors currently working in Mozambique. The mass suffering occasioned first by the insurgency and later by the drought required a commensurate response on the supply-side in terms of emergency food relief, the provision of basic services and the restocking of the productive assets of the most affected, vulnerable groups. The peace only increased the numbers of affected groups; it did not substantively or qualitatively change the nature of these essentially relief and rehabilitation needs. The tasks to be undertaken in this regard were essentially logistical and administrative in nature, i.e., the mass distribution of agricultural inputs and reintegration or survival packages; mass immunization campaigns and the provision of water points throughout the country; and the rehabilitation of health, education and transportation infrastructure. With some four-to-six million displaced Mozambicans falling into the vulnerable group and absolute poverty category, any increase in required inputs provided by USAID were likely to be absorbed by PVOs and passed on to final beneficiaries.

PVOs have historically been in the forefront of emergency relief efforts and have a proven track-record in this regard, especially in their ability to maintain accountability over the resources

provided to them by USAID. The kinds of rehabilitation activities which they have been funded to undertake through the PVO Support Project do not qualitatively differ from those that brought PVOs to Mozambique in the first place. The mass distribution of goods and the provision of basic services, are both logistical and administrative tasks, and what the current group of PVO grantees do best. This is not to say that PVOs have been uniformly competent in all of the activities that they have undertaken, as has been detailed above and expanded upon below, but as a general conclusion, it can be said they have performed admirably. USAID/Mozambique's strategy of utilizing PVOs in this fashion, i.e., to facilitate the transition from relief to rehabilitation and thus lay the foundation for longer-term development, can therefore be considered, in general terms to have been successful; and by implication, the quantity and quality of inputs provided can also be said to have been satisfactory to the task at hand, thus contributing to the achievement of overall Project objectives.

a) Appropriateness and Timeliness

The principal category of USAID inputs has been that of the PVO Grant Fund, accounting for over 92 percent of all Project inputs. Within the overall USAID strategy of using PVOs as a means of reaching vulnerable target groups with a range of goods and services, the nature and level of inputs (funding) have been appropriate. PVOs should, thus, be viewed as "intermediaries" being able to transform inputs (funds) into outputs (goods and services) that correspond to beneficiary needs. In this regard, Project inputs have been totally appropriate. Short-term technical assistance, the other major category of inputs, cannot be said to have been either appropriate or inappropriate, because it has hardly been utilized at all. This underutilization can be concluded, however, as having rendered both Project and Grantee management of Project inputs less effective than they should have been.

The timeliness of these inputs has been satisfactory. Significant delays did occur, however, in grant approval due to backlogs at the Regional Contracts Officer level. This should be considered a "normal" aspect of the overall USAID procurement process and, thus, an unavoidable cost of doing business.

b) Adequacy of Remaining Resources through PACD

As previously discussed, the resources remaining for the next 30 months of project life are more than adequate to meet Project needs. Significant funding remains to finance current Project Management needs and to engage at least one additional long-term PMT member. Remaining short-term TA funds are adequate to undertake virtually any types of training and TA interventions that Project Management and/or PVO Grantees may identify between now and the PACD. The PVO Grant Fund, as noted previously, has roughly \$20.0 million in unearmarked funding to date and thus provides the Project with ample resources to finance the number of grants which can be usefully absorbed by PVOs. The issue is thus more one of how the remaining grant funding will be used, rather than whether it is adequate to Project needs.

The larger and more important issue is whether all remaining resources can be expended by the PACD. This primarily relates to the Grant Fund and the individual grants that are financed. Three of the 18 on-going grants have grant assistance completion dates (GACD) of September

30, 1996 and one has a GACD of June 30, 1996. As noted above, there remains over \$20.0 million in grant funding which has not been earmarked or committed. The PMT estimates that it will take at least the remainder of this calendar year to fully obligate and commit these remaining funds through approved Project grants. Assuming a two-year grant life for each of the newly approved grants, it can be anticipated that at least several will exceed the current PACD of September 30, 1996 by three months. Assuming a six-month Project close down period including a final evaluation, it appears the PACD will have to be extended until at least June 30, 1997.

2. Effectiveness of USAID Management Structures and Procedures

Two essential and inter-related conclusions emanate from the findings presented in the preceding sections. The first concerns the overall magnitude of Project funding, especially the PVO Grant Fund, and the impact that this has had at all levels of Project management. And secondly, that the Project Management Team has been severely understaffed and undersupported despite the fact that adequate resources have existed to address this fundamental problem. The connection between the two conclusions is obvious: that obligating grant funding, i.e., getting proposals developed and approved, has been the overriding concern of the PMT in particular, and USAID in general, and has overshadowed all other Project Management responsibilities.

At the same time, it must also be pointed out that the PMT has accomplished a herculean task in keeping the Project on-track, while obligating roughly \$60.0 million in Project grants. The PMT has been universally praised by PVOs and their Mission colleagues alike for establishing and maintaining an open and supportive environment and conducting themselves professionally while, at times, under great stress. This has been no small accomplishment. It must also be pointed out that within the larger context of the USAID Mission to Mozambique, there has been, until just recently, a severe shortage of personnel. This has led to using all available human resources, including those on the PMT, to undertake the full range of management and implementation responsibilities associated with the current Transition Program. While this fact is not intended as a justification for the inability of the PMT to fully discharge the full range of their management responsibilities, the evaluation would be remiss in not taking into account the larger setting, including constraints, under which the Mission, as a whole, has labored under for the past three years.

The following discussion portrays some of the more important areas of Project planning and management that have suffered from understaffing and nearly exclusive focus on the grants administration.

a) **Strategic Planning**

Overall there has been a lack of longer-term thought concerning the direction in which the Project should be heading - an aspect that could easily be rectified over its remaining years. This shows up in the fact that the Project Committee has never prioritized and established those categories of activities which were to be encouraged for funding by the Project at various points during Project implementation. Likewise, selection criteria have never been reviewed for appropriateness or modified given the tremendous changes which have taken place in the larger

and evolving country context and the Mission Transition Program. Both of these points were conditions stipulated in the Project Paper, and the team believes that they were sound requirements then as they are now. Indicative of this problem is the nature of new activities currently being proposed by PVOs and entertained by the Mission.

If, as the team has been told on numerous occasions by Mission staff, the current desire is to promote and place greater emphasis on Category III activities for the remainder of the Project, then the types of PVOs and the range of activities they are proposing do not appear to be consistent with this new direction. Both the American Refugee Committee and the International Refugee Committee represent organizations which have, as their names imply, a very narrow range of interests, primarily in the area of short-term relief. One can also question the follow on grants to both Save the Children and CARE which appear to be financing the same welfare (Category II) type activities as undertaken in their original grants. The Team also had serious reservations about the appropriateness of the follow-on grant to ADRA for the Chimoio Water Supply Project, not necessarily because the need is not there, but because it is inconsistent with established grant criteria, i.e., both its cost and technical complexity, and because ADRA has, to the best of our knowledge, no previous expertise in this area.

This conclusion should not be construed to mean that the great majority of activities which have been undertaken to date have been inappropriate or that the Mission lacks an overall Program strategy. Rather, that with roughly three quarters of grant funding obligated and two-thirds of the project life completed, it is appropriate to reassess the types of activities and PVOs that could best lead to the attainment of Project objectives, expressed, at this point, in terms of the three Project output and activity categories.

b) Internal Grant Review and Approval Process

The Team has some basic concerns with the internal review and approval process as it has been practiced to date. As noted under the findings section, the system in place bears little resemblance to that initially designed and presented in the Project Paper. While modifications do often take place during the implementation phase, there is no indication that the initial process and procedures were ever tested, or that a set of revised procedures, or selection criteria, were ever documented and made known to PVOs, either currently in Mozambique, or those with an expressed interest in participating in the Mozambican recovery. More importantly, it does not appear that the current process provides the most effective means to ensure that the most appropriate activities or best qualified PVOs are selected for funding as envisaged by the PP. This is especially true if, as has been frequently stated, the Mission wants to promote more Category III type activities. Requisite expertise in such areas as on- and off-farm income generating and microenterprise activities and primary cooperative formation for input purchase and produce marketing are not areas in which current PVO grantees are particularly strong.

Two extremely innovative steps have been taken by Project Management to expedite the review and approval process. The first has been the participation of concerned PVOs in Project Committee meetings where their proposals were being reviewed. Permitting PVOs to directly respond to questions about their proposals raised by PC members is not only good management, it is indicative of a participatory approach. This innovation has applicability for other PVO

projects in Africa, either underway or to be designed in the future. The second procedure which the Mission has adopted, albeit on a restricted basis, that has proven to be quite effective, is the Quick Implementing Project (QIP) approval and authorization process. Essentially, the QIP cuts out the need for RCO or RLA approval on smaller scale grants, leaving this responsibility with the Mission Director, and thus saves at least one-to-two months in the overall process. Given the familiarity and confidence that the Mission has gained over the course of the Project with the PVO community here, consideration could be given to using this procedure as a normal rather than exceptional feature of the review and approval process.

c) Grants Management and Grantee Monitoring

One of the primary management areas that has suffered due to the significant time spent on grant review and approval, and the overall lack of PMT staff, has been in the monitoring of grantee performance, grant progress and overall Project impact. The problem will only be partly resolved by the full obligation of remaining grant funds and/or the addition of new PMT staff. The fundamental problem facing the Project as a whole, and which the Evaluation Team has experienced first hand, has been the initial inattention to the need to develop quantifiable outputs, targets and EOPS at the grant proposal stage. The problem has been further compounded by fact that baseline data is collected after grant approval and not prior to proposal development, thus denying the incorporation of data that would both inform proposal development and provide initial indicators for use in developing outputs, EOPS and an overall monitoring and evaluation plan. This is a problem that should be rectified immediately. Secondly, there exist no uniform reporting requirements, and/or, conversely, PVOs have been remiss and avoided complying with them. Thus, even with identifiable and quantifiable targets, PVO reports have been of little utility as a project management tool.

When PMT staff or Mission technical officers make field visits to grantee sites they should be equipped with the latest progress reports and the outputs and EOPS developed for each grant. Visiting grantees in the field for the purpose of monitoring, should be organized around the needs of assessing these activities against established targets and objectives, or the visits will be less useful than they could be. This is particularly important considering the inadequate time that PMT staff have to travel, and their reliance on technical officer visits to their grantees.

d) The Role of Mozambican Institutions

Both the GRM at the national level and indigenous NGOs have had little if any meaningful role in the evolution of Project activities. This is in spite of the change from working through a Memorandum of Understanding to a Project Grant Agreement in the case of the former; and the specific inclusion in Amendment two of indigenous NGOs as partners and potential recipients of Project assistance. While the Mission has provided convincing arguments on both accounts, the Team still feels that less is being done than is indicated by the terms and intent found in core Project documentation. Specifically:

- ▶ While it is acknowledged that the Project is intended to support the GRM's decentralization policy, that GRM institutions are generally weak, and that the Project was not designed to build institutional capacity, this does not argue for denying the GRM's

representative a means to engage USAID on a regular basis in discussions concerning Project progress and problems that may arise during implementation. The Team does not suggest that a decision making role beyond what already exists should be provided to the GRM. Rather, that a normal agenda of periodic meetings, either on a quarterly or semi-annual basis be considered as a way to share information and encourage government support of PVO/NGO activities. Given the relatively bad feelings that exist between GRM agencies and PVOs in particular which the Team encountered through interviews and heard from other parties as well (e.g., PVOs, NGOs and other donors), such proposed meetings might be a way to diffuse tensions. This could become particularly important under the new CPSP in which PVOs and NGOs will continue to play an important role in Mission strategy.

- ▶ There is a lack of rationale to the argument that since so few indigenous NGOs exist, and those that do are so weak, that it does not make sense to work with them. The logic of such "circularity" in thinking would ultimately lead to never working with indigenous NGOs at all under this Project. The current Project strategy of expecting PVOs to either voluntarily partner with NGOs or to oblige partnerships as a precondition to grant funding, has a short and unfavorable history in the rest of Africa. For one, it implies that PVOs have the expertise, not to mention the interest in working with indigenous NGOs. Secondly, the fundamental nature of PVO activities, i.e., mass distribution and provision of goods and services, provides neither time nor a good reason to work with NGOs. The Team also feels as a result of our discussions that there are at least a handful of Mozambican NGOs which could be considered grant worthy and thus worthy of immediate funding. The focus on NGOs does not have to be a major undertaking, but given the tremendous amount of time and funding devoted to U.S. PVOs, and the specificity of Amendment two requirements, there appears no reason to not spend some Project Management time and funding -- more than adequate resources exist -- on local NGOs.

e) Project Management Structure

The overall Project Management structure currently in place, and discussed previously, is in its general form more than adequate to undertake remaining responsibilities and ensure accountability through the PACD, provided certain actions are carried out to reinforce and support the Project Management team. This includes adding one more long-term TA person to the PMT and/or significantly increasing the use of short-term technical assistance. The second requirement would be to integrate technical officers more fully into the grant monitoring process by developing standardized monitoring forms and requirements for use when making site visits to Grantee activities. The Team believes that these two actions would not only reinforce the Project Management Team, but decrease the considerable management burden already placed on other Mission offices by the requirements of this Project. It is also our conclusion that the current structure which assumes overall responsibility for Project implementation is preferable to the proposed alternative of moving grants management responsibility for individual grants out of the Project Management unit to the several technical offices for the following reasons:

- **The Project is greater than the sum of all its component grants. Ensuring the coherence of Project level strategy, priorities and objectives can best be obtained through the core team of professionals which devote full time to the consideration of Project level issues. With direct responsibility for a limited number of grants, the Project loses the possibility for promoting greater integration and synergism of activities that ensures the attainment of Project outputs and EOPS.**
- **It risks breaking the link between Project management performance and overall Project level accountability. By diffusing responsibilities for individual grants management to a number of technical offices in addition to the project management unit, it also diffuses accountability for the overall performance of Project Management.**
- **Current management burdens are already, or soon will be, at maximum capacity for the technical offices. In the Team's discussions with staff from the concerned technical offices, it did not appear that either the time or human resources were available for the added management burden that would result from the additional responsibilities associated with individual grants administration and management. The maxim that a small project is as management intensive as a large one, is one that has particular relevance to this issue.**

3. Validity of Project Design Parameters

To the extent that design parameters were specified in the PP, many of them are no longer valid with the tremendous changes which the Project has undergone since its commencement in 1990. The PP indicated that Project-level targets would be derived from those developed and specified at the individual grant level. This is based on the assumption that the sum total of grant level outputs and EOPS translates into and leads to the achievement of Project level targets and overall impact. While this has been the approach taken by the Evaluation Team it can only be considered a second best solution. The fact is that the sum total, or aggregation, of grant level outputs is at best equal to, but most likely to be less than those specified at the Project level. The leap of faith in equating grant level to project level outputs is a big one, but far less than that required to validate the jump from grant level outputs and achievement to the achievement of Project level purpose and EOPS. In short, Project-level indicators and EOPS need to be developed independent of those developed for each individual grant and then aggregated.

4. The Appropriateness of the Project Strategy & Approach

The Team has concluded that the strategy of employing PVOs to attain Project objectives with the level of resources available has been not only appropriate but the only realistic one given the alternatives. Given the disarray of Mozambique's public sector and the virtual non-existence of a private sector and functioning market economy, international PVOs have been the only mechanism willing and able to undertake the tasks of emergency relief and rehabilitation during the extended period of insurgency, drought and reintegration. Building on their knowledge and expertise gained in relief activities, both in Mozambique and the refugee camps in surrounding countries, was a logical extension when it came to the new rehabilitation needs and opportunities occasioned by the drought and peace.

B. Assessing Progress Made Towards Achievement of Project Outputs¹⁵

Despite the problems encountered when trying to measure progress towards achievement of grant level outputs, as well as attributing aggregated grant level output achievements to Project level output achievement, there has been a sufficient level of activities under Project output Categories II and III to date to provide a notional idea of progress in this regard.

1. Building Indigenous Capacity for Planning, Management and Delivery of Relief Services

It is effectively impossible at this point to judge what progress toward achievement of output objectives was made under the two grants to CARE in support of the logistical operations of the DPCCN because:

- ◆ No anticipated output objectives were specifically stated in either of the grant agreements; and
- ◆ No actual outputs were reported in any of the subsequent documentation on these grants.

What progress reporting is available on these grants relates entirely to progress toward attainment of end-of-project status (EOPS) conditions. These are discussed in Sections II.C and III.C of the report.

Under these circumstances, the evaluation team cannot make a legitimate assessment of whether or not the two project activities contributed significantly to attainment of the Category I output objectives.

2. Facilitating the Transition from Relief to Rehabilitation

One of the conceptual problems with trying to determine whether grant activities financed under the PVO Support Project have "facilitated the transition from emergency relief to rehabilitation" in Mozambique is whether there is a qualitative distinction between relief and rehabilitation, and if so, what are the types of indicators that would demonstrate such movement from the former to the latter. Viewed on a continuum from relief to development, rehabilitation has been defined as being "more developmental" than relief, but not developmental; and that the activities undertaken through the Project would be "laying the foundation for longer-term development. This leads to having to define rehabilitation not only in relation to relief, but in relation to development as well; and whether there is a set of principles and approaches which distinguishes these two from each other. This discussion is not merely an academic exercise. It is necessary for both the present evaluation of the activities and the effect they have had on the progress

¹⁵ As discussed under findings, the information contained in this section, including that found in the several tables which follow, are derived from a review of the 22 grants awarded to date. Ascertaining information was not always straightforward and there is also a likelihood that some outputs were missed along the way. While there are therefore likely to be some errors and omissions, they will be relatively few compared to the mass of information reviewed and therefore not affect the overall validity of conclusions that follow.

towards achievement of Project outputs, and the eventual design of a new PVO project which is supposed to have purely developmental objectives.

The Team has not been able to make any conceptual distinction between relief and rehabilitation. We do, however, make a simple distinction between relief and development and put it in terms of what development is and what relief is not. Development requires and relief does not (i) a high level of beneficiary participation in all phases of activities designed to improve their welfare (ii) the building of indigenous institutional capacity for self-governance in relation to the allocation and management of resources (goods and services); and (iii) sustainability (which is to a large extent a function of the first two requirements) of these activities in terms of being able to cover a significant portion of recurrent and capital costs. In addition, by its very nature, development is a long-term endeavor, concerned with the development of human resources and the building of lasting institutions. Relief on the other hand, is short-term in nature; designed to address the immediate concerns of basic human needs through the mass distribution of goods and the provision of services; requires little or no beneficiary participation in this process; makes no attempt at building individual or institutional capacity; and is not concerned with issues of self-reliance or self-governance.

Looking at the kind of activities undertaken through the PVO Support Project, it can be said that they primarily resemble -- but not exclusively so -- those of relief and in a limited number of cases have introduced elements that are developmental in nature. The vast majority of inputs provided by the Project and transformed by the PVOs into outputs have been the mass distribution of both goods (e.g., ag-paks, veg-paks, reintegration packs) and the provision of basic social welfare services including infrastructure (e.g., immunizations, rehabilitation of health centers and the drilling of boreholes). While there was a degree of participation involved, it was undertaken only insofar that it contributed to the achievement of a specific grant output, (e.g., a hand dug well, the distribution of agricultural inputs) and has not, in most cases, led to the formation of an enduring local institution that ensures sustainability or self-governing capacity.

In practical terms then, what we can say about rehabilitation (and the activities undertaken to facilitate its achievement), is that it is probably more developmental than relief and, while it may, in fact, be laying the foundation for development, it could just as easily be continuing the dependence on relief. What can definitely be said, however, is that without the activities being carried out by PVOs under the Project there would have been continued and widespread suffering, and that there would have been no opportunity, whatsoever, for longer-term development to have taken place. In these terms, and with this rather facile definition of rehabilitation, i.e., in terms of relief and development, there has in fact been a transition from relief towards development. In a future project, however, we would suggest that the conceptual framework of a relief to development continuum be abandoned in favor of either relief or development. A final point to note is that the degree to which activities have, in fact, promoted the transition from relief to rehabilitation have been, to a large degree, a function of the particular understanding and approach of development which a given PVO grantee has put into practice.

3. Grant Contributions Towards Project Output Objectives

In this sub-section, an attempt is made to directly and objectively assess the progress toward Project-level output objectives by comparing the cumulative anticipated output objectives stated in quantitative terms as drawn from the various grant agreements with the cumulative actual grant outputs as reported to the USAID Mission subsequent to the signing of the agreements. Due to the evident deficiencies in clearly and quantitatively stating anticipated output objectives in many of the earlier grant agreements, and the continuing problems with getting some PVOs to produce comprehensive quantitative reporting of actual grant outputs, it must be admitted that the exercise has been a frustrating, tedious and largely unsatisfactory one for the evaluation team. The comparison results, which are necessarily partial, are reported below by sector.

a) **Social Welfare Activities**

TABLE 7: PLANNED VERSUS ACTUAL OUTPUTS TO DATE IN HEALTH

Output Indicator	Anticipated Outputs	Actual Outputs to Date
Health posts rehabilitated and operational	13	22
Latrines constructed and in use	1,120	4,676
Community facilitators, mobilizers and animators trained	115	81
Government health staff trained	6 to 8	32
Community volunteers trained	Indeterminate	173
Seminars and workshops on health topics conducted	Many	Many
Mosquito nets distributed	3,000	0
Village clean-up campaigns organized	6	0
Monthly prenatal visits to pregnant women	Indeterminate	Large number of consultations
Growth monitoring programs organized	Several	Several
Pilot nutritional educational program developed and implemented in three Machaze District towns	1	1
Community Immunization Tracking System organized in Manica Province	1	1
Children vaccinated	1,000 per year	76,220
Health campaigns and community education programs on diarrheal disease control	Many	Many
Baseline maternal and child health surveys conducted	Several	Several
EPI "Missed" Opportunity Study conducted	1	1
Technical studies conducted.	Many	Many

Of the eight health grants, two were completed on 31 March 1994. Two more grants are scheduled to end on 30 September 1994. And, the remaining grants will end in 1995 (2) and 1996 (2). Substantial progress appears to have been made in attaining health output objectives.

TABLE 8: WATER AND SANITATION: PLANNED VERSUS ACTUAL OUTPUTS

Output Indicator	Anticipated Outputs	Actual Outputs to Date
Shallow wells constructed, rehabilitated and/or equipped	325	78
Boreholes constructed, rehabilitated and/or equipped	318	108
Water cisterns constructed or rehabilitated	500	1,000
Water standpipes constructed or rehabilitated	50	0
Well/borehole drilling team and mechanics trained	3 and 13	4
Other types of workers trained	32	0
Villagers trained in basic water and hygiene	5,000	3,000 to 4,000
Village water user committees organized	805	38
Well/borehole caretakers trained	500	171
Water user-fee systems for wells and boreholes functioning	90	0
Baseline surveys completed	8	7
Technical studies completed	Several	Several
Water quality monitoring system installed	1	0
Tender documents for reconstruction of the Chimoio water supply system completed	1	0

Of the nine water and sanitation grants or grant elements, one ended on 31 December 1992. Three other grants ended in February and March 1994. A fifth grant is scheduled to end on 31 December 1994. The four remaining grants are to end between April 1, 1995 and June 30, 1996.

As can be seen in the above table, progress toward the anticipated output objectives has been quite variable, ranging from considerable over-achievement in one category to no performance as yet in several others. The cumulative anticipated output objectives are to a large extent distorted by the original statements submitted by AFRICARE for its second water grant. This grant agreement statement is now viewed by AFRICARE as unrealistic and it is reported that more modest output objectives are now being negotiated with USAID.

TABLE 9: CHILDREN AND WAR: PLANNED VERSUS ACTUAL OUTPUTS

Output Indicator	Anticipated Outputs	Actual Outputs to Date
Unaccompanied children registered	30,000	25,800
Children reunited with families	25,000	8,867
Follow-up assistance for reunited children	15,000	4 per month under Phase II
Former child soldiers assisted	5,000	16 persons/month under Phase II
Demobilized soldier receiving skill training and follow-up assistance	2,000	28 under Phase II
Children participated in job and life skills training	1,000	22
Traumatized children received community-based interventions	20,000	35,831
Organizationally-autonomous and operational Mozambican NGO created and trained	1	N/A
Formal community associations created and registered with the government	5 to 10	
Mozambican interns trained	20	
Volunteers working in networks/Volunteers trained	40,000	1,722
Salesian Mission orphanage repaired	1	
Basic social services provided to orphaned or abandoned boys aged 11 to 15 years	80	8

According to USAID records, the SCF Children and War Project - Phase I was completed on 2/28/1993 and Phase II will reach its authorized grant activity completion date on 31 March 1995. Present reported outputs do not indicate that all of the anticipated outputs objectives will be attained by that date.

The Salesian Mission Project had an effective starting date of 22 November 1993 and is scheduled to complete activities by 30 September 1996.

b) Self-Provisioning Activities

TABLE 10: AGRICULTURAL RECOVERY: PLANNED VERSUS ACTUAL OUTPUTS

Output Indicator	Anticipated Outputs	Actual Outputs to Date
Ag-paks and veg-paks distributed to farmers	72,000	Reported outputs are extremely confused. 6,000 ag-paks distributed in 1990/1991. 40,000 ag-paks and 30,000 veg-paks distributed in 1992/1993. 120,000 ag-paks and 30,000 veg-paks distributed in 1993/1994. 60,000 ag-paks and 80,000 veg-paks purchased for distribution in 1994/1995. In addition, one grantee reported providing seeds, hand tools, domestic utensils and food packages to 19,500 families. Forty oxen for animal traction activities also distributed. One grantee reported distributing 1,322 metric tons of "traditional" crop seeds and 1,571 kilograms of vegetable seed. Finally, four fruit tree nurseries were established and 11,416 fruit tree seedlings distributed.
Hand tools distributed to farmers	7,500	One grantee reported 116,000 tool-paks distributed in 1993/1994. Another reported distribution of 2,500 hand sickles, 5,700 watering cans, and 130,000 hoes and axes. A third reported 5,407 hand tools distributed. 6,400 hoes were distributed in Machaze District. Finally, 10,000 "survival kits" were distributed.
Meters of road rehabilitated	200	No road rehabilitation reported.
Number of farmers with improved access to extension training	6,000	11,411 farmers with improved access to extension training.
Number of extension workers trained	15 to 25	115 extension supervisors and agents trained.
Number of technical studies completed	2	2 studies completed.
Number of small scale vegetable oil production businesses operating without direct subsidy	10	None reported.
Small ruminant production pilot activities functioning	2	None reported.

According to USAID grant records, three of the agricultural recovery grant activities have been completed. The fourth and fifth grants are to reach their grant activity completion dates on June 30, 1994 and September 30, 1994, respectively. And, only one grant, which has just being initiated, is to continue until 1996.

The cumulative outputs of the six grants have equalled or exceeded most output objectives. One suspects that this performance record is the partial result of the under-recording the anticipated outputs in the grant agreements.

**TABLE 11: EDUCATION & VOCATIONAL SKILLS TRAINING:
PLANNED VERSUS ACTUAL**

Output Indicator	Anticipated Outputs	Actual Outputs to Date
Skill training provided to orphans and abandoned boys at the Salesian Mission	80	0
Skill training provided to youth from the communities surrounding the Salesian Mission	60 in first year, 75 in second year, and 100 in the third year (targeting young girls)	36 youths observed in two classes of whom 12 to 14 were females
Skill training center rehabilitated at the Salesian Mission	1	0
Primary schools rehabilitated and operational	9	11
Public structures rehabilitated for community purposes	7	0

The SCF Gaza grant - Phase I, reached its grant activity completion date on March 31, 1994. The Salesian Mission grant was initiated in November 1993 and is scheduled to end on September 30, 1996. The first grant achieved more than the stated output objective with respect to primary school rehabilitation but to date has reported no progress on the rehabilitation of public structures. The second grant has twenty-nine months remaining to achieve its objectives.

The general conclusion of the Evaluation Team is that PVO Grantee activities have contributed to the attainment of the Project-level output objectives. However, the degrees of attainment by category or within sectors are impossible to determine objectively based upon the existing Project documentation and our interviews with Grantee and Cooperative Agreement recipients. This is so primarily because the anticipated output objectives were not stated precisely and quantitatively in many of the agreements and, consequently, they do not constitute a comprehensive basis against which actual outputs can be measured.

The Project's monitoring system for PVO grant activities has, unfortunately, not produced accurate and cumulative statements of actual outputs despite the frequent reports demanded of the PVOs as Grantees and Cooperators. In this regard, both the USAID Mission and the PVOs have done themselves a considerable disservice in that many of the activities appear to have contributed significantly to the transition from relief to rehabilitation of Mozambicans but their outputs have not been recorded in a systematic and coherent manner.

4. PVO Absorptive Capacity and Contribution Towards Project Outputs

Conclusions regarding PVO operational sustainability, grant activity sustainability, USAID collaboration with PVOs and the GRM, USAID/PVO Involvement with Mozambican institutions, including NGOs, PVO collaboration with beneficiaries, PVO-GRM collaboration, gender issues, effects of import restrictions on mobilization of resources, delays in grant awards are covered below under Section III.D Specific Issues and Requirements. Comments here are restricted primarily to the need for improvements in Grantee implementation planning, improving grant monitoring and financial management.

(a) Improving PVO Implementation Planning

Neither PVOs nor the USAID project managers are taking full advantage of annual workplan preparation for planning purposes to measure project progress toward meeting objectives. Frequent project amendments, incremental funding and excessive reporting are management intensive for both PVOs and USAID and not conducive to more strategic thinking.

(b) Improving Project Monitoring

The absence of standardization in proposal preparation and grants with insufficient attention to selecting appropriate and quantifiable outputs and EOPS have resulted in serious information lacunae in PVO proposals and grants which subsequently affect the ability of evaluators and project managers to measure grant achievements. The lack of standardization in reporting, the absence of cumulative output and EOPS against total outputs and EOPS, and insufficient attention by PVOs to presenting quantified data, makes it extremely difficult for PVO and USAID Project Managers to track grant progress. In this regard, several specific conclusions are drawn:

- Gender disaggregated data is needed to ensure that gender bias is being avoided in PVO grant activities.
- USAID should ensure that PVO matching contributions are being made as specified in their grants.

(c) Financial Management

PVO financial management capacity appears adequate, however USAID Controller's office oversight and assistance requires a commitment of two persons working full-time on the PVO Support Project.

5. Appropriateness of PVO Rehabilitation Strategies and Approaches

Within the context of the categories and instructions laid down by USAID for PVO Support Project activities, the evaluation team believes that all grant activities undertaken to date are appropriate. Even though the individual grants represent a wide range of people-level activities (e.g., water and sanitation, preventive health activities, skills training for orphans affected by war, production of tender documents for a municipal water system) at widely dispersed sites in Mozambique, each of them does fit under at least one of the defined activity categories set down by USAID and the Government of Mozambique in the Project Grant Agreement, and its several amendments. A number of the grants address output objectives under two of the defined categories.

C. Assessing Progress Made Towards Achievement of Project Purpose

The following assessment is based on information gained from the two previous sections reviewing inputs and outputs, i.e., the extent to which they have led to the achievement of Project purpose. Perspective needs to be maintained in this regard. The farther away this evaluation gets

from the factual content of Project findings, and even the conclusions presented at the inputs and outputs level, the more subjective it has become. This follows from the facts that (i) less than one-quarter of the 22 individual grants upon which evaluation findings are based, have been completed to date; and (ii) the lack of specificity in defining output targets and inadequacy of Grantee reporting previously reported. This said, the following conclusions, dealing with Project level achievement of purpose is considered generally consistent with direction of overall evaluation findings.

1. As a Result of USAID Project Inputs and Management

a) **Project Purpose and Strategy**

The overall response in terms of inputs made available by the Mission to the needs and opportunities presented by the both initial Project context and that which rapidly evolved over the course of the next two years was appropriate and consistent with the Project purpose. As was noted under the preceding section on input conclusions, the elasticity of beneficiary demand (suffering) under the conditions which the Project has operated, has been of such magnitude, that the USAID response, however great it has ultimately turned out to be, could never have hoped to meet this demand to begin with. What is important to keep in perspective, however, is that there has never been a USAID response of the magnitude of the PVO Support Project undertaken anywhere in Africa except in what are today called "failed states." In this larger sense, the Project has contributed to keeping Mozambique within the larger community of viable nation states ... a significant accomplishment in and of itself.

The Project has had a significant impact to date in mitigating the worst effects of, and decreasing vulnerability to, absolute poverty on target groups both specified in the Project Paper and those later included and significantly amplified under Amendments Two and Three. In addition, the Project has contributed to the initial CPSP goal and second strategic objective, as well as to the overall objectives of the new Transition Program. The issue which has been repeatedly noted in this report, has been in trying to determine the magnitude of this contribution (impact) given the massive level of resources (inputs) provided. Trying to make this determination through an extensive examination of the 22 grants funded to date has not only been unsatisfying as a methodology, it has surely underestimated the number of beneficiaries and people level impact that the Project has actually had to date.

It has only been in the last year that the Project has been able to begin addressing the underlying, structural causes of absolute poverty and, thus, begin the transition from a purely relief program and reactive strategy to a longer-term, more developmental and proactive approach to poverty alleviation. This, of course, has had nothing to do with the nature of the inputs provided or the strategy undertaken by the Mission; rather it has been the result of the context in which the Project was conceived and later evolved. With peace and an increased degree of stability achieved since late 1992, the remaining years of the Project can be more fully focused on approaches and strategies which promote the increased movement towards a developmental program, if not the specific objectives to which Category III funding was to be directed. The challenge which thus faces the Mission at this point is making a commitment to taking sufficient

time to reflect on the new conditions which have been obtained, and to decide how remaining funds can best advance the Project's transition strategy.

The overall Project strategy of employing PVOs as the means to achieve Project purpose has also proven to be appropriate to the setting in which the Project has taken place. PVOs have a proven track-record in emergency relief and rehabilitation throughout the world in general, and in the Mozambican situation in particular. Taking advantage of their expertise and voluntary spirit or mission, was not only expedient given the lack of viable alternatives, but builds on and promotes the long tradition of humanitarian assistance provided through the American private and voluntary sector. It should be clear, however, that the capacity of PVO Grantees to undertake the activities financed by the Project, has, to a large extent, been a function of being able to acquire it through the same Project funding. In this light, the magnitude of their operations, including the expatriate intensive management and technical staffing patterns are unsustainable without continued USAID funding. In short, while the strategy of employing PVOs under the current conditions of short-term relief and rehabilitation has been appropriate, it would not seem to be in a program promoting longer-term development.

b) USAID Project Management

The overall conclusion of the Team is that management of the Project, including the Project Management Team and other concerned Mission Offices, has been a contributing factor to the achievement of the Project purpose, in terms of the quality and professionalism of the Officers involved, and particularly the Project Management Team. This is not to say that its understaffing and the virtual exclusion of all other management tasks except those related to grants administration have not led to a number of significant problems ... the most noticeable being the inability to adequately assess Project progress to date. This problem, as discussed elsewhere, can be addressed with little lasting effect on the Project if the time and resources, i.e., additional long-term staff and/or short-term technical assistance, necessary to remedy it are brought to bear.

While Project Management, including its structures, systems and procedures has changed substantially from those initially established in the Project Paper, there has not been a corresponding documenting of these changes, nor sufficient communication to other possible grant recipients not resident in Mozambique. This assumes that the Mission would be interested, during the remainder of the Project, in entertaining proposals from other PVOs. In this regard, the Team does believe that it would be in the best interests of the Project to solicit interest from other PVOs which have a different expertise than those currently receiving Project funding. This would include Category Three type activities and experience in working with indigenous NGOs.

2. As a Result of PVO Grant Activities and Performance

a) PVO and Grant Effectiveness

Overall it can be said that PVO Grantees have performed competently and professionally in the management and execution of their grant activities. It has not been an inexpensive undertaking, but largely warranted under the set of circumstances which has defined the Project context over the past three years. From the logistical point of view, both poor transportation infrastructure and

the dangers associated with mined roads, raised individual grant costs considerably and were a major factor in the delays associated with grant start-up and implementation. Compared to other countries, the large number of expatriates required under each grant would seem excessive, but in the Mozambique context appears to be entirely the norm. There are simply too few Mozambicans with the skills and expertise required to manage large scale relief and rehabilitation efforts. This is particularly true for the requirements of accountability that each of the grants necessitated considering the tremendous volume of goods which were transferred from PVOs to final beneficiaries. Finally, working with the poor who are socially marginalized and geographically isolated in the best of circumstances, has always been an expensive proposition to begin with, and one which has traditionally been left to PVOs to tackle within the hierarchy of donor organizations. This has been the primary reason why PVO programs have often been criticized for being costly. In general, the Team believes that PVOs and their grant activities have been effectively managed and that this has contributed to the achievement of the Project purpose.

b) Comparative Advantage

"What is it that PVOs do best" is one way to phrase the issue of their comparative advantage vis-a-vis other actors, public and private, indigenous and foreign, in the relief to development continuum. What we can conclude based on the results of the PVO Support Project to date is the following. First, the types of PVOs operating in Mozambique are but a subset of the larger international PVO community. Virtually all those represented here and receiving grants are "operational" PVOs which have traditionally developed and implemented their own programs with a considerable amount of private financing. Their origins date back some 40-to-50 years to relief and rehabilitation activities in Europe following the War, and quickly adapted to similar needs in the post-colonial era. They have gradually moved from relief to social welfare and most recently into development. Secondly, their programs have been multi-sectoral in this regard, responding to the many needs of their clients, primarily the poor. They have, however, always maintained a relief capability, and Mozambique has offered them an opportunity not only to re-enter this area, but to gain an operational presence in Mozambique as well. Finally, from this "toe-hold" they have become well positioned to move into the country's developmental era vis-a-vis other PVOs whose expertise is limited to a specific technical area, as well as indigenous institutions in both the public and non-governmental sectors. This advantage is further pronounced by the high cost of starting up a program in the case of these other PVOs and the weak institutional capacity of most indigenous organizations.

A particularly important point to note as regards the programs of PVO Grantees in Mozambique, is their multi-sectoral scope and attempts at integrated area-based coverage. Most of these Grantees undertake activities in at least two sectoral fields in addition to emergency food assistance in relatively extensive program areas. This directly responds to the fundamental relief and rehabilitation needs of their client groups. This approach seems to have been effective under the context of the past four years. However, as USAID and other donors have learned over the past three development decades, externally-financed and managed "integrated rural development" programs have a mixed result at best, and there is not reason to believe that PVO programs will demonstrate any different experience as they move out of relief and into development.

What the current array of PVO Grantees have demonstrated is their tremendous voluntary spirit and their exceptional administrative and logistical capacity. In a relief and rehabilitation situation these are highly sought after and appreciated skills and qualities. They do not, however, necessarily translate into characteristics which are consonant with a more developmental program that aims at tackling the causes rather than the symptoms of poverty. This can be applied to either the current Project purpose which seeks to make this transition from strictly relief to a more developmentally-oriented strategy of rehabilitation; or to a follow-on project which is likely to be entirely developmental in purpose.

c) Collaborative Development

A major issue which has heretofore not been addressed in this report is the extent to which the Project supported either PVO programs or USAID strategy. It is an important one not only for this evaluation, but also for a future follow-on project. It also has a great deal of relevance in the larger context of USAID's overall sustainable development strategy, and the role it posits for PVOs in its implementation. Answering the first question should throw light on the second.

In 1990 the Mission found itself in the midst of a situation that did not call for having a comprehensive program strategy, although there was the recently developed CPSP which addressed the most pressing problems of the time. Relieving the terrible suffering and misery of the largely civilian population that resulted from a brutal civil war, was significant rationale for its emergency relief program and the slightly broader aims of the PVO Support Project. PVOs were invited to Mozambique by the GRM to participate in emergency relief activities, and USAID encouraged them to become involved in the PVO Support Project. Since the Project strategy was essentially built around the PVO presence here, there was not, in principle, a conflict between what USAID wanted and what the PVOs were prepared to undertake. What the Team found during the course of the evaluation was that a high degree of collaboration has taken place both in the development of individual grant activities and later in grant implementation. Both sides have been unusually complimentary of the other given the historical tendencies of PVOs to demand, by right, unlimited independence in their programs, as contrasted with USAID's desire for absolute control over funding that comes from its own program resources. It is likely that the conditions that have defined the Mozambique context these past four years were highly unique, not to be replicated here or elsewhere, and should be treasured above all else.

The Mission is in the process of developing a new CPSP that will address the opportunities and challenges of an entirely new context, including a multi-party democratic system and a post-emergency, developmental setting. It is also about to begin the design of a new PVO project that will be consistent with the larger Program strategy. In principle, PVOs will no longer be the sole player within this new strategy, which will effectively change the nature of the relationship which has existed to date. The issue of whose program will be supported in this new context will become a much more prominent feature of the new relationship in this changed context. While the Mission will still want PVO participation in its new programs, it will be and should be looking for those organizations which have the set of skills and expertise which are consistent with the new activities that will support the overall program. The current group of PVOs will not only have this larger future issue to deal with, but will also have to come to terms with the more immediate concern of how to down or "right-size" their current programs with the coming

to term of the PVO Support Project. Both circumstances are likely to be somewhat traumatic for these PVOs and are likely to generate a certain degree of friction unless certain steps are taken now by the Mission to ease the situation. The Team believes that it would be useful if the Mission facilitated a process of strategic planning with PVOs in which they begin planning now for the end of their grants and their future role in a new project.

3. Unexpected Results

The PVO Support Project has demonstrated a capacity for adaptation and flexibility that no one could have anticipated when it was originally designed in 1990. This is primarily due to the fact that no one could have anticipated either the extent of the drought of 1991/1992 or the dream of peace that was achieved in October 1992. As the Mission's principal operational project throughout the last four years, it has provided the Mission with a capacity to respond to a wide set of needs and opportunities that no other mechanism was able to. Thus, change has been the driving force and characteristic of the Project. While the overall result has been favorable, there have been aspects which have detracted from the Projects overall success to date. Principal among them, are (i) the inability to adequately evaluate Project progress, achievements and impact; and (ii) the funding of several activities which, with additional time for analysis, are not consistent with either the objectives of the Project or the capabilities of the PVOs implementing them.

It is hard not to view PVO grant recipients as direct and major beneficiaries of Project assistance. At least 25 percent of all grant funding went to cover the direct and indirect costs of PVO grantees. Project funding permitted them to remain in Mozambique well after the emergency situation had abated and positions them for further funding in a developmental context.

D. Specific Issues and Requirements

The evaluation SOW listed nine requirements that were to be addressed in this mid-term evaluation if the four overall objectives are to be satisfactorily answered. Many of these specific requirements have been dealt with in discussions under previous sections reviewing Project inputs, outputs and purpose. There were, however, several issues and requirements which either have not been covered, or only marginally so. This section ensures full compliance with the SOW.

1. Coordinated PVO/NGO Development Strategic Plan

Most of the PVO interventions under the Project have been provided to beneficiaries with little or no costs attached. The longer goods and services are provided at no cost to beneficiaries, the more difficult it becomes to move away from dependency to self-reliance. These types of PVO interventions are not sustainable over the long-term; donor/PVO resources cannot continue indefinitely to support large dependent populations. Further, even where donors/PVOs serve effectively as catalysts in building local systems which are self-sustaining, their continuing presence contributes to a form of dependency which undermines the process of governance as professionals abandon national and local governance structures to work at higher salaries for donors and PVOs. Thus a strategic plan for the use of PVOs must stress the importance of

developing local capacity for self-governance as quickly as possible, so that the distortions to local economies and governance systems caused by donor/PVO presence do not result in permanently dysfunctional systems. While this may not be totally feasible under the current situation of relief and rehabilitation, consideration can be given in future grants in terms of ways to promote Category III objectives more sustainably.

The use of PVOs/NGOs in Mozambican development must necessarily support an overall development strategy as defined under the Mission's CPSP. There are many development activities for which PVOs have unique capabilities, but there are others which would be best made part of longer-term bilateral activities which cannot normally be carried out under short-duration grants or with low-cost technical skills. PVOs and NGOs (both local and international), USAID, other donors and the GRM would benefit from developing sector-by-sector strategies for PVO/NGO involvement in Mozambique. Given the Mission's interest in a possible follow-on to the PVO Support Project it would be beneficial to develop sectoral strategies which support CPSP preparation and implementation and ultimately define the role that PVOs/NGOs will play in this Program.

2. Sustainability

a) PVO Operational Sustainability

Because the scale of PVO activities in Mozambique is without precedent, it seems likely that, although some of the current international PVOs working in Mozambique may be sustained for an indefinite period at roughly current levels of activity, the aggregate total of international PVO activities will tend to decline over the next few years. PVO activities in Mozambique are not sustainable without continued donor support. That support should be conditioned by the role PVOs may play in supporting the Mission CPSP and the objectives of a coordinated PVO/NGO development strategic plan for Mozambique. Certain types of PVOs, i.e. those which fund and/or support activities undertaken by indigenous NGOs, are not likely to decline. Other types, i.e. those which are large-scale implementors of donor funded relief activities, are almost certainly unsustainable at current levels.

The following factors will greatly influence operational sustainability of international PVOs in Mozambique over the next five years:

- ▶ Those PVOs willing and able to shift from relief programs to development activities will fare best. Not all PVOs are interested in making this shift and some who are interested will no doubt be unable to do so. In short, just because a PVO has an on-going program, should not automatically qualify it for future participation in USAID's new program strategy.
- ▶ Those PVOs with a diverse funding base, specifically including "own source" contributions, bilateral and multi-lateral funding, are more likely to be sustained. Church sponsorship and use of "child sponsorship" as a solicitation mechanism are important sources of PVO support, which tend to sustain own source revenues.

- ▶ Well established collaborative relationships with the GRM and, perhaps, local NGOs will enhance operational sustainability. This will be a function of how PVOs define their future role in a developmental as opposed to relief context.
- ▶ Those PVOs able to recruit and retain highly qualified technical and managerial staff, both expatriate and national, will be more sustainable in a post-relief environment.
- ▶ USAID may be able to enhance PVO operational sustainability by encouraging and facilitating the entry into Mozambique of an increased number of international PVOs with significant prior experience in development (as distinct from relief) experience.

b) Grant Activity Sustainability

Historically the PVOs operating in Mozambique have demonstrated considerable logistical expertise in emergency relief and rehabilitation, including distribution of food, tools, seeds, construction of wells and catchments, immunization, ORT, and in provision of basic health care services. Many of these activities have unsustainable recurrent costs and also increase dependency the longer they are continued.

To begin more development-oriented efforts will require building sustainable local governance capacity while simultaneously providing the training and education of local organizations and communities in those technologies which will lead to self-reliance. These skills have not been given emphasis by the PVOs currently operating in Mozambique because up until the signing of the General Peace Accord in 1992 the primary thrust of the Project was to support relief and rehabilitation. PVOs operating through the emergency period have been highly effective in supporting these efforts. To do so they have relied heavily on purchasing capacity in the form of skilled logistical personnel. The results have been impressive; relief and rehabilitation is often what PVOs do best.

Yet, to build sustainable local governance/capacity and to provide the necessary training and education in technologies for self-betterment will require a move away from logistics¹⁶ to different kinds of development skills. This implies that other types of PVOs/NGOs should be encouraged to participate under the PVO Support project during its remaining life, as well as under a possible follow-on project; PVOs which have demonstrated capability in areas such as: enterprise development, rural credit (especially for women), AIDS/STD/family planning, local governance and tourism/parks/natural resource management.

In general those PVOs that are concentrating on developing capacity at the village and community level are engaged in activities which do not show the immediate results associated with direct interventions, such as number of wells rehabilitated, water tanks constructed, roads cleared, health posts constructed or vaccinations administered (e.g. World Vision activities in

¹⁶ Indicative of the lack technical capacity to undertake development activities and the heavy reliance on logistic personnel for project management, are the number of international NGOs or PVOs undertaking forms of integrated rural development in Mozambique, an approach tried for over 30 years with very limited success.

health show more immediate outputs than those of SCF, yet over the long-term SCF's Xai Xai focus on building village/community knowledge and capacity in the health sector may have a more lasting development effect).

The desire to show immediate results in some cases seems to drive not only the grant activities, but also the performance of expatriate advisors. Just as grant performance tends to be measured by immediate and tangible outputs, so is the performance of an expatriate project manager by the home office. This focus on immediate results causes a shift away from slower collaborative, capacity building approaches to development. "Getting the job done" becomes the driving force for many PVO activities, rather than educating, advising and building the capacity of local communities, indigenous NGOs, GRM counterparts, or even the PVOs' own Mozambican staff. The demand for immediate outputs also affects their quality. For example, PRONAR engineers at the national level complain that the rush to achieve outputs is resulting in technical errors in water development, including faulty installation of pumping systems. The combined effect on many PVO projects is that very few activities have had long-term sustainability.

In summary, relief activities should be continued only as long as they are absolutely necessary. The scale and duration of relief activities in Mozambique may already have compromised the potential impact of international PVOs as fomenters of sustainable development activities, in that the rural populace has become accustomed to receiving free goods rather than actively participating in production. Keeping the above caveats in mind, the following factors will influence grant activity sustainability:

- ▶ Activities in which recurrent costs are recovered from domestic sources will tend to be more sustainable than others.
- ▶ For true public goods and goods with large externalities, established cooperative relationships with local government agencies and, in theory, NGOs will enhance sustainability.
- ▶ Due to the extreme shortage of trained human resources in Mozambique, an emphasis on provision of training, education and human resource development will increase sustainability.
- ▶ Activities which are implemented in a manner designed to encourage local organizational/institutional capacity for self-governance will be more sustainable.
- ▶ Adaptation to local variations in cultural and economic circumstances will enhance sustainability. Examples of such circumstances include local languages, literacy levels and gender defined social roles.

c) PVO Collaboration with Beneficiaries

PVO collaboration with beneficiaries is a complex subject that should be treated in a more disaggregated manner than we are able to do here. However, running the risk of oversimplification, it is our impression that collaboration with beneficiaries has been reasonably good

in health activities, somewhat less satisfactory in agricultural work, and is, in some senses, untested in water supply. The maternal and child health/child survival activities have been relatively effective in reaching significant proportions of their respective target groups. They have imparted significant health information and training to MOH staff, community health workers, village health committees, and large groups of beneficiaries. The health activities have been particularly good, relative to agriculture and water supply, in adapting health related messages to local languages, literacy levels and gender defined social roles. In many cases, the impacts of PVO health activities have been clearly visible in post-activity KAP surveys. We take the effectiveness of these activities as evidence of "collaboration" with beneficiaries in the limited sense that those implementing the health activities seem to have a functional knowledge of the communities in which they work.

Although some outstanding work has been done in agriculture by PVOs (World Vision and Food for the Hungry are cases in point), these efforts have not, to this point in time, been particularly collaborative. In the World Vision case, the variety trials research is the leading edge of the work, with comparatively little emphasis on understanding traditional farming systems, rural household income strategies and other relevant social structures. Extension activities are only tentatively supported. The Food for the Hungry activities give relatively more weight to extension and can demonstrate that farmers who follow their advice achieve substantial improvements in production, but they are reaching, relative to health activities, a limited number and percentage of their intended beneficiaries. Neither World Vision nor FHI have been particularly sensitive to adapting their messages to local languages, literacy levels and gender defined social roles.

Collaboration is relatively untested in the water supply work in the sense that PVOs can do little more than report the creation of village water committees as required under the terms of their grants. The grants do not require the PVOs to assist, or monitor, the functioning of these committees for any defined post-installation period. It isn't clear that these committees have any meaningful tasks or autonomy in decision-making, since formal responsibility for maintenance of pumps lies with Agua Rural.

There are few examples in the activities of the PVO Support Project where evidence of the active participation of intended beneficiaries in determining program activities is seen. Participation in the more active sense intended by the phrase "participative development" is simply not necessary and not easily elicited in welfare enhancing activities in which goods and services are provided free of charge.

d) PVO - GRM Collaboration

Donors and PVOs/International NGOs not only draw away Mozambican professionals from the GRM with higher salaries, the multiplicity of donor programs and projects stretches to the limit the capacity of the few competent professionals who remain in government service. PVOs must be sensitive to the implications of their continuing presence in Mozambique on the GRM's ability to build capacity for governance, and the dependency created by continued donor and PVO support. The presence of readily accessible donor and PVO resources may become an irresistible inducement for GRM officials and others to divert resources from their intended uses, creating

ingrained society-wide patterns of malfeasance and inefficiency with deleterious effects on future development efforts.

PVO - GRM collaboration mirrors the "sectoral" collaboration described above among PVOs and direct beneficiaries. That is, collaboration seems most extensive and effective in the health field, with agriculture in an intermediate position, and water supply showing the least cooperation. In health, most coordination occurs between the district-level offices of the Ministry of Health and the nearest office of the responsible PVO. The content of collaboration is driven by the health grant agenda, not ministerial objectives. However, the Ministry does seem to be effective in insisting that grant activities meet standards established in national ministerial protocols. A tentative impression is that coordination concerning extension activities is district-based, while research activities are coordinated between the PVO and national institutions (INIA and SEMOC). Those PVOs with large-scale agricultural activities (WVRD and FHI) have some contact with national-level Ministry of Agriculture officers.

In both health and agricultural activities, all grant resources are fully controlled and accounted for by the responsible PVO, but significant resources are used by, and to the benefit of, district "counterpart" agencies. This appears to be based on an assumption that maintaining PVO control of resources means that a higher proportion of these resources will be applied to grant purposes than would be the case if resources were controlled by the "counterpart" agency.

An ultimate judgement concerning the appropriateness of current systems of collaboration between the various PVOs and the GRM is difficult to make based on the limited evidence available to the evaluation team. Some members of the team have very serious reservations about an apparent lack of input from national GRM officials and the perceived growing tension between PVOs/NGOs (who provide free goods and services to local beneficiaries) and the GRM which perceives their legitimacy is undermined by not having resources to distribute to constituents. As noted above the tension is exacerbated by inability of the GRM to retain professional staff when competing with the higher salaries and incentives available to Mozambicans who go to work for donors or PVOs. However, the seriousness of this "problem" is difficult to assess for the following reasons:

- ▶ **Despite the lack of contact, GRM national policies and preferences may be reflected in local PVO activities through the coordination that occurs in the GRM governmental hierarchy. The Ministry of Health, known historically as a relatively strong ministry, is able to insist that its protocols be followed in at least some of the instances reported in the PVO Support Project files. If the Ministry can consistently articulate and enforce its policies at the district-level, then the absence of a formal role for national officials of the Ministry is not disturbing and further promotes decentralized administration.**
- ▶ **The current pattern of PVO - GRM collaboration is consistent with the GRM's announced policy of governmental decentralization.**
- **The current pattern of PVO - GRM collaboration may be consistent with past, largely emergency relief, activities, but need to be modified as the focus moves to true development activities - in the case of Project activities, Category III output objectives.**

The general conclusion to be made about PVO - GRM collaboration is that it varies from sector-to-sector. In some activities, local representatives of the GRM are willing and able to insure that GRM policies are reflected in PVO grant activities. In other sectors, this is not true, due in part to the fact that GRM institutions are weak and/or in some cases linkages have not been made between PVOs and the appropriate GRM agency.

3. Gender Issues

PVO Support Project reports from grantees do not reflect appropriate gender awareness. This does not seem to be a major issue with regard to health activities; since one doesn't find any suggestion of gender bias in the various grant and consultant reports. There does not seem to be much scope for anti-female bias, given that maternal and child health and child survival activities are a prominent part of the health activities. These activities normally place women beneficiaries at the center of decision-making for themselves and their children. Even though there is no suggestion of gender bias, it is still useful as well as an overall USAID reporting requirement to have gender disaggregated information on beneficiaries, so as to clearly portray the situation. It is of more concern that gender disaggregated data is not generally available for the various local "health committees" and "water committees" set-up and trained under health and water supply project auspices.

Project records of agricultural activities are mixed. Records and consultant reports suggest that gender disaggregated data do exist for the huge distributions of seeds and tools that have taken place and that the gender composition of the recipient group appropriately reflects the gender composition of the population of rural farmers, that is, most are women. Unfortunately, periodic reporting on these activities does not always include gender disaggregated data. With respect to agricultural extension activities there is a clear need to improve gender reporting and gender composition among extension agents.

4. Effects of Import Restrictions on Mobilization of Resources

All PVOs surveyed for this evaluation reported serious and continuing problems with delays in the duty free import of necessary grant materials. Delays of several months are the rule rather than the exception.

Efforts by the donors and PVOs in 1992 to convince the Ministry of Finance to alter rules and procedures covering importation of vehicles and equipment for relief and development purposes were only partially successful. The Ministry of Finance continues to hold the position that certain taxes (which they consider minimal) are to be paid on imported vehicles and equipment whatever their purposes, and that these fees, if not paid by the PVO or donor are to be paid by the appropriate GRM counterpart agency. Because of MOF policy, it is not clear to the lower levels of Government (especially Customs and port of entry officials) that PVO/NGO activities are exempt from duty and taxation. They expect payment, if not from the PVO/NGO, then from their counterpart agencies. Counterpart agencies usually are unable to pay and often do not come to the defense of the PVO/NGO. When the fees are not paid imported items may be held in Customs or the port of entry for weeks or months while GRM storage charges mount. At least three of the USAID PVO grantees have had vehicle clearance delays of over five months,

seriously affecting grant start-up. The problem is further exacerbated by Mozambique's administrative rules and systems, many unchanged since the Portuguese colonial period, which include a labyrinthine and arbitrary clearance process. These are GRM, donor and NGO/PVO problems costing the GRM and the donors millions of dollars a year in project implementation delays.

5. Delays in Award of Grants

Substantial delays in the award of several grants have sometimes produced grants that have outlived their supposed purpose. This was clearly the case with a number of water supply and seed distribution activities conceived as a response to the drought. Because of delays in awarding these grants, the drought was over long before these activities got underway. All agricultural grants are highly sensitive to timely award.

6. PVO Technical Capacity in the Water Sector

The technical competence of PVOs in the water sector is probably limited relative to private engineering companies. In general, PVOs are unable to attract highly qualified engineers to work on their projects, because of the much higher salaries available through the private sector. Also because most PVO grants are for no more than two years, and because of rapid expatriate turnover rates, it is difficult for PVOs to retain technically competent personnel for long enough periods to show tangible results. Often the rush to meet specified outputs and EOPS affects the quality of water development work being done by PVOs in Mozambique. Nevertheless, it is not clear whether (i) PVO water development expertise is as limited as that claimed by PRONAR, (ii) whether PRONAR's standardization policies¹⁷ are appropriate, (iii) whether EPARs and HIDROMOC have the capacity to support PVO water development efforts and are able to work collaboratively with PVOs.

The sustainability of current approaches to water development in Mozambique is in question. Given experience across Africa, village level programs to establish water user fees and locally managed repair and servicing of pumps have for the most part proved unsustainable. Where pump installation, maintenance and repair is privatized and paid for through local taxation along with other community services (health, education, etc.) there may be greater potential for long-term sustainability.¹⁸

¹⁷ Standardization has merit when it improves the potential safety or cost-effectiveness of equipment and systems, for example, using one or two indigenously manufactured pumps rather than a whole range of donor supplied pumps for which spare parts may be unavailable in the future. However, the advantages may disappear if the agency responsible for standardization has only limited ability to review new designs introduced to the market and to respond quickly when more cost-effective equipment is produced. It is not clear whether PRONAR is capable of this kind of dynamic efficiency.

¹⁸ ADRA's involvement in the improvement of the town of Chimoio's urban water supply relies on private technical and management expertise to complete the design and prepare tender documents for reconstruction of the Chimoio water supply system. Unfortunately, while the expertise supplied is of high quality, this activity will have low sustainability unless water fees for consumers reflect operating costs and the parastatals and government agencies in Chimoio begin paying for the water they consume, and unless other

7. Environmental Issues

In addition to the originally approved Initial Environmental Examination for the overall PVO Support Project, potential Grantees are required to incorporate in their proposals an examination of potential environmental impacts and how they propose to mitigate them. In some of the newer grants PVOs have done this, and grant agreements now have attached to them a set of USAID requirements.

Grant agreements of more than \$100,000 cannot be signed until an Initial Environmental Examination approval has been received from the USAID Washington Africa Bureau Environmental Officer. This process delays grant finalization by between 3-4 weeks.

The Mission is in the process of trying to improve the IEE approval process by: (i) requesting that the minimum grant value requiring IEE approval be raised to \$500,000 (No response has yet been received, though a \$2,000,000 limit is under discussion); (ii) seeking Delegation of Authority to the Mission to clear on IEE's, either by the Mission Environmental Officer or the Regional Environmental Officer based at REDSO/ESA (Again a decision from USAID Washington is pending).

The Mission is also attempting to obtain a USAID Washington environmental program assessment for Mozambique in the hopes that USAID approval for selected pesticides can be obtained for USAID/Mozambique's agricultural programs.

improvements are made to the system which are not covered by USAID's support (e.g. the end use distribution system has water losses of 40 percent or more, and water treatment facilities require complete rehabilitation).

IV. EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Part IV is divided into sections presenting recommendations relevant to: the remainder of the Project (Section A); to a follow-on project (Section B); and lessons learned (Section C).

A. Through the Project Agreement Completion Date

Overall, the remainder of the Project should be looked as a transition period to a new follow-on project and an opportunity to re-institute what might be called "best practices" within the Project.

1. Project Level Actions

- ▶ The current PACD of September 30, 1996 should be extended to at least June 30, 1997 in order to ensure that current and future grants have time to be fully implemented and to permit a Project close-out period of six months including a final evaluation.
- A new Project budget and financial plan should be undertaken which takes into consideration a new PACD; in this regard, the following complementary actions should be taken:
 - consideration should be given to fully obligating all existing grants before funding any new ones; there is still some \$7.0 million in unobligated Project funding;
 - deciding on the staffing pattern for the PMT (implying overall responsibilities of the Mission) and recalculating this input category accordingly;
 - elaboration of a training and technical assistance plan for the remainder of the Project and developing a corresponding budget.
- ▶ Reformulate Project Logical Framework to reflect changes presented in each of the Project amendments. Targets and indicators should be developed for the Project independent of those developed under each Project-financed grant. Specific revisions should include:
 - Specify the overall number of beneficiaries to be reached with Project assistance;
 - An End of Project Status (EOPS) component with specific indicators;
 - Project inputs should specify the number and type of grants to be funded by the Project; total long-term (PMT) person months; and total short-term TA;
 - Verifiable indicators at the purpose and outputs levels; and,
 - A revision of Project assumptions.

2. Concerning USAID/Mozambique Project Management

- ▶ **Strengthen Project Management Team (PMT) capacity; preferably by adding a new Activity Monitor, as called for in the PP (adequate funds exist) and/or through a substantial increase in short-term technical assistance for which significant unutilized funding remains.**
- **Maintain current responsibility for overall Project Management including grants management with the PMT, but with increased and structured involvement of technical offices in grants monitoring.**
 - **Review job descriptions with PMT staff and PDO supervisor defining and clarifying responsibilities between the two levels of Project Management.**
- **Consider establishing the PVO Round-table meetings initially described in the Project Paper as a forum for sharing information and experience among Grantees and between them and the Mission.**
- **Formulate an implementation plan for remainder of the Project; and annual workplans (action plan) with TA, Training and monitoring plans for current and future calendar years.**
- ▶ **Develop and implement a strategic plan related to the attainment of Project objectives for the remainder of the Project and be proactive in its implementation. Specifically:**
 - **utilizing short-term TA, coordinate a series of planning sessions among USAID, PVO and NGOs, and GRM officers to develop individual sectoral and geographic plans for future Project-funded PVO activities. Sectors examined should include those which promote achievement of Category III objectives such as: small-holder agriculture, as well as potential new initiatives in microenterprise and informal sector development, rural credit (especially for women), local governance and capacity building, and natural resource management;**
 - **identify those PVOs (whether in Mozambique or the U.S.) and future grant activities which promote achievement of Category III objectives; actively solicit PVOs and NGOs that can promote these objectives;**
 - **Reconsider those grants already under consideration in terms of their conformity with new emphases identified; and, give consideration to limiting new proposal submissions until this planning exercise is completed.**
- ▶ **Work with PVOs to update and/or specify outputs and EOPS in previously awarded grants. Ensure that new proposals contain benchmarks, targets, outputs and EOPS, etc.**

- Consideration should be given to requiring future grant proposals to include results of baseline surveys rather than to fund them under the grants, thus increasing the quality of proposals.
- ▶ Eliminate monthly Grantee reporting and adopt quarterly (or semi-annual when feasible) reporting requirements which provides necessary information for USAID semi-annual and API reporting requirements;
- ▶ Standardize reporting formats and require PVOs to adhere to them. Ensure progress reporting is in a format which tracks cumulative output and EOPS to date against anticipated outputs and EOPS. {CARE's reporting forms for the Inhambane Water and Sanitation Project (3029) might serve as a model}.
- Increase monitoring by Project Management Team and develop standardized monitoring format for use by all Mission staff who make field visits;
- ▶ Revise grant selection criteria to reflect priority areas (e.g., Category III activities) for remainder of the Project and inform potential grantees accordingly.
- ▶ Document the actual review and approval process and procedures that are currently in use and inform potential grantees accordingly. Specifically:
 - The two-step process including concept paper and final proposal stages that is currently in use;
 - All contacts related to requests for Project grant funding including submission of concept papers and proposals should be formally recorded and officially responded to. In principle, concept papers should be reviewed by PMT and, if found in conformity with selection criteria, reviewed by Project Committee; if not, the non-acceptance letter should be circulated to Committee members and signed by the Director;
 - Consideration should be given to developing a simple weighting system for use by the Project Committee in the application of selection criteria against submitted proposals;
 - Keep grant amendments and incremental funding to a minimum under newly awarded grants;
 - Consider greater use of QIP process with Mission Director signing grants without RCO and RLA involvement.
- ▶ In support of the Second Project Amendment, a proactive approach to including Mozambican NGOs in Project activities should be undertaken, either through the award of direct grants and/or in the provision of targeted technical assistance and training interventions. Consideration should be given to:

- soliciting a proposal from a U.S. PVO to manage a small grant fund for and provide TA/training to Mozambican NGOs;
- if the Mission decides that it is too premature to undertake such actions with Mozambican NGOs, then it needs to document this policy change formally in order to comply with previous requirements stipulated in Project Amendments.
- Undertake short-term TA and training interventions with PVOs in such areas as strategic planning; sectoral strategies; and cross-cutting issues such as WID, the Environment, participation and capacity building.
- Consider setting up a Project Advisory Committee including concerned GRM agency(ies) and USAID, and perhaps some local NGOs and international NGOs to serve as a forum for the sharing information and progress on Project implementation, while soliciting input without it being binding.
- Renew efforts (initiated in 1992) to convince the Ministry of Finance to alter rules and procedures governing duty-free importation of Project-financed commodities (e.g., vehicles, equipment and grant materials), in conformity with terms and conditions of Project Grant Agreement.
- In the interim, sufficient local currency counterpart funds should be made available to concerned GRM agencies to pay duty for grant procured commodities.

3. Concerning PVO Grantee Performance

a) **Water Supply Activities**

- ▶ The PVO Support Project should re-analyze its support for water supply development with the objective of undertaking those activities which are commensurate with demonstrated PVO capacities and which enhance the sustainability of improved water supplies.
- ▶ A technical assessment of the water sector by an impartial engineering consultant is recommended to assist DNA and PRONAR in (i) refining a district and provincial water development priorities list, (ii) developing an appropriate strategy for the use of PVOs versus private engineering consultants for water development in Mozambique, (iii) determining the degree to which PRONAR standardization policies are appropriate and should be followed by the PVOs, (iv) assessing the efficiency and capacity of the EPAR and HIDROMOC in collaborating with PVOs and recommending the most cost-effective options for provision of water development services at the local level, and (v) helping ensure access to water development contracts in Mozambique by private engineering firms, drilling companies and pump manufacturing companies.
- ▶ A component of the water sector assessment recommended above should be an analysis of successful water user fee systems elsewhere in Africa, and their potential for adaptation in the Mozambican setting.

b) PVO Management and Reporting

- ▶ Annual workplan preparation should be used as a planning tool by PVO project managers. Progress needs to be measured against workplans, and the implementation plans prepared for the Project proposal should be revised in the initial quarter of project operation so as to reflect the realities of actual project implementation. Quarterly workplans should then be matched against the annual workplans in order to measure progress in meeting grant objectives.
- Reports from Grantees to USAID should specifically state that the document in question is a report to USAID and cite the appropriate grant number.
- Reports from grantees to USAID should be less frequent, more focused on tracking progress toward End Of Project Status, standardized among grantees as much as possible, and contain gender disaggregated data where relevant. The standard reference to reporting requirements in grant agreements should be rewritten to reflect a requirement to report on outputs and progress towards EOPS, in addition to the current focus on activities reporting. Reporting on outputs and progress toward EOPS should include data identifying accomplishments during the reporting period, cumulative outputs and progress towards EOPS, and target outputs and EOPS information. To the maximum extent possible, data categories should exactly match EOPS measures. At a minimum, reporting formats should be standardized by activity area, e.g. health, agriculture, water supply and sanitation, etc. Requirements for gender disaggregated data should be imposed uniformly within activity areas.
- ▶ Current reports emphasize static indices of grant performance during a particular time period. Future reports should also include indices of grant performance through time. For example, the unit cost of reuniting one lost child with his/her family in a given reporting period should be compared with later unit costs for this same activity, in order to identify trends in project efficiency.
- ▶ Require each PVO to provide a breakdown of its contributions to the grant activity on an annual basis.
- ▶ PVOs need to observe the requirement in their grants to report beneficiary information using gender disaggregated data.

c) Gender Issues

- ▶ Before instituting a "gender issues" component to an enhanced monitoring and reporting system, the PVO Support Project should contract for an assessment of gender issues as reflected in the following dimensions of project activity:
 - **Agricultural extension:** There are very few women agricultural extension workers/contact farmers in Project-financed agricultural extension activities. This

may pose a problem of gender equity, as well as decreased effectiveness in agricultural extension.

- **Local Management/Advisory Committees:** Water Supply and Health activities have encouraged the formation of a large number of local committees. Members of these committees have received substantial training, some decision-making powers, and (one assumes) their status within the community has been enhanced. Very little is known about the gender composition of these committees.
- **Child Survival:** Data have not been systematically reported on the gender of beneficiaries of the child survival activities. The possibility exists that male children participate at higher rates than females.
- The aims of the study are (i) to determine whether gender equity problems exist, (ii) suggest solutions for problems identified, and (iii) suggest indices for an appropriate monitoring system for problematic situations.

4. Concerning USAID - PVO Relationships with the GRM

- ▶ Seek to reduce perceived tension among PVOs/NGOs and GRM related to lack of GRM input to Project activities and the perception that their legitimacy is being undermined by significant resource distribution by PVOs. Consideration should be given to the following steps:
 - Involve GRM national agencies more directly in Project activities through Project Advisory Committee discussed above;
 - That appropriate technical agencies have a formal opportunity to comment on PVO/NGO proposals prior to USAID approval;
 - Require that PVOs/NGOs obtain letters of approval from Provincial and District level GRM officials prior to proposal and grant approvals;
 - Ensure that goods and services received by beneficiaries are perceived by them as originating jointly from the GRM, USAID and PVOs.
- ▶ Review and modify where necessary grant selection criteria found in the Project Paper to ensure greater sustainability of individual grant activities.

B. For a Possible Follow-on Project

It is strongly recommended that concerned Mission staff and/or design team members visit PVO Support Projects in Malawi and Mali. Both Projects have indigenous NGO capacity building as an objective. The former embodies an approach and strategy which utilizes an external institutional project manager that provides financial grants to PVOs and NGOs as well as technical assistance and training to indigenous NGOs, while the latter utilizes internal Mission

management and funds primarily U.S. PVOs to increase service delivery and build indigenous NGO capacity. There are many lessons to be learned from both projects and no sense in relearning the negative ones during the implementation of Mozambique's new follow-on project.

One of the dangers in undertaking the design of a new PVO support project prior to finalizing the Mission's new Country Program Strategy Plan is that individual sectoral strategies targeting PVOs and NGOs may conflict with or duplicate that of the new project itself. One of the principal tasks in the initial stages of the design phase will be define the role of PVOs and NGOs in the larger Mission program. This should be a Mission-wide exercise; should seek to answer a series of critical questions related to PVO and NGO capacities; and include a number of "side" studies to inform the overall process. The following recommendations raise a number of these issues and list several of the more important studies that need to be undertaken.

1. Concerning Project Purpose and Strategy

- ▶ Any follow-on project should be based on an explicit strategy, which clearly defines the demonstrated comparative advantage of PVOs and NGOs in undertaking the intended project activities. In this regard:
 - A major assessment should be undertaken of U.S. PVOs and their technical skills and expertise as part of the design phase in order to identify those that can best promote overall project objectives; and
 - An updated inventory and institutional assessment (e.g., management, technical capacities) of Mozambican NGOs, including membership-based organizations (e.g., cooperatives, credit unions, womens federations, etc.) should be undertaken.
- View PVOs and NGOs as intermediaries between national and local level and particularly as catalysts in the formation and strengthening of grassroots self-governing organizations, with less emphasis on PVOs and NGOs as service providers replacing government in the provision of public goods and services.
- ▶ Consider a two-fold project purpose:
 - increase the capacity of Mozambican NGOs to plan and manage development activities in key GRM and USAID development sectors; and,
 - increase the quantity and quality of PVO/NGO development activities that build local capacity for self-governance in these priority sectors.
- ▶ Key objectives would include:
 - develop and increase the capacity for local self-governance in the allocation and management of local resources;
 - promote sustainability of project funded activities at the local community level;

- increase participation of beneficiary groups in the identification, planning, management and evaluation of grant activities; and
- give priority to those interventions and innovations which are not only self-sustaining, but also have the potential to undergo rapid self-replication and diffusion.

2. Concerning the Nature of Project Management

- ▶ Consideration should be given to other project management arrangements in the new project. Particularly, the design team should assess the utility of an external institutional project manager for the following reasons:

- The new CPSP will most likely look at increasing the participation of other development partners, including government, and thus decrease centrality of PVOs as an implementing mechanism in the larger portfolio. Thus new project will not be as central as is the current one;
- The emergency situation no longer exists (or has significantly and qualitatively changed from that under which the original Project was designed and operated) and the need to maintain direct control over and guide project activities will not be as essential under a new project;
- Look at cost issues of Mission management versus external management; assumption was previously made that former is less costly than latter; this is however, not proven and should be; and,
- A significant component of NGO capacity building and grant making has normally been found too management intensive for USAID missions to handle internally.

3. Concerning Project Beneficiaries

- ▶ Target only resettled populations; Indigenous NGOs; U.S. PVOs with a recognized expertise in either a technical or sectoral area or NGO capacity building and local institution building.
- Insulate new project from the provision of emergency relief and rehabilitation assistance. Similar projects throughout the world show that relief activities take precedence over those of development.

4. Concerning Project Components

- ▶ The following components are recommended:
 - NGO capacity building through TA and training and modest institutional support grants;

- Development Activity Grants to support sectoral development;
- A research and study component;
- An information collection and sharing component;

5. Concerning LOP Funding and PACD

- ▶ As a project focusing on long-term development, including indigenous NGO and local institutions capacity building, a minimum 10-year PACD should be considered.
- ▶ With long-term developmental objectives, rather than immediate relief concerns guiding the Project, LOP funding in the amount of \$20.0 - \$25.0 million would be consistent; includes project management costs; assumes two types of grant funding, i.e., modest institutional support grants and larger sectoral development activity grants.

6. Choice of Procurement Instruments

- ▶ If external Project Manager is engaged to manage project then a Cooperative Agreement with substantial involvement understanding clause should be employed. This "CA Recipient" would then make subagreements with PVOs and NGOs to undertake specific development & capacity building activities.
- ▶ If internal Mission Management, then a combination of Grants and Cooperative Agreements depending on the complexity and size of the activity and the "developmental" track-record of the recipient.

C. Lessons Learned

- ▶ Project Management is a highly labor intensive in PVO projects even when using a grant instrument with "grant-worthy" PVOs.
- ▶ There seems to be no way to conceptually or practically distinguish between relief and rehabilitation on the one hand, and between rehabilitation and development on the other. The distinction can be made between relief and development. Projects should promote either one or the other.
- ▶ Sustainability issues must be given a lesser priority in relief and rehabilitation activities, and not be used to evaluate PVO proposals under the current Project.

ANNEXES

- Annex A. Detailed Scope of Work**
- Annex B. Detailed Review of Individual Project Grants**
- Annex C. List of Individuals and Organizations Interviewed**
- Annex D. List of Reference Documents**
- Annex E. PVO Questionnaire**
- Annex F. Evaluation Team**

ANNEX A

DETAILED SCOPE OF WORK

MOZAMBIQUE PVO SUPPORT PROJECT (656-0217)

MID-TERM EVALUATION

98

ARTICLE III - SCOPE OF WORK

A. General:

The evaluation team provided by the Contractor shall be composed of members with backgrounds and expertise consistent with the focus of this evaluation. The Contractor shall appoint one member as team leader. A resource person may be provided by USAID as a member of the evaluation team.

Other than for one day of team building activities in Washington, the evaluation team will not be required to spend any other time in Washington, D. C., or at any other place, prior to its arrival in Mozambique.

The evaluation team will arrive and begin work in Mozambique on a date and at a time that has been concurred in by the PVO Support Project Officer. The team will coordinate its work through the Office of Project Development and Management within USAID. In carrying out its task, the team will review project documentation, and will meet with officers of USAID and the Government of the Republic of Mozambique (GRM), grant recipients, and representatives of nongovernmental organizations working in Mozambique. The team may make selected site visits together with USAID and other project, GRM or PVO representatives.

The evaluation team will present a complete draft report (20 copies) in English, and will provide oral briefing to USAID, representatives of the GRM and selected nongovernmental organizations no later than the seventeenth working day of this assignment. USAID, representatives of the GRM and selected nongovernmental organizations will provide the team with comments, verbal or written, within five working days following the oral presentation of the draft report. A final evaluation report (20 copies), including a complete Evaluation Summary (Form USAID 1330), is to be submitted to and accepted in fulfillment of the terms of the evaluation team's work by the Project Officer and the Mission Evaluation Officer no later than 30 calendar days after the comments and suggested modifications have been given to the evaluation team's leader.

B. Specific Requirements

To achieve the objectives of the evaluation, the team shall address the following specific questions and topics:

1. Have the quality and quantity of USAID inputs been adequate to achieve project outputs at this time, and are sufficient resources available during the remaining life of project?
2. Is the absorptive capacity of USAID inputs been adequate to achieve project outputs at this time sufficient resources available during the remaining life of project?
3. Are the activities described in the Project paper and the Project Paper Supplements being carried out? What has been the impact of these activities on project outputs and EOPS?

4. Has the project contributed to the eventual operational sustainability of PVO and nongovernmental organizations in Mozambique? to the extent that PVO activities are replacing or substituting for services which would normally be provided by the government, have the PVOs made adequate provision for the sustainability of those activities after the grant? Have the PVOs adequately involved government in planning and implementing grant activities?
5. Have the development services performed by the private voluntary and nongovernmental organizations in Mozambique, particularly by those organizations which receive grant funding from USAID, improved since the project began? To what extent can these improvements be attributed to the project and to its management?
6. The evaluation will assess the effectiveness of the project management structures and procedures used to review the proposals, make grants, and monitor grantee activities. The evaluation will review and make recommendations relative to the internal proposal review and grant-making process, identify any administrative and management constraints, and make recommendations relative to improving project management and implementation.
7. The evaluation will review the process of sub-grant evaluations (of the individual grantees and program activities) and comment specifically on how the results of these evaluations are being used for project management to improve implementation of grantee program activities. The evaluation will also assess project monitoring of grantees and recommend any changes in current procedures.
8. The evaluation will assess the effectiveness and appropriateness of the Project to support the priority intervention areas as identified in the Project Paper and Project Paper Supplements. Included are:
 - a) Assistance to improve efficient and timely planning for distribution of food and emergency supplies resulting from both the insurgency and the drought;
 - b) Assistance to develop the capacity of Mozambicans to manage needs assessments, consolidate local planning or assess donor requirements in order to improve targeting of emergency assistance;
 - c) Activities that promote the private sector involvement in transport and distribution of emergency supplies;
 - d) Activities that increase coverage of preventive health care, nutrition information, family planning and child survival;
 - e) Activities which increase availability (both rural and urban) of potable water and adequate sanitation;
 - f) Activities that provide access to rehabilitation from trauma;

100

- g) Activities that promote agricultural recovery including provision of tools and seeds and extension activities;**
 - h) Activities that increase employment or cash income among the target group in order to alleviate poverty, contribute to the regeneration of the marketing system and promote self reliance;**
 - i) Activities which save labor and time which help to alleviate the constraints to increased productivity;**
 - j) Activities that rehabilitate rural infrastructure including health centers and tertiary roads; and**
 - k) Activities that provide direct assistance to vulnerable groups including refugees, internally displaced people and demobilized combatants**
- 9. The evaluation will assess for grants with reintegration, rehabilitation, recovery or long-term development objectives whether the PVOs are applying criteria for a) selecting the most cost-effective technologies, implementation and management approaches; and b) potential for sustainability in Mozambique.**

ANNEX B

GRANT DATA SUMMARY SHEETS

MOZAMBIQUE PVO SUPPORT PROJECT (656-0217)

MID-TERM EVALUATION

**GRANT DATA SUMMARY SHEETS
MOZAMBIQUE PVO SUPPORT PROJECT (656-0217)**

<u>General Grant Information</u>	
Grantee	: CARE
Grant Title	: DPCCN Logistical Support Project -- Phase I
Grant Number	: 656-0217-G-SS-0013-00
Total Estimated Grant	: \$ 3,059,371
Funds Obligated to Date	: \$ 3,059,371
Grantee Cost Share	: \$ 0
GOM Cost Share	: \$ 0
Effective Date for Grant	: 7/10/1990
PACD as of April 1994	: 3/22/1993
Indirect Cost Rate	: 7.6 to 8.0 % of total direct costs
<u>Grant Financial Plan</u>	
Personnel Salaries	: \$ 1,842,797
Equipment & Supplies	: 569,119
General Administrative	: 427,197
Indirect Costs	: 220,258
<hr/>	
Total Budget	: \$ 3,059,371
<u>Grant Purpose Statement</u>	
<p>The purpose of the grant is to provide support for CARE's program to enhance the capacity of the Department for the Prevention and Control of Natural Calamities [DPCCN] to coordinate and manage local, donor, private sector and NGO resources and thereby maximize their contributions toward addressing the emergency situation in Mozambique.</p>	
<u>Activity Purpose Statement(s)</u>	
<p>The purpose of the activity is to support the CARE program of assistance to the DPCCN to promote improved food aid planning and logistics capability. The CARE Logistical Support Unit directly supports the objectives of:</p>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enhancing the capacity of the DPCCN to plan, coordinate and manage resources so that increased numbers of people eligible for food aid receive the nationally approved ration 100 % of the time; and 2. Facilitating an increased percentage and tonnage of emergency food aid contracted to private transporters. 	

123

Anticipated Outputs

None specifically stated.

Actual Outputs as of March 1994

This grant continued AID's support, begun with an OFDA grant, to the CARE partnership arrangement with DPCCN. In 1990, USAID concerns were for regularizing emergency disaster assistance and expanding the flow of resources into affected areas using NGOs and the private sector. A subsequent grant made in 1992 continued CARE's involvement with the DPCCN and is reported under PVO Support Project Grant No. 2037.

End-of-Project Status

The expected impact of the CARE/LSU is improved logistical capacity and efficiency as well as accountability for food aid programs. Benchmarks established to track such impact are:

1. Stability of supply in the emergency food aid pipeline;
2. An increased percentage of emergency food transport contracted to the private sector; and
3. A reduction in the number of unsigned way bills for commodity deliveries from ports to district warehouses and distribution centers.

Actual End-of-Project Status:

1. The stability of food supply in the relief aid pipeline over the period of this grant was a function of many different factors. It was impossible to determine what, if any, effects on pipeline stability were attributable to CARE interventions and activities with the DPCCN.
2. Data on private sector haulage of relief food was difficult to reconstruct for the earlier years of this grant. However, some of the food aid handled by DPCCN during the latter years of civil strife was transported by private sector contractors. A much larger portion of relief food flowing through the World Food Programme was distributed using private sector contractors. It should be noted that, during the period of this grant, there were large areas of the country where the private sector would not operate because of the security risks.
3. The reduction in unsigned way bills was dropped early in the period of the grant as an indicator of end-of-project status. It had been carried over as an indicator from the OFDA grant and was no longer deemed relevant.

General Grant Information

Grantee	:	World Vision Relief & Development, Inc.
Grant Title	:	Child Survival and Agricultural Recovery Project -- Phase I
Grant Number	:	656-0217-G-SS-0014-00
Total Estimated Grant	:	\$ 9,216,960
Funds Obligated to Date	:	\$ 9,216,960
Grantee Cost Share	:	\$ 2,290,619
GOM Cost Share	:	\$ 0
Effective Date for Grant	:	7/3/1990
PACD as of April 1994	:	9/30/1994
Indirect Cost Rate	:	20 % of total direct costs

Grant Financial Plan

Personnel Salaries	:	\$ 1,231,700
Travel/Transportation	:	1,618,750
Other Direct Costs	:	97,000
Equipment & Supplies	:	4,374,310
Training	:	112,000
Evaluation/Audit	:	247,000
Indirect Costs	:	1,536,160
<hr/>		
Total Budget	:	\$ 9,216,960

Grant Purpose Statement

The purpose of this grant is to provide support for the World Vision project of child survival and agricultural recovery.

105

Activity Purpose Statement(s)

A. Child Survival Activity

The nutrition component of the project will concentrate on promoting breast feeding, adequate weaning practices, tracking of newborns and growth monitoring of children 0 to 2 years, with special emphasis on the under-weights. The malaria control component will focus on social mobilization for sanitation/clean up campaigns to destroy mosquito breeding grounds. It will provide malaria prophylaxis to infants and pregnant mothers during the rainy season and distribute impregnated mosquito nets to pilot communities. The immunization component will provide personnel, equipment and logistical support to the on-going immunization activities of the GOM Ministry of Health. The training component will provide training to community facilitators and health workers in target areas. Training will be provided in mobilization of communities for construction of latrines and health posts, promotion of preventative health practices, including oral rehydration therapy.

B. Agricultural Recovery Activity

The component focused on providing seeds and other agricultural inputs to displaced and other seriously affected persons; training extension workers; and crop improvements on 250 acres of land.

Anticipated Outputs

None specifically stated.

Actual Outputs as of March 1994

A. Child Survival Activity

1. Approximately 37,000 immunizations were administered to infants less than 3 years of age.
2. Approximately 23,000 tetanus toxoid immunizations were administered to women of child bearing age.
3. Almost 17,000 infants less than 3 years of age were weighed two or more times in a growth rate monitoring program.
4. A very substantial amount of health education and training was delivered by World Vision and Ministry of Health technical staff. Thirty-two health assistants, 64 community facilitators, mothers of 0-3 year olds, pregnant women, women of child bearing age, health committees and residents of the target communities participated in training programs.
5. Culturally-appropriate curricula, training methods, and audio-visual training materials were produced on selected aspects of basic health care including: diarrhea, breast-feeding/weaning, nutrition, malaria, AIDS, and vaccination.

B. Agricultural Recovery Activity

1. Agricultural research and extension activities in Zambezia, Tete, Nampula, and northern sections of Sofala provinces are ongoing.
2. Approximately 6,000 families received free agricultural seeds -- i.e., Ag-Paks -- prior to the 1990/1991 agricultural season.
3. Approximately 56,000 families received free Ag-Paks prior to the 1993/1994 agricultural season.
4. An additional 60,000 Ag-Paks have been purchase for delivery to farmers prior to the 1994/1995 agricultural season.
5. Approximately 80,000 Veg-Paks of selected vegetable seeds have been purchased for free delivery to farm families in May and June 1994.
6. Approximately 116,000 Tool-Paks, with appropriate agricultural hand tools varied by region and crop mix, were delivered free of charge to farm families prior to the 1993/1994 agricultural season.
7. Approximately 10,000 Survival Kits -- i.e., bucket, cooking/eating utensils and a blanket -- have been purchased for free distribution to the neediest individuals. Most, but perhaps not all, of these have been distributed.
8. Transport, including airlift of some commodities, of the above items was provided.

End-of-Project Status

A. Child Survival Activity

1. Reduction in infant morbidity and mortality rates by cause.
2. Reduction in the prevalence of measles, malnutrition and malaria.
3. Increased immunization coverage.
4. Reduction in the number of deaths due to dehydration.
5. Reduction in the number of diarrhea cases.

B. Agricultural Recovery Activity

1. Increased total household agricultural production for family consumption and/or sale.
2. Increased number of households with cash incomes.
3. Increased reliance on own production and markets, rather than emergency food aid, to meet food requirements.
4. Reduction in growth faltering rates.

General Grant Information

Grantee	:	Save the Children Federation
Grant Title	:	Gaza Health and Rural Development Project -- Phase I
Grant Number	:	656-0217-G-SS-0015-00
Total Estimated Grant	:	\$ 2,823,446
Funds Obligated to Date	:	\$ 2,823,446
Grantee Cost Share	:	\$ 589,687
GOM Cost Share	:	\$ 0
Effective Date for Grant	:	8/20/1990
PACD as of April 1994	:	3/31/1994
Indirect Cost Rate	:	25.13 % of total direct costs less equipment costing over \$ 500.00

Grant Financial Plan

Personnel Salaries	:	\$ 842,281
Travel/Transportation	:	410,532
Other Direct Costs	:	323,203
Equipment & Supplies	:	577,338
Training	:	123,632
Indirect Costs	:	546,460
<hr/>		
Total Budget	:	\$ 2,823,446

Grant Purpose Statement

The purpose of the grant is to provide support for the SCF project of child survival and rural development.

Activity Purpose Statement(s)

The purposes of the activities are:

1. To promote increased coverage of preventive health care and availability of basic services; and
2. To promote increased rural employment, productive capacity and cash income among target groups.

Purpose One is to be supported by: increased immunization coverage; increased numbers of women who can use oral rehydration therapy; and increased access to latrines and clean potable water in target areas.

Purpose Two is to be supported by: facilitating total household agricultural production for own consumption or sale in target areas; assisting selected communities to reduce dependence on external assistance and move towards some form of self-provisioning and self-reliance.

Anticipated Outputs

None specifically stated.

Actual Outputs as of March 1994

The major achievements of the Gaza Project -- Phase I were listed by project staff in October 1993 and the final evaluators in January 1994 as:

1. 7,000 children immunized.
2. 173 village health volunteers trained in basic health care.
3. 4,611 latrines constructed by villagers.
4. 142 traditional birth attendants trained in AIDS/STD prevention and more than 11,000 condoms distributed by the preventive medicine team and the AIDS theatre group.
5. Health posts rehabilitated in Mapai, Combomune, Mpuzi and Litlatla.
6. In-service training the trainers course in preventive health conducted for GOM health staff at the provincial level.
7. 35 hand-dug wells newly installed and/or rehabilitated and 19 boreholes rehabilitated in 20 villages in three Districts of Gaza Province. [Note: the final evaluation of the Gaza Phase I Project dated February 1994 states that 36 wells were constructed and 27 existing water points were improved or rehabilitated by the end of 1993.]
8. 119 women trained in pump maintenance, well repair and water conservation.
9. Seeds, simple hand tools, domestic utensils and food packages distributed to a total of 19,500 displaced families.
10. 1,400 farmers in one village provided with seed on credit and access to agricultural extension and marketing services.
10. 40 cattle distributed as traction animals in one village. [Note: the final evaluation states that 50 % percent of these animals died in the first year.]
11. Two shelters for maize grinding mills rehabilitated.
12. Nine classrooms rehabilitated in Nhakutse and two new classroom blocks completed in two villages.

End-of-Project Status

1. Reduction in infant mortality and morbidity by cause.
2. Increase in immunization coverage.
3. Increase in the number of women able to use oral rehydration therapy.
4. Reduction in growth faltering rates among children from 0 to 3 years of age.
5. Increased total household agricultural production for own consumption or sale.
6. Increased numbers of households with cash income.
7. Increased reliance on own production and markets, rather than emergency food aid, to meet food requirements.

Progress toward achievement of end-of-project status included:

1. 80 % of families in the "old impact areas" -- i.e., the three villages -- with "minimum conditions of hygiene".
2. 3,000 children treated for malnutrition at the nutrition centers in the Limpopo Corridor, Xai-Xai and Chicumbane hospitals and Catholic church-run nutrition centers in Chokwe and other centers.
3. Basic health services restored in Mapai, Combomune, Mpuzi and Litlatla.
4. An estimated 40 to 50 % of births being attended by either a midwife or a traditional birth attendant in target villages.
5. An estimated 80 % of mothers in target villages have an awareness of oral rehydration therapy.
4. 3,700 families have access to potable water.
5. User fee fund created for maintenance of each water point. Fund had a balance of Meticais 268,000 in October 1993.
6. Maize crop yields estimated to have increased from 750 to 1,800 kilogram per hectare in one village.
7. 1,400 farmers have had access to seeds on credit, agricultural extension and marketing in one village. 91.5 % of seed credit was returned in-kind after the 1992/1993 crop season.
8. 65 families benefitted from a small irrigation project in Mabalane and met 80 % of their annual food needs in 1992/1993.
9. 733 adults have participated in SCF literacy classes, including the activists, over three years.

General Grant Information

Grantee	:	Food for the Hungry, Inc.
Grant Title	:	Sofala Rural Rehabilitation Project
Grant Number	:	656-0217-G-SS-0016
Total Estimated Grant	:	\$ 6,470,101
Funds Obligated to Date	:	\$ 6,470,101
Grantee Cost Share	:	\$ 4,828,886
GOM Cost Share	:	\$ 0
Effective Date for Grant	:	7-1-1990 [and 8/20/1992]
PACD as of April 1994	:	6/30/1994
Indirect Cost Rate	:	13.7 % of total direct costs

Grant Financial Plan

Personnel Salaries	:	\$ 697,933
Travel/Transportation	:	599,252
Other Direct Costs	:	575,271
Equipment & Supplies	:	2,931,351
Training	:	98,552
General Administrative	:	788,149
Indirect Costs	:	779,600

Total Budget	:	\$ 6,470,108
--------------	---	--------------

Grant Purpose Statement

The purpose of the grant is to assist beneficiaries to reduce dependence on external assistance and move towards self-provisioning and self-reliance by:

1. Increasing agricultural production for household consumption or sale;
2. Generating cash income; and
3. Increasing rural employment.

Activity Purpose Statement(s)

The activity purposes of the grant are to implement:

1. An expanded ag-pak distribution program;
2. Expanded agricultural extension activities; and
3. Income generation activities.

Anticipated Outputs

1. 60,000 ag-paks and veg-paks distributed for crop year 1993/1994.
2. 2,500 hand sickles and 5,000 water cans distributed.
3. Extension training given.
 - a) 6,000 farmers trained by FHI agents.
 - b) 15 to 25 government extension agents in the five districts trained.
4. Assessment of oil seed production completed.
5. Ten new small scale vegetable oil production businesses operating six months without direct subsidy.
6. Assessment of small ruminant production possibilities.
7. Small ruminant production pilot activities functioning in two districts.

Actual Outputs as of March 1994

1. 60,000 ag-paks and 30,000 veg-paks were distributed for crop year 1993/1994. 100,000 ag-paks and 60,000 veg-paks distributed over the life of the two grants.
2. 2,500 hand sickles distributed in 1993/1994.
3. 4,500 watering cans distributed in 1993/1994. A total of 5,700 watering cans distributed over the life of the two grants.
4. 90,000 hoes and axes distributed in 1993/1994. A total of 130,000 hoes and axes distributed over the life of the two grants.
5. 30,000 machetes distributed in 1993/1994. A total of 50,000 machetes distributed over the life of the two grants.
6. In targeted collection points within the five districts, FHI extension agents have provided training to 10,311 displaced persons who are presently farming small plots adjacent to the temporary settlements. Training normally consists of approximately four visits per month.
7. To provide extension education, FHI has hired and trained 40 extension agents. In addition, they have trained 22 agents from the District agricultural service and given some extension training to 13 agents serving RENAMO-controlled areas. It should be noted that the 22 agents from the government agricultural service represent about 60 percent of District agents. In total, FHI has trained about 75 extension agents working in the region.
8. Assessments of the possibility of producing oilseeds and small ruminants have been carried.
9. Pilot activities in producing and processing oilseed crops and small ruminant production are underway and will continue over the next several months.

End-of-Project Status

1. FHI extension agents working with farmers in all five Districts.
2. 60,000 families planted FHI seeds and produced sufficient food for themselves for six months.
3. Crop yields increased for 6,000 farmers who received direct FHI extension assistance by at least 30 % over yields of farmers in the area not receiving assistance.
4. FHI field trial information shared with government extension agents.

Progress toward achievement of the end-of-project status

1. Extension agents are working with farmers in all five Districts. FHI is working in both RENAMO and government-controlled areas within the districts.
2. FHI estimates at present that approximately 10,000 families receiving ag-paks and veg-paks were able to produce an estimated seven months of maize supply and a supplemental supply of beans and vegetables for family consumption.
3. An estimated 10,000 families receiving FHI seed packages and extension support produced an average of about 60 % more food than farmers who had not received assistance, as per crop yields sampled by project personnel.
4. FHI field trial information and extension methodology shared with government agricultural extension and research personnel.

General Grant Information

Grantee	:	Adventist Development & Relief Agency
Grant Title	:	Inhambane Rural Rehabilitation
Grant Number	:	656-0217-G-SS-0017-00
Total Estimated Grant	:	\$ 1,233,849
Funds Obligated to Date	:	\$ 1,233,849
Grantee Cost Share	:	\$ 403,487
GOM Cost Share	:	\$ 0
Effective Date for Grant	:	7/31/1990
PACD as of April 1994	:	3/31/1994
Indirect Cost Rate	:	17 % of total direct costs

Grant Financial Plan

Personnel Salaries	:	\$ 292,840
Technical Assistance	:	151,020
Travel/Transportation	:	83,850
Other Direct Costs	:	400,016
Evaluation	:	45,510
General Administrative	:	81,336
Indirect Costs	:	179,277

Total Budget	:	\$ 1,233,849
--------------	---	--------------

Grant Purpose Statement

To support ongoing rural rehabilitation project in Inhambane Province.

Activity Purpose Statement(s)

To increase rural employment, production capacity and cash income of target groups. To facilitate increased total household agricultural production by providing agricultural inputs to displaced and other seriously affected persons and training of extension workers.

Anticipated Outputs

1. Seeds and tools distributed to target population.
2. Extension workers trained.
3. Develop health program with other PVOs working in region.

Actual Outputs as of March 1994

The following information taken largely from the final evaluation of the project undertaken by ADRA in late 1993 and early 1994.

1. Four supervisors and thirty-six agents trained and at the time of evaluation, 25 extension agents still working on the project. Four supervisors/trainers subsequently dismissed for theft.
2. 16 demonstration plots for traditional crops planted.
3. Eleven demonstration plots for vegetables planted.
4. 322 metric tons of traditional crop seeds distributed to displaced families.
5. 1,571 kilograms of vegetable seed distributed.
6. 5,407 agricultural tools distributed.
7. Four fruit nurseries established and 11,416 fruit tree seedlings distributed.

End-of-Project Status

1. Increased total household agricultural production for consumption and sale.
2. Increased number of households with cash income.
3. Increased reliance on own production and markets, rather than food aid.
4. Reduction in growth faltering rates.

Progress toward achievement of end-of-project status:

1. Comparisons of crop yields on participating and non-participating farmers were conducted. Reported results showed increased yields for maize, peanuts and millet by 32 %, 37 % and 20 % respectively.
2. Interviews at the end of the grant to measure impact show that most of the participating farmers are now living primarily on their own production as opposed to food aid or wild plants.
3. From October 1990 through December 1992, 14,467 families received project assistance. Beneficiaries included many displaced families.
4. In 1993, over 23,000 of the 46,705 families that are in the target districts were assisted by the project. Each family averages 5.5 persons over the four districts, for a total of about 126,000 persons benefitted.
5. Assisted families all received some training in improved agricultural production techniques of traditional crops.
6. Over 8,200 families received training in vegetable crop production and 1,050 were given training in fruit crop production. A portion of those trained also received seeds for traditional and vegetable crops and tree seedlings. To dampen developing dependency, most of the traditional crop seeds were sold to participating farmers.

General Grant Information

Grantee	:	AFRICARE
Grant Title	:	Water and Sanitation Project in Sofala Province
Grant Number	:	656-0217-G-SS-0018-00
Total Estimated Grant	:	\$ 256,111
Funds Obligated to Date	:	\$ 256,111
Grantee Cost Share	:	\$ 450,000
GOM Cost Share	:	\$ 0
Effective Date for Grant	:	7/31/1990
PACD as of April 1994	:	12/31/1992
Indirect Cost Rate	:	23.91 % for personnel and administrative costs and 11.96 % for project supplies and equipment

Grant Financial Plan

Personnel	:	\$ 48,081
TA and Evaluation	:	7,965
Equipment & Supplies	:	134,825
General Administrative	:	14,334
Indirect Costs	:	50,906

Total Budget	:	\$ 256,111
--------------	---	------------

Grant Purpose Statement

Promoting the increased coverage of preventive health care and availability of basic services.

Activity Purpose Statement(s)

This grant activity is the water/sanitation component of a broader Rural rehabilitation in Sofala Province operated by AFRICARE.

Anticipated Outputs

1. Construction of 30 shallow wells.
2. Construction of 20 boreholes.
3. Rehabilitation of 20 existing wells.

Actual Outputs as of March 1994

Limited file information was available on this grant. One quarterly progress report for the period November 1991 to January 1992 was found.

It reported activities during the period as:

1. In Machanga District
 - a. Eight boreholes constructed.
 - b. Five Afridev hand pumps installed.
 - c. Five aprons and drainage canals constructed.

2. In Nhamatanda District
 - a. Six boreholes constructed.
 - b. Six Afridev hand pumps installed.
 - c. Six aprons and drainage canals constructed.

Activities scheduled for Gorongosa were not undertaken for security reasons.

For the next reporting period Africare was scheduled to construct or rehabilitate eight additional boreholes and install 12 more Afridev pumps in Machanga and Buzi Districts. These installations are not confirmed in the project files.

End-of-Project Status

1. Wells benefitting approximately 3,000 families in Gorongosa, Nhamatanda, Buzi and Machanga Districts.

119

General Grant Information

Grantee	:	CARE
Grant Title	:	DPCCN Logistical Support Project -- Phase II
Grant Number	:	656-0217-A-00-2037-00
Total Estimated Grant	:	\$ 4,899,533
Funds Obligated to Date	:	\$ 4,899,533
Grantee Cost Share	:	\$ 10,558,570
GOM Cost Share	:	\$ 0
Effective Date for Grant	:	3/26/1992
PACD as of April 1994	:	6/30/1994
Indirect Cost Rate	:	7.6 % of modified direct costs

Grant Financial Plan

Personnel Salaries	:	\$ 824,501
Benefits	:	275,436
Travel/Transportation	:	846,639
Consultants	:	115,864
Other Direct Costs	:	351,454
Equipment & Supplies	:	118,598
Allowances	:	712,702
General Administrative	:	1,308,907
Indirect Costs	:	345,432
<hr/>		
Total Budget	:	\$ 4,899,533

Grant Purpose Statement

The cooperative agreement will focus on two principal objectives:

1. Provide effective technical advice and management support to enable DPCCN to meet the humanitarian assistance needs of up to 2.2 million beneficiaries of the emergency food aid program through 4/30/1994; and
2. Handover all functions of the LSU Project to DPCCN counterparts by 6/30/1994.

Activity Purpose Statement(s)

Same as above.

Anticipated Outputs

None specifically stated.

Actual Outputs as of March 1994

Each of the above systems has been dealt with by CARE and the DPCCN played a very important role in the distribution of food during the periods of civil strife and drought. However, the operational systems developed are simply too costly to keep in place when not functioning. The organizations that housed these systems are degrading internally largely from disuse.

1. All food aid reception and transshipment operations are contracted to the private sector either by DPCCN or World Food Programme.
2. Local procurement systems for spare parts are in place but many problems plague their use. In many cases, parts not available locally.
3. An estimated 30 % of food aid transportation -- i.e., port to District level -- handled by DPCCN was contracted to private transporters during 1992 and 1993. Work contracted out to private transporters declined when DPCCN existing truck fleet could easily handle the greatly reduced levels of food aid flowing through the DPCCN. WFP contracted out most of its transportation services to private companies.
4. Systems have been designed for downsizing the DPCCN vehicle fleet but DPCCN has been moving slowly to divest itself of these resources.
5. Numerous systems were put in place to secure adequate and reliable sources of fuel, CARE was involved in the more formal systems.
6. The DPCCN procured private storage services during peak aid inflows and now is contracting out its own storage capacity.
7. A major part of emergency assistance coming into Mozambique through DPCCN/WFP/ UNHCR was distributed by non-governmental organizations.

End-of-Project Status

1. All functions of the DPCCN in the hands of local counterparts as of 6/30/1994.

Progress toward achievement of end-of-project status:

1. The DPCCN is reflective of the rapidly changing organizational environment within which it exists. Some of the DPCCN's current institutional capacity will probably remain intact, but the organization as a whole will probably not be sustained nor is that even desirable. The disaster response planning function is probably the strongest unit and will be absorbed within existing ministerial structures. The organizational linkages with village and district level entities have served as an important element in relief assistance and hopefully will be maintained. The warehouses and vehicle fleet are clearly not sustainable. District and community-level distribution systems are increasingly the responsibility of PVOs, NGOs and UN agencies.
2. CARE is responsibly phasing out its involvement with the DPCCN and is expected to end all activities under this grant by June 1994.

21

General Grant Information

Grantee	:	Mozambique Health Committee
Grant Title	:	MHC Preventive Health Project
Grant Number	:	656-0217-G-SS-2051-00
Total Estimated Grant	:	\$ 2,040,820
Funds Obligated to Date	:	\$ 2,040,820
Grantee Cost Share	:	\$ 126,500
GOM Cost Share	:	\$ 189,700
Effective Date for Grant	:	5/28/1992
PACD as of April 1994	:	12/31/1994
Indirect Cost Rate	:	30 % of total direct costs

Grant Financial Plan

Personnel Salaries	:	\$	734,685
Travel/Transportation	:		96,800
Allowances	:		115,383
Other Direct Costs	:		391,573
Equipment & Supplies	:		211,420
Training	:		20,000
Indirect Costs	:		470,959

Total Budget	:	\$	2,040,820
--------------	---	----	-----------

Grant Purpose Statement

No specific statement.

Activity Purpose Statement(s)

No specific statement.

Anticipated Outputs

The grant agreement provided no specific statement of anticipated outputs for this project. During the evaluation team's visit to Chimoio, MHC produced a draft logical framework listing the following anticipated outputs:

1. Baseline maternal and child health survey with report.
2. EPI "Missed" Opportunity Study.
3. Initiate Community Immunization Tracking System and expand to four rural target communities.
4. Diarrheal disease management qualitative study with recommendations.
5. Diarrheal disease survey about community knowledge of oral rehydration therapy in three districts, with recommendations.
6. Community education program developed and implemented on control of diarrheal disease.
7. Initiate sentinel nutritional surveillance system.
8. Special Attention evaluation and recommendations.
9. Improved coordination of supplementary feeding activities by DPS and NGOs.
10. Identification of major health problems and barriers to women, analysis of their use of health services.
11. Study of the prevalence of sexually transmitted diseases in women seeking pre-natal consultations in Chimoio and target rural community, with recommendations.
12. Knowledge, Attitude Practice (KAP) survey to generate program planning information.
13. Traditional birth attendants program evaluation and report.
14. Increased community coverage by traditional birth attendants.
15. Traditional birth attendant supervision monthly [80% compliance] with statistic collection.
16. Community health workers and activists trained in community mobilization.
17. Management seminars in MCH and AIDS programs.
18. Financial/sustainability study, report and recommendations.
19. DDS staff trained to plan, supervise, implement and evaluate MCH programs; increase District to Health Post supervision.
20. Workshops on AIDs education and case management.
21. Workshops on diarrhea management, nutritional surveillance, Special Attention, management, MCH evaluation tools, SMI and other topics.
22. Screening and health services for repatriated populations in target areas.
23. Needs assessment and selected rehabilitation completed as needed.

Actual Outputs as of March 1994

1. Baseline MCH/EPI survey completed in September 1992.
2. EPI "missed opportunities study completed in May 1993.
3. Community training/mobilizations conducted on EPI via community councils.
4. Regular technical/transport support given for mobile brigades throughout.
5. Survey about community knowledge of oral rehydration therapy completed in three districts in September 1992.
6. Community education programs developed on CDD and implementation ongoing.
7. Community leaders trained in oral rehydration therapy in health-promotion seminars.
8. Four communities supplied with seven safe water sources.
9. Provincial nutritional surveys conducted in 1992 and 1993.
10. Three supplementary feeding programs newly linked to HPs/DDSs.
11. Evaluation of Special Needs underway.
12. Ten health posts operating in 1993.
13. Consulting report completed April 1994 identifying major health problems and barriers to women and analyzing women's use of health services.
14. Study of sexually transmitted disease prevalence in women of child-bearing age in Chimoio and rural communities initiated November 1993 and continuing.
15. 402 women tested for syphilis in three target districts [43 % of total antenatal clinic attendance] and an average 343 women tested per month.
16. Pre-natal registry developed and supported.
17. A variety of health education materials and methods developed and used.
18. A minimum of five new theatre groups in four districts and Chimoio trained to deliver health messages and training activists in sanitation, diarrhea and AIDS education.
19. Survey conducted to measure improvement in AIDS knowledge before and after theatre presentations in selected audiences.
20. Three district traditional birth attendant programs evaluated; 15 new attendants trained in Manica; 48 attendants given in-service training; and 48 attendants receiving quarterly supervision and material to do deliveries in 1993.
21. 1,236 births assisted by trained attendants in three districts in a six to eight month period in 1993.
22. 17 community health workers contacted and links re-established with nearest health post.
23. Minimum of 25 community councils formed and active.
24. Three refugee screening sessions done with MHC assistance.
25. Seven health posts being equipped and staffed to function in Barue and Sussundenga Districts.
26. Ten latrines and five washing areas constructed at health units in Sussundenga.
27. Two cholera centers and one house completed with MHC support to support health services.

End-of-Project Status

1. 20 % increase in vaccination coverage in target communities.
2. 40 % increase in utilization of routine child care services.
3. 40 % increase in protocol-managed diarrheal oral rehydration therapy training.
4. 50 % increase in Special Attention favorable outcomes.
5. 15 % increase in women receiving prenatal care.
6. 95 % feedback of health information to health units.
7. 1,000 families enrolled in Community Information Tracking System.

125

General Grant Information

Grantee	:	Save the Children Federation
Grant Title	:	Children and War Project -- Phase I
Grant Number	:	656-0217-G-SS-2053-00
Total Estimated Grant	:	\$ 1,820,503
Funds Obligated to Date	:	\$ 1,820,503
Grantee Cost Share	:	\$ 550,000
GOM Cost Share	:	\$ 0
Effective Date for Grant	:	9/1/1991
PACD as of April 1994	:	3/15/1993
Indirect Cost Rate	:	26.78 % on total direct costs except equipment.

Grant Financial Plan

Personnel Salaries	:	\$ 435,873
Benefits	:	64,210
Travel/Transportation	:	485,885
Allowances	:	15,924
Other Direct Costs	:	331,823
Equipment & Supplies	:	81,620
Training	:	38,773
Indirect Costs	:	366,395
<hr/>		
Total Budget	:	\$ 1,820,503

Grant Purpose Statement

The purpose of the grant is to provide support for the SCF Children of War program.

Activity Purpose Statement(s)

None specifically stated.

Anticipated Outputs

None specifically stated.

126

Actual Outputs as of March 1994

1. Project documented 8,383 children separated from their families and affected by the war.
2. Project was instrumental in reunifying 2,502 children with their families.
3. Project has documented 13,071 children reported missing by their families.
4. Project has created networks for reunifying families comprising 13,542 volunteers as of the end of Phase I.
5. Project has identified populations of 12,000 traumatized children and 6,000 demobilized soldiers in need of assistance.

End-of-Project Status

None specifically stated.

General Grant Information

Grantee	:	World Relief Corporation
Grant Title	:	Preventive Health, Water and Sanitation Project
Grant Number	:	656-0217-G-SS-3003-00
Total Estimated Grant	:	\$ 2,915,115
Funds Obligated to Date	:	\$ 2,915,115
Grantee Cost Share	:	\$ 311,706
GOM Cost Share	:	\$ 0
Effective Date for Grant	:	10/1/1992
PACD as of April 1994	:	9/30/1995
Indirect Cost Rate	:	24.7 % on total direct costs

Grant Financial Plan

Personnel Salaries	:	\$ 398,766
Travel/Transportation	:	119,100
Other Direct Costs	:	261,765
Equipment & Supplies	:	553,320
Drilling Sub-Contract	:	1,016,636
Indirect Costs	:	565,528

Total Budget	:	\$ 2,915,115
--------------	---	--------------

Grant Purpose Statement

The follow-on grant supports the purpose and objectives detailed in the original grant. The purpose is to enable cooperating community organizations and associations, as well as local government health and sanitation services in selected areas of Gaza Province, to plan for and deliver appropriate water supply to communities so as to measurably improve community health and the quality of life. This will be done through the additional drilling of boreholes and the development of a community-based water/sanitation action and education program.

Activity Purpose Statement(s)

None specifically stated.

128

Anticipated Outputs

1. Up to 70 deep boreholes will be drilled and tested through contracting with a private drilling company.
2. Up to 78 shallow boreholes of up to 50 meters in depth will be drilled using hand operated rigs.
3. WRC will train and equip two local teams of three persons each to operate and maintain the manually operated rigs.
4. An estimated 110 successful boreholes will be developed and equipped with a cement apron, drain and hand pump installed on a sealed well head.
5. Where feasible and cost-effective, WRC will rehabilitate existing non-operative boreholes rather than drill new ones.
6. Village water user committees will be organized for each of the successful borehole sites and each committee will appoint two well caretakers.
7. Sixty health groups will be organized and/or mobilized and supported to provide health education. Each group will contain 15 to 20 volunteers, primarily women.
8. A baseline survey of water needs and potential in Massangena and Chigubo Districts.
9. Up to 12 model pit latrines built using local materials.

Actual Outputs as of March 1994

1. Outputs under Original Grant Agreement

- a. Forty-one deep boreholes were sunk and pump tested along the Limpopo Corridor in the Province of Gaza.
- b. Hand pumps were installed and concrete aprons and drainage structures were built for the 29 boreholes which yielded sufficient potable water.
- c. Village-level management and maintenance organizations were created in 11 communities served by the wells.
- d. Pump caretakers and maintenance men were selected and trained in each community.
- e. Spare parts and tools were provided to eight communities.
- f. An estimated 30,000 persons were given access to sanitary domestic water.

2. Outputs under Amendment 1

- a. No deep boreholes have been drilled or tested. However, a contract has been signed with a private drilling company to drill 25 deep boreholes. Drilling will start before the end of April.
- b. No shallow boreholes have been drilled.
- c. Training of local teams to operate and maintain the manually-operated drilling rigs has started. Local teams are currently drilling one test/training shallow borehole as a training exercise.
- d. No aprons, drains or hand pump installations have been completed.
- e. No existing non-operative boreholes have been rehabilitated.
- f. No village water user committees have been organized. No well caretakers have been appointed.
- g. No health groups have been organized.
- h. Baseline surveys of water needs and potential in Massangena and Chigubo Districts have been completed.
- i. No model pit latrines have been completed.

End-of-Project Status

1. Sixty health groups trained in community education for the correct utilization of the borehole and pump, treatment of water and the general relationship of water to health.
2. 110 village water user committees trained in water/sanitation topics, construction of home latrines, and proper procedures for disposal of garbage.
3. A user-fee system in place for new water points developed in coordination with Agua Rural and the village water user and health committees, with 17 community water user committees having a functioning user-fee system which covers the recurrent costs of their well.
4. Forty communities participating in the grant activities with a total beneficiary population of about 74,000 people.
5. Clean water at the rate of one well for 500 people, providing at least 10 liters of potable water per person per day in each community.
6. 100 % of well users have received water and hygiene education.
7. A water quality, well head conservation and environmental impact monitoring system established for 110 boreholes.
8. Diarrheal diseases in children under five years of age decreased by 40 %.
9. 30 % of the targeted families have built latrines for their own use based on the WRC model.
10. Productive and environmentally safe end uses for run-off water developed for 70 % of the boreholes.

General Grant Information

Grantee	:	Medical Care Development
Grant Title	:	MCD Water and Sanitation Project
Grant Number	:	656-0217-G-SS-3011-00
Total Estimated Grant	:	\$ 1,213,122
Funds Obligated to Date	:	\$ 1,213,122
Grantee Cost Share	:	\$ 513,260
GOM Cost Share	:	\$ 0
Effective Date for Grant	:	4/30/1993
PACD as of April 1994	:	4/1/1995
Indirect Cost Rate	:	42 % of total direct costs

Grant Financial Plan

Personnel Salaries	:	\$ 294,000
Consultant Fees	:	21,000
Travel/Transportation	:	131,000
Allowances	:	144,000
Other Direct Costs	:	53,122
Equipment & Supplies	:	340,000
Indirect Costs	:	230,000

Total Budget	:	\$ 1,213,122
--------------	---	--------------

Grant Purpose Statement

The purpose of this grant is to provide support for the Rural Water and Sanitation Program in Cuamba District of Niassa Province.

Activity Purpose Statement(s)

The purpose of this activity is to enable villagers in the target areas of Cuamba District of Niassa Province to recognize and resolve individual and community health problems which are related to the provision and use of water for consumption and sanitation. MCD will assist villagers with community mobilization and participation in the process of providing information through health education and with provision of potable water from hand-dug wells. This will be accomplished by organizing activities around the solution of water and sanitation problems. These activities are seen as a pilot program which will provide a data base and a model for future water and sanitation activities in the Province.

132

Anticipated Outputs

1. 100 operating shallow wells fitted with handpumps -- i.e., 60 new hand dug wells and 40 rehabilitated wells.
2. 100 village water committees organized and trained in the use and management of water, sanitation and hygiene topics related directly to water and sanitation.
3. Six to eight extension workers trained with more than 80 hours each of formal training in community mobilization and health education.
4. Installed capacity for bacteriological water quality testing in Niassa Provision.

Actual Outputs as of March 1994

1. Rapid Needs Assessment conducted, with selection of villages and prioritization of construction.
2. 95 % of the Knowledge Attitudes Perception and Beliefs study completed.
3. No shallow wells fitted with hand pumps and none operating to date.
4. No village water committees organized and trained to date. Agua Rural specialist to begin forming committees in May 1994.
4. No extension workers trained to date.
5. Water quality specialists from North America performed water quality testing of wells and town reservoir. They also trained Agua Rural specialists in how to perform water quality testing and evaluation.

End-of-Project Status

1. Latrine coverage for 75 % of the target area.
2. 25 to 50 communities participating in the project with a total beneficiary population of about 50,000.
3. Each community with access to clean water at the rate of one well for 500 people, providing at least 30 liters of potable water per person per day.
4. Each village committee and all villagers introduced to the idea of community mobilization and subjects related to health education including the correct transport and storage of water, latrine promotion, use and maintenance, the correct use and maintenance of pumps and wells, and diarrhea prevention.
5. Development and/or modification of didactic materials, testing and refined use in villages, and, if possible, health center oral rehydration therapy corners.

133

General Grant Information

Grantee	:	Save the Children Federation
Grant Title	:	Children and War Project -- Phase II
Grant Number	:	656-0217-G-SS-3016-00
Total Estimated Grant	:	\$ 3,626,205
Funds Obligated to Date	:	\$ 2,200,000
Grantee Cost Share	:	\$ 1,361,217
GOM Cost Share	:	\$ 0
Effective Date for Grant	:	4/1/1993
PACD as of April 1994	:	3/31/1995
Indirect Cost Rate	:	28.5 % of total direct costs except equipment

Grant Financial Plan

Personnel Salaries	:	975,638
Travel/Transportation	:	629,918
Other Direct Costs	:	352,395
Equipment & Supplies	:	400,860
Training	:	303,400
Indirect Costs	:	552,399

Total Budget : \$ 3,314,610

[NOTE: Balance of this grant -- i.e., \$ 311,595 -- is budgeted for activities in Malawi and Zimbabwe]

Grant Purpose Statement

The purpose of this grant is to:

1. Assist war-affected Mozambican children resume normal social and psychological development; and
2. Help restore traditional social functions of families and communities in the care of war-affected children.

Activity Purpose Statement(s)

None specifically stated.

134

Anticipated Outputs

1. 30,000 unaccompanied children registered, with 25,000 reunited with their families or guardians.
2. 5,000 former child soldiers assisted.
3. Follow-up assistance received by 15,000 reunited children.
4. 1,000 children participated in job and life skills programs.
5. 20,000 traumatized children received community-based interventions.
6. 2,000 young demobilized soldiers received skill training and follow-up assistance.
7. One organizationally-autonomous and operational Mozambican non-governmental organization created and trained in assistance for war-affected children.
8. Five to 10 formal community associations from the informal volunteer network created and registered with the government.
9. Twenty Mozambican interns trained.

Actual Outputs as of March 1994

1. Project has documented 1,617 children missing their families under Phase II and 10,000 children missing their families in total.
2. Project has been instrumental in reunifying 1,210 children with their families under Phase II and 3,712 children in total.
3. Project has identified families missing 2,729 children under Phase II and families missing 15,800 children in total.
4. Project has provided followup support services for 350 children reunited with their families.
5. Project has documented 5,155 spontaneous reunifications of children with families under Phase II.
6. Project has provided job/life skills training to an average of 16 persons per month under Phase II.
7. Project has assisted 28 traumatized children under Phase II.
8. Project has assisted an average of four demobilized soldiers per month under Phase II.
9. An additional 22,289 volunteers have participated in the networks under Phase II and a total of 35,831 volunteers have participated in total.
10. 1,722 Community Volunteers and 22 Children at War interns have been trained under Phase II.

End-of-Project Status

1. An informal assistance network of 40,000 volunteers in place and extended to every District and administrative post in the seven Provinces where the grant operates.
2. 75 % of formerly inaccessible areas reached by grant activities.
3. Assistance under the grant received by 50 % of the unaccompanied children in RENAMO areas.
4. 400 communities trained in treatment/care of traumatized children.

135

General Grant Information

Grantee	:	AFRICARE
Grant Title	:	Africare Wells and Sanitation Project
Grant Number	:	656-0217-G-00-3022
Total Estimated Grant	:	\$ 2,450,113
Funds Obligated to Date	:	\$ 1,357,529
Grantee Cost Share	:	\$ 913,328
GOM Cost Share	:	\$ 0
Effective Date for Grant	:	7/1/1993
PACD as of April 1994	:	6/30/1994
Indirect Cost Rate	:	

Grant Financial Plan

Personnel	:	\$ 726,702
Travel/Transportation	:	122,215
Equipment & Supplies	:	283,381
Other Direct Costs	:	902,004
Indirect Costs	:	415,811

Total Budget	:	\$ 2,450,113
--------------	---	--------------

Grant Purpose Statement

To support integrated health, water and sanitation activity in the Sofala Province.

Activity Purpose Statement(s)

To improve the health status of a selected peri-urban and rural population in Beira and Chibabava Districts of Sofala Province. To reduce and control water-borne and other diarrheal diseases. To provide safe and potable water and community mobilization and education.

136

Anticipated Outputs

1. 210 hand dug wells constructed or rehabilitated in Beira City and Chibabawa District.
2. 210 water technicians trained to operate pumps and maintain wells [1 per well].
3. 210 water user committees organized, trained and functioning.
4. 50 water user committees with functioning user-fee systems covering 100 % of recurrent costs of the water point.
5. 50 constructed and operating at stand pipes in Beira City with capacities of 8,000 to 15,000 liters.
6. Five private workers trained.
7. Agua de Beira well team trained.
8. Agua Rural well team trained.
9. 50 school latrines built and functioning with committee of students maintaining facilities.
10. 30 household latrines built and functioning in Chibabava District.
11. Five AFRICARE latrine workers trained.
12. Three health posts rehabilitated in Chibabava and equipped with a well and latrine.
13. Six to eight health post government staff trained in preventive medicine.
14. Three AFRICARE preventive health care agents recruited and trained.
15. Fifteen rural and 20 urban Mozambican Red Cross volunteers trained and working as community mobilizers in health, water and sanitation.
16. Twenty community volunteers trained and retransmitting preventive health education related to water and sanitation.
17. Ten community health trainers trained in preventive health, water and sanitation.
18. Six health campaigns on diarrheal disease control conducted.
19. Survey and analysis of existing wells in Beira City.
20. Community Health Profiles (KAP) completed for Chibabava and Beira water and sanitation beneficiaries.

Actual Outputs as of March 1994

Africare is proposing to adjust project outputs seven months after initiating grant activities. To date, the USAID Mission has not approved the adjustments as proposed. Africare's rationale for the revisions are based on their perception that previous outputs were emergency relief and rehabilitation-oriented, rather than centered on development-related activities. The new list of anticipated outputs were developed with assistance from WASH during a two week consultancy in April 1994.

1. To date, enumerators have been trained and a KAP health baseline survey has been completed, with survey data from over 300 wells.
2. Africare has established contacts with government agencies and communities and set up working teams
3. Local level health/sanitation committees have been established and work sites have been identified. These activities are not clearly quantified in Africare reports.
4. Other activities included: obtaining work approvals; constructing working demonstration of water tank; establishing the Africare office; developing training materials; initiating procurement activities; trying to resolve importation issues; refining scopes of work and work plans; and design of public exhibits.

End-of-Project Status

1. 200,000 beneficiaries receiving at least five liters each of potable water from 250 water storage tanks in Beira City.
2. 50 % of families in four or five communities in Chibabava District received basic health education.
3. 70 % of mothers able to practice oral rehydration therapy.
4. Diarrheal diseases in children under 3 years of age decreased by 10 %.
5. 85 % of diarrheal cases reported at health facilities in Chibabava treated with oral rehydration therapy.

General Grant Information

Grantee	:	CARE
Grant Title	:	Inhambane Water and Sanitation Project
Grant Number	:	656-0217-G-00-3029-00
Total Estimated Grant	:	\$ 867,468
Funds Obligated to Date	:	\$ 867,468
Grantee Cost Share	:	\$ 425,434
GOM Cost Share	:	\$ 0
Effective Date for Grant	:	9/1/1993
PACD as of April 1994	:	12/31/1994
Indirect Cost Rate	:	7.6 % of total direct costs less exclusions

Grant Financial Plan

Personnel Salaries	:	\$ 166,523
Benefits	:	92,554
Travel/Transportation	:	102,549
Other Direct Costs	:	31,318
Equipment & Supplies	:	413,957
Indirect Costs	:	60,567

Total Budget	:	\$ 867,468
--------------	---	------------

Grant Purpose Statement

Improve health status of selected rural population in Inhambane Province.

Activity Purpose Statement(s)

Provide accessible and potable water and sanitation program in Mabote, Govuro, Vilanculos and Inhassoro Districts.

Anticipated Outputs

1. Construction of 30 boreholes and 10 shallow wells with cement aprons, drains, and hand pumps on sealed heads.
2. Four new Agua Rural animators trained in water point construction.
3. Eight health workers, 8 mechanics and 15 animators from Agua Rural, EPAR and PEC received refresher training on hand pump mounting and maintenance and sanitation/hygiene.
4. Pilot user-fee system established for all 40 water points.
5. Pilot water quality, well head conservation and environmental impact monitoring system established for all 40 water points.
6. 320 improved latrines constructed and in use.
7. Forty village water and health committees formed, trained and functioning.
8. 160 community water source caretakers trained and functioning as intended.
9. Water needs and baseline socio-demographic surveys on all potential water development sites.
10. Forty community and water source profiles produced.

Actual Outputs as of March 1994

1. Thirty boreholes successfully drilled and being fitted with handpumps.
2. Ten cement-lined shallow wells dug and being fitted with drains and pumps.
2. Latrine construction activities commenced.
3. Village health education program started with training of trainers and village health surveys.
4. Training for handpump maintenance and repair started.

End-of-Project Status

1. Thirty-five communities with an estimated beneficiary population of about 35,000 participated using water and sanitation facilities and training.
2. Thirty-five communities having access to clean water at rate of one well for 500 people and 15 liters of water per person per day.
3. 20,000 community residents have access to clean water within two kilometers of their residence.
4. Forty village level water and health committees and 20 % of community members trained in water and hygiene.

Progress toward achievement of the end-of-project status:

1. Water point development targets are largely met but the project is experiencing numerous problems in pump breakdowns.
2. Health education and sanitation activities are proceeding much more slowly.

140

General Grant Information

Grantee	:	CARE
Grant Number	:	656-0217-G-00-3046-00
Grant Title	:	Machaze District Potable Water Project
Total Estimated Grant	:	\$ 233,861
Funds Obligated to Date	:	\$ 233,861
Grantee Cost Share	:	\$ 354,371
GOM Cost Share	:	\$ 0
Effective Date for Grant	:	9/1/1993
PACD as of April 1994	:	3/31/1994
Indirect Cost Rate	:	7.6 % of total direct costs less adjustments

Grant Financial Plan

Personnel Salaries	:	\$ 60,000
Benefits	:	13,412
Travel/Transportation	:	20,559
Allowances	:	400
Other Direct Costs	:	17,926
Equipment & Supplies	:	83,517
Training	:	3,639
General Administrative	:	17,890
Indirect Costs	:	16,518

Total Budget	:	\$ 233,861
--------------	---	------------

Grant Purpose Statement

Provide a continued source of potable water to selected rural population of Machaze District in Manica Province.

Activity Statement(s)

To rehabilitate up to 500 concrete water catchment cisterns; install hand pumps on ten existing boreholes; conduct hydrogeological survey to identify potential borehole sites.

Anticipated Outputs

1. 500 concrete water catchment cisterns repaired and able to hold up to 24,500 gallons of clean water.
2. 500 water user communities trained in use and environment hygiene of rehabilitated cisterns.
3. 5,000 village women trained in basic water and hygiene education.
4. Ten hand pumps installed on existing deep boreholes.
5. Five local pump mechanics and 20 water source caretakers [2 per well] trained.
6. Technical studies on: survey of existing cisterns in northern Machaza District; existing borehole test results; cost effective supply systems; and hydrogeological survey of southern Machaza District.

Actual Outputs as of March 1994

1. 1,000 concrete water catchment cisterns have been repaired. An estimated 500 remain. Each cistern can hold up to 1,500 liters of water.
2. Three existing deep wells have been fitted with handpumps. A fourth well is being fitted with a handpump. Other boreholes in the District have been sabotaged and are considered beyond repair.
3. A four person team has been organized and trained in pump maintenance, repair and water hygiene.
4. Basic health and hygiene training has been given in thirty villages where cisterns and deep wells have been repaired. Training is normally conducted over two or three visits per site. An estimated 3,000 to 4,000 women have been trained.
5. A census of existing boreholes has been completed, including checks on condition of well, its depth and salinity level.
6. A census of existing cisterns has been completed.
7. A hydrogeological survey of southern Machaze District has been completed.

End-of-Project Status

1. All users of water catchment cisterns receive potable water from the cisterns either through chlorination or home purification systems.
2. 500 water user communities with an estimated beneficiary of 35,000 people participated in cistern rehabilitation.
3. 75 % of beneficiaries have access to clear water within five kilometers of their homes.

Progress toward achievement of end-of-project status:

1. The cistern repair activity will not be able to deliver a constant clean supply of water and is being downscaled.
2. Repaired cisterns probably serve as a supplementary water supply for a portion of the year for five or six family members.
3. It is estimated that, for a good portion of each year, seven boreholes, including the four repaired under the grant, serve 80,000 people currently living in the district.

General Grant Information

Grantee	:	CARE
Grant Title	:	Machaze District Food Security Project
Grant Number	:	656-0217-G-00-3047-00
Total Estimated Grant	:	\$ 484,933
Funds Obligated to Date	:	\$ 484,933
Grantee Cost Share	:	\$ 200,000
GOM Cost Share	:	\$ 0
Effective Date for Grant	:	9/1/1993
PACD as of April 1994	:	2/28/1994
Indirect Cost Rate	:	7.6 % of total direct costs less exclusions

Grant Financial Plan

Personnel Salaries	:	\$ 37,295
Benefits	:	12,587
Travel/Transportation	:	33,811
Allowances	:	6,654
Other Direct Costs	:	11,700
Equipment & Supplies	:	347,771
Training	:	46
General Administrative	:	817
Indirect Costs	:	34,252

Total Budget	:	\$ 484,933
--------------	---	------------

Grant Purpose Statement

To improve food security for the rural population of Machaze District in Manica Province.

Activity Purpose Statement

Distribution of seeds and agricultural tools for the 1993/1994 crop season.

Anticipated Outputs

1. Ag-paks [cereal and pulse seeds and one hoe] distributed to 12,000 families engaged in subsistence farming in Machaze District.

Actual Outputs as of March 1994

1. 4,000 ag-paks [cereal and pulse seeds and one hoe] distributed to families in Southern Machaze District.
2. 6,400 hoes and 6,300 sacks [40 kgs. each] of seeds distributed in Northern Machaze District.

End-of-Project Status

1. 12,000 families in Machaze District plant CARE-supplied seeds.
2. Each farm family has sufficient cereal stocks for at least six months and pulses for at least one year.

Progress toward achievement of end-of-project status:

1. An estimated 10,000 families benefitting from CARE supplied seeds. Yield estimates, crop or household surveys not available.

145

General Grant Information

Grantee	:	Action Internationale Contre La Faim
Grant Title	:	Preventive Health Care Project in Sofala Province
Grant Number	:	656-0217-G-00-3048-00
Total Estimated Grant	:	\$ 618,635
Funds Obligated to Date	:	\$ 436,052
Grantee Cost Share	:	\$ 313,580
GOM Cost Share	:	\$ 0
Effective Date for Grant	:	10/1/1993
PACD as of April 1994	:	9/30/1994
Indirect Cost Rate	:	11.2 % of total direct costs less cost of equipment

Grant Financial Plan

Personnel Salaries	:	\$ 311,366
Travel/Transportation	:	53,412
Other Direct Costs	:	93,100
Equipment & Supplies	:	92,795
General Administrative	:	15,000
Indirect Costs	:	52,962

Total Budget	:	\$ 618,635
--------------	---	------------

Grant Purpose Statement

The purpose of this grant is to improve the health status of a selected rural population in Sofala Province.

Activity Purpose Statement(s)

The purpose of the original activity was to improve the health status of a selected rural population in Caia District through provision of maternal and child health services and reduction and control of water-borne and other diarrheal diseases. This will be done by the rehabilitation of health centers, provision of potable water and the instituting of a maternal and child health system.

Anticipated Outputs

1. Complete survey of existing water points in Murraca and Sena identifying priority sites for rehabilitation and/or construction.
2. Complete survey of existing wells in Marromeu District.
3. A water needs assessment of each potential water point site prior to well construction or rehabilitation.
3. 55 hand dug wells -- i.e., 10 in Sena District, 20 in Murraca and 25 in Marromeu District -- each with a cement apron, drain and hand pump installed on a sealed well head.
4. 110 community volunteers trained for hand pump use and water point maintenance [2 persons per well].
5. 55 water user committees created and functioning.
6. Two health centers in Caia District rehabilitation or reconstructed.
7. Two health centers fully equipped and with a system in ensure regular provision of drugs and supplies from the Ministry of Health and UNICEF.

Actual Outputs as of March 1994

1. Survey of existing water points in Murraca and Sena completed with identification of priority sites for rehabilitation and/or construction.
2. Complete survey of existing wells in Marromeu District completed.
3. Water needs assessment of each potential water point site prior to well construction or rehabilitation completed.
4. Sixteen Afridev pumps installed in Marromeu District and on five rehabilitated wells outside project.
5. In Murraca District, five wells have been drilled and 4 pumps installed.
6. In Sena, seven wells drilled but no pumps installed to date.
7. 40 community volunteers trained to date for hand pump use and water point maintenance.
8. 20 water user committees created and functioning in Marromeu District. Seven other committees in the process of formation.
7. One health center in Murraca has been completed and the team is operating in the center. A second health center in Sena is anticipated to be finished in two months.
8. Medical kits, supplies and drugs are now being received regularly every two or three months.

147

End-of-Project Status

1. 40,000 beneficiaries receiving at least 20 liters of potable water per day from AICF wells.
2. Two nurses and four first aid workers recruited, trained and conducting nutritional surveillance.
3. 95 % of the participating mothers in the maternal and child health program have received health education.
4. 95 % of children under five years of age participating in the maternal and child health program and receiving vaccinations.
5. 95 % of mothers participating in the program using oral rehydration therapy.
6. Diarrheal diseases in children under three years of age decreased by 30 %.
7. Child mortality reduced by 80 %.
8. Mother mortality during childbirth reduced by 80 %.
9. Nutritional screenings completed at eight locations with identification and treatment of malnourished children.
10. 95 % of participating mothers received nutritional education.
11. Global malnutrition for children under five years of age in Murraca and Sena under 8 %.
12. 35 health assistants and two nurses recruited, trained and used in the maternal and child health program.

Progress towards achievement of end-of-project status:

1. Currently 20,000 beneficiaries receiving at least 20 liters of potable water per day from AICF wells.
2. Two nurses and four first aid workers recruited, trained and conducting nutritional surveillance.
3. 95 % of the participating mothers in the maternal and child health program have received health education. AICF believes that approximately 50 % of mothers are listening.
4. Currently 50 to 60 % of children under five years of age participating in the maternal and child health program and receiving vaccinations.
5. Less than 50 % of mothers participating in the program are using oral rehydration therapy. Constraints include lack of sugar, salt and oranges.
6. Diarrheal diseases in children under three years of age have decreased by 30 % for those children treated.
7. Nutritional screenings have been completed at eight locations with identification and treatment of malnourished children.
8. Global malnutrition for children under five year of age in Murraca and Sena is under 8 %.
9. 35 health assistants and two nurses recruited, trained and used in the maternal and child health program. Some training is still being carried out.

General Grant Information

Grantee	:	Salesian Missions
Grant Title	:	Salesian Mission Orphanage and Training Project
Grant Number	:	656-0217-G-00-4003-00
Total Estimated Grant	:	\$ 565,000
Funds Obligated to Date	:	\$ 565,000
Grantee Cost Share	:	\$ 380,000
GOM Cost Share	:	\$ 0
Effective Date for Grant	:	11/23/1993
PACD as of April 1994	:	9/30/1996
Indirect Cost Rate	:	None

Grant Financial Plan

Personnel Salaries	:	\$ 118,000
Travel/Transportation	:	30,000
Other Direct Costs	:	78,000
Equipment & Supplies	:	339,000
<hr/>		
Total Budget	:	\$ 565,000

Grant Purpose Statement

The purpose of the grant is to provide humanitarian assistance to those most seriously affected by the insurgency and to facilitate the transition from emergency to rehabilitation and development.

Activity Purpose Statement(s)

The purpose of this activity is to provide shelter, care and basic vocational training to children orphaned or abandoned as a result of the war. To address the needs of orphaned children who cannot be reunited with their immediate family or relatives, the Salesians will restore the Lhanguene orphanage on the outskirts of Maputo to its former level of operations and establish a skills training center (community center) next to the orphanage to provide the older youth with trade skills which will enable them to become productive members of society.

The Salesian Missions activity is premised on the principle that the care of orphans implies not only the clothing, medical treatment, and shelter, but also counseling, education, moral and human formation, skills training, assistance with job placement, and continued follow-up support upon leaving the orphanage.

Anticipated Outputs

1. Provide basic social services to 80 boys between the ages of 11 and 15 who have been orphaned or abandoned.
2. The orphanage will be repaired and returned to its normal operation.
3. Provide skills training to 80 orphans and approximately 60 youth (targeting primarily young girls) in the surrounding community in the first year, 75 in the second year, and 100 in the third year.
4. Rehabilitation of a building adjacent to the orphanage as a community center and an area for workshops, classrooms, offices and library.
5. Apprenticeship/skills-training courses will be conducted in tailoring, sewing, typing and carpentry for orphans and out-of-school youths in the community.

Actual Outputs as of March 1994

The major activities anticipated under the grant have not yet begun. The renovation, repair and re-equipping of structures for orphans and vocational skills training are anticipated to start in May 1994. Some general cleanup of the building sites at the Salesian Mission has already been carried out. Six orphans currently reside at the Mission but have not started formal skills training. Thirty-six children from the surrounding community were observed in two classes -- i.e., 17 teenagers in a typing class and 19 children under twelve in a basic literacy class. Of these students, 12 to 14 were female.

End-of-Project Status

1. Orphanage and community center rehabilitated and operational.
2. Skills training provided for orphans and out-of-school youths according to the schedule above.

General Grant Information

Grantee	:	CARE
Grant Title	:	Machaze Nutritional Education and Health Monitoring Project
Grant Number	:	656-0217-G-00-4005-00
Total Estimated Grant	:	\$ 1,104,843
Funds Obligated to Date	:	\$ 1,104,843
Grantee Cost Share	:	\$ 0
GOM Cost Share	:	\$ 0
Effective Date for Grant	:	11/1/1993
PACD as of April 1994	:	4/30/1995
Indirect Cost Rate	:	7.6 % of total direct costs less exclusions

Grant Financial Plan

Personnel Salaries	:	\$	286,801
Benefits	:		107,241
Travel/Transportation	:		62,744
Allowances	:		115,426
Other Direct Costs	:		180,669
Equipment & Supplies	:		253,086
Training	:		1,650
General Administrative	:		19,189
Indirect Costs	:		78,037
<hr/>			
Total Budget	:	\$	1,104,843

Grant Purpose Statement

Improve food security of a selected rural population in Machaze District of Manica Province.

Activity Purpose Statement(s)

Develop a community-based nutritional education and monitoring program and rehabilitation of essential infrastructure.

Anticipated Outputs

1. Two health post rehabilitated and operational. Each post serving 3,000 to 8,000 residents.
2. Nine primary schools rehabilitated and operational. Each school takes 300 students.
3. Seven other public structures used for community purposes.
4. 200 kilometers of dirt roads rehabilitated.
5. Pilot nutritional educational program developed and implemented in three Machaze District towns.
6. Nutritional monitoring of approximately 50 % of children under five years of age in four communities. Monitoring linked to referral feeding center.
7. KAP survey(s) completed in at least three communities involved in nutritional education program.
8. Two community animators trained in nutritional education and implementing such programs.
9. Program linkages established between Zimbabwe refugee camps and Machaze District.

Actual Outputs as of March 1994

Program getting underway. Nutritional surveys being conducted. Road rehabilitation commencing. No outputs as of this date.

End-of-Project Status

1. 60 % of mothers who received nutritional education able to identify malnutrition and treat with locally available products.
2. Seven communities providing 25 to 30 volunteers to rehabilitation programs.

General Grant Information

Grantee	:	World Vision Relief and Development
Grant Title	:	Child Survival Project
Grant Number	:	656-0217-G-00-4006-00
Total Estimated Grant	:	\$ 2,818,846
Funds Obligated to Date	:	\$ 2,095,158
Grantee Cost Share	:	\$ 502,484
GOM Cost Share	:	\$ 0
Effective Date for Grant	:	10/1/1993
PACD as of April 1994	:	9/30/1996
Indirect Cost Rate	:	20 % on modified direct costs

Grant Financial Plan

Personnel Salaries	:	\$ 1,135,562
Travel/Transportation	:	303,966
Other Direct Costs	:	63,386
Equipment & Supplies	:	647,588
Training	:	99,000
General Administrative	:	170,468
Indirect Costs	:	398,876

Total Budget	:	\$ 2,818,846
--------------	---	--------------

Grant Purpose Statement

The purpose of this activity is to reduce child mortality and morbidity in selected districts of Tete and Zambezia Provinces through activities that promote maternal and child health.

Activity Purpose Statement(s)

The program focus is two-fold:

1. To mobilize communities to incorporate basic health practices into their daily lives, thus helping to reduce existing high infant and child mortality and morbidity.
2. To train and support the Ministry of Health in the implementation of preventative health activities in order to facilitate the recovery of a comprehensive, cost-effective system.

153

Anticipated Outputs

1. Bimonthly vaccination rounds of children under two years of age and, at least, 1,000 children from 0 to 1 year of age vaccinated each year.
2. At least one training session of vaccine usefulness conducted per year in each village.
3. Bimonthly growth monitoring conducted on, at least, 1,200 children under 2 years of age, with one-on-one counseling given to mothers of children who exhibit growth faltering.
4. Two teaching sessions per village per year on proper nutrition/ weaning practices.
5. Two training sessions per village per year on the prevention and management of diarrhea.
6. Monthly prenatal visits to pregnant women conducted on, at least, 1,400 women per year.
7. Community mobilization to build, at least, 720 ventilated improved pit latrines and 30 wells.
8. Three villages receive intensive training on malaria prevention with mini-KAP [Knowledge, Attitude, Practice] survey each year.
9. 3,000 mosquito nets distributed.
10. Six village-wide clean-up campaigns conducted each year.
11. Joint seminars held with Ministry of Health personnel at the district level each year for nursing staff.
12. Supervisory visits to health posts made each month and biweekly monitoring of health post registries conducted with training.
13. Four health posts renovated using local materials whenever possible.
14. Health Committees formed in four pilot villages in each district.
15. 60 Community Facilitators trained to teach mothers about vaccinations, nutrition/weaning, diarrhea and malaria.

134

Actual Outputs as of March 1994

1. From 1 October 1993 to 1 February 1994, approximately 9,220 doses of vaccine have been administered to children less than three years of age. Children less than three years of age who have received the complete series of childhood vaccinations number 523.
2. Training sessions on vaccine usefulness are on-going.
3. Growth monitoring is ongoing. The number of children monitored twice within a 90 day period is averaging about 1,700 per month.
4. Teaching sessions on proper nutrition/weaning practices are ongoing.
5. Training sessions on the prevention and management of diarrhea are ongoing.
6. Prenatal examinations by CSP from 1 October 1993 to 30 January 1994 are estimated at 924. An annual rate of 2,772 can be projected.
7. Through 3 January 1994, 55 pit latrines had been constructed in Zambezia. Cumulative totals have not been reported for Tete province. The three month Zambezia total projects to an annual rate of 220 latrines for Zambezia alone. Only 20 latrines per year would have to be constructed in Tete in order for CSP to meet its three year target of 720.
8. Training of Community Facilitators is ongoing.

End-of-Project Status

None specifically stated.

155

General Grant Information

Grantee	:	Adventist Development & Relief Agency
Grant Title	:	Chimoio Water Supply Project -- Phase I
Grant Number	:	656-0217-A-00-4007-00
Total Estimated Grant	:	\$ 589,532
Funds Obligated to Date	:	\$ 589,532
Grantee Cost Share	:	\$ 0
GOM Cost Share	:	\$ 0
Effective Date for Grant	:	12/17/1993
PACD as of April 1994	:	6/10/1994
Indirect Cost Rate	:	17 % of total direct costs less donated commodities and ocean freight

Grant Financial Plan

Personnel Salaries	:	\$ 42,308
Home Office Support	:	4,496
Travel/Transportation	:	48,640
Sub-Contracting	:	401,002
Other Direct Costs	:	11,400
General Administrative	:	81,686

Total Budget	:	\$ 589,532
--------------	---	------------

Grant Purpose Statement

The purpose of this Cooperative Agreement is to improve the water supply situation for the city of Chimoio through design and eventual reconstruction of the Chimoio water supply system.

Activity Purpose Statement(s)

The purpose of this Cooperative Agreement for Phase I of the Project is to complete the design and prepare the tender documents for the reconstruction of the Chimoio water supply system.

Anticipated Outputs

1. Tender document(s) for reconstruction of the Chimoio water supply system.

Actual Outputs as of March 1994

1. A number of design consultancies have been undertaken related to production of the required tender document(s).

156

End-of-Project Status

1. Reconstruction activities for reconstruction of the Chimoio water supply system ready for tendering.

General Grant Information

Grantee	:	Save the Children Federation
Grant Title	:	Gaza Health and Rural Development Project -- Phase II
Grant Number	:	656-0217-G-00-4017-00
Total Estimated Grant	:	\$ 3,743,000
Funds Obligated to Date	:	\$ 3,743,000
Grantee Cost Share	:	\$ 1,265,000
GOM Cost Share	:	\$ 0
Effective Date for Grant	:	4/1/1994 but grant agreement not yet signed.
PACD as of April 1994	:	9/30/1996
Indirect Cost Rate	:	Not available

Grant Financial Plan

Personnel Salaries	:	Not finalized as yet.
Benefits	:	
Travel/Transportation	:	
Allowances	:	
Other Direct Costs	:	
Equipment & Supplies	:	
Training	:	
General Administrative	:	
Indirect Costs	:	
Total Budget	:	

Grant Purpose Statement

Community based health and rural development activity in Xai-Xai and Bilene Districts of Gaza Province.

Activity Purpose Statement(s)

Not finalized.

Anticipated Outputs

Not yet formalized in a grant agreement.

Actual Outputs as of March 1994

As the grant agreement has not yet been signed, this project does not technically exist.

End-of-Project Status

Not yet formalized in a grant agreement.

138

ANNEX C

INDIVIDUALS AND ORGANIZATIONS INTERVIEWED

MOZAMBIQUE PVO SUPPORT PROJECT (656-0217)

MID-TERM EVALUATION

**INDIVIDUALS AND ORGANIZATIONS INTERVIEWED
MOZAMBIQUE PVO SUPPORT PROJECT (656-0217)**

USAID MISSION/MOZAMBIQUE

**Roger Carlson, Mission Director
John Miller, Deputy Director**

Program Office

**Cheryl McCarthy, Program Officer
Juliet Born, Program Advisor
Charles North, Program Officer/Evaluation**

Project Development and Management Office

**Gregg Wiitala, Supervisory Project Development Officer, PVO Office Director
Sidney Bliss, Project Development Officer, PVO Support Project Officer
Sue Nelson, Project Manager, PVO Support Project Manger
Robin Mason, Project Manager, PVO Support Project**

General Development Office

**Laura Slobey, Supervisory General Development Officer
Armand Utshudi-Lumbu, HPN Program Manager
Dr. Casseiro Rocha, Primary Health Care Support Project Manager
Dr. Mussa Calu, Prosthesis Field Coordinator
Scott Hudson, Human Resources and Training Officer**

Agricultural Office

**Darell McIntyre, Agricultural Office Director
Donald A. Drga, Agricultural Officer
James Jackson, Agricultural Officer/PL-480**

Engineering Office

**Peter Argo, Engineering Office Director
Mary Schwarz, Water and Sanitation Specialist**

Controller's Office

**George Jenkins, Controller
Martin Karlsen, Financial Analyst**

RESDSO/ESA (Nairobi)

MURL R. Baker, Project Development Officer

PRIVATE VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS/NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

Action Internationale Contre La Faim

**Hugues Burrows, Coordinator, Maputo
Gervais Viale, Logistics Coordinator, Beira
Anne Sophie Fournier, Nurse, Beira
Jean Berranger, Logistician, Marromeu**

Adventists Development Relief Agency

**Filipe Cabalero, Acting Director
Stephan Hugman, Project Manager for the Chimoio Water Supply Cooperative Agreement
Mirko Ristic, Civil Engineer (Sheladia), Maputo & Chimoio**

Africare

**Ralph S. Coleman, Resident Representative, Maputo
Ricardo L. Dueñez, Jr., Project Coordinator, Beira
John Swett, Water and Sanitation Project Coordinator, Beira**

CARE/International

**David Little, Country Director, Maputo
Christy Gavitt, Deputy Director, Maputo
Peter Abrams, Regional Director, Chimoio
Rob Smith, Project Manager, Machaze**

CUAMM (Italian NGO)

**Dr. Fabio Boccardi, Marromeu
Dr. Ceclia Fozzer, Marromeu**

Food for the Hungry International

**Shaun Walsh, Country Director, Maputo
Buck Deines, Agronomist, Extension Specialist, Beira**

International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)

Simon Anstey, Project Officer, Angola/Mozambique

161

KULIMA (Non-governmental Organization)

Domenico Liuzzi, Representative

Medical Care Development International (MCDI)

Peter Macy, Project Director

Mozambique Health Health Committee

James Pfeiffer, Program Coordinator, Chimoio
A. Moisés Metuque, Administrator

Save the Children Federation

Justin Opoku, Field Office Director, Maputo
Sebastiao Rodriques, Program Officer, Xai-Xai
Shasi Chanda, Administrative Officer, Xai-Xai

Southern Africa Development Trust [SADET]

Ivan Labra, President
Isabel R. de Labra, Educational Psychologist

World Relief Corporation

Trudy Schwartz, Country Director, Maputo

World Vision Relief and Development

John Yale, Director, Maputo Office
Steve Goudswaard, Accountant, Maputo
Jonathan White, Program Manager, Agricultural Recovery Program, Maputo
Anne Henderson, Health Program Manager, Quelimane
Leslie Sitch, Provincial Coordinator, Zambezia, Agricultural Recovery Program, Quelimane
David Spurling, Consultant Plant Breeder, Agricultural Recovery Program, Quelimane
Jimmy M. de Dios, Commodities Manager, Quelimane
Veronique Kolhof, Emergency Feeding, Quelimane

LINK (NGO Coordinating Unit)

Pal Nesse.)

AirServ

Andrei Maliarov, Manager

162

GOVERNMENT OF MOZAMBIQUE

Ministry of Cooperation

Rogério Marrime, Department of NGOs

Ministry of Justice

Job Mabalane Chambal, Registry of National Organizations, Maputo

National Rural Water Supply Programme (PRONAR)

Lúis Elias, Director

Leo Stolk, Sanitary Engineer

Ben Lameray, DNA Water Resource Department, Water Engineer

Maria Angelina Francisco Xavier, Geologist

Agua de Chimoio

Silvestre Martinho, Director

OTHER DONORS

Commission of the European Communities

Robert F. Nelson, Programme Coordinator

Overseas Development Administration/British Embassy

Charlotte Seymour-Smith, First Secretary, [Aid/Commercial]

Keith Shannon, Third Secretary

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)

Jean-Claude Legrand, Head, Emergency Section

UNDAC

Kjell Johannes Madsen, Relief Delegate, UNDAC Stand-by Team, Department of Humanitarian Affairs

UNOHAC

Sam Barnes,

Catherine Huck, UNOHAC/UNHCR Area Based Programme

163

Henry Matos, UNOHAC/NGO Liaison Officer

World Bank

Luisa Diogo, Program Officer

ANNEX D

LIST OF REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

MOZAMBIQUE PVO SUPPORT PROJECT (656-0217)

MID-TERM EVALUATION

MOZAMBIQUE PVO SUPPORT PROJECT (656-0217)

MID-TERM EVALUATION

165

**LIST OF REFERENCE DOCUMENTS
MOZAMBIQUE PVO SUPPORT PROJECT (656-0217)**

Agency for International Development, Handbook 3, Chapter 12, Project Evaluation.

Burke, M. and T. Tiffany. [1992]. "Rural Economic Programming Position Paper", Paper prepared for the Rural Economic Programming Workshop, San José, Costa Rica, 15-20 November 1992, CARE, Atlanta, Georgia.

Food for the Hungry International, USAID Sofala Rural Rehabilitation Project, Social and Economic Impact Survey, July-August 1991, Maputo, Mozambique.

Food for the Hungry International, "Evaluation Report: Sofala Rural Rehabilitation Project," Jan. 30, 1994, Maputo: Food for the Hungry International.

Food for the Hungry International, "USAID Sofala Rural Rehabilitation Project: Project Impact Survey," February 1, 1994, Maputo: Food for the Hungry International.

Green, E.C., J. Williamson and P. Nimpuno-Parente, "Evaluation of the Children and War Program -- A Sub-Regional Program of Save the Children (USA)", Technologies for Primary Health Care (PRITECH) Project, 1992, AID, Washington, D.C.

Labra, I. and I. Labra, "Children and War Programme -- Phase Two of the Mid-Term Evaluation - - Mozambique -- Debriefing Draft", Southern Africa Development Trust (SADET), 1994, Harare, Zimbabwe.

Plank, David N., AID, Debt and the End of Sovereignty: Mozambique and Its Donors, The Journal of Modern African Studies, Cambridge University Press, Vol. 31, No. 3, September 1993, pp. 407-430.

Save the Children Federation/Mozambique, "Mid-Term Evaluation Survey Umbrella Project Save the Children," Save the Children Federation/Mozambique, 1992, Maputo, Mozambique.

Save the Children Federation/Mozambique, "PVO Support Program: Gaza Province Final Evaluation Report -- Summary Findings." Save the Children Federation/Mozambique, 1994, Maputo, Mozambique.

Save the Children Federation/Mozambique, "PVO Support Program: Gaza Province 1990-93 Project Evaluation Report", Save the Children Federation/Mozambique, 1994, Maputo, Mozambique.

Save the Children Federation/Mozambique, "PVO Support Program: Gaza Province Mid-Term Evaluation Report," Save the Children Federation/Mozambique, 1992, Maputo, Mozambique.

USAID/Mozambique, Annual Budget Submission, FY 1993, July 1991, Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C. 20523.

USAID/Mozambique, Country Program Strategic Plan (FY 1990-1992), March 1990, Agency for International Development.

USAID/Mozambique, PVO Support Project (656-0217) - Project Identification Document, April 1990.

USAID/Mozambique, PVO Support Project (656-0217) - Project Implementation Report, September 1993 - March 31, 1994, (Draft April 1994).

USAID/Mozambique, PVO Support Project (656-0217) - Project Paper, June 1990.

USAID/Mozambique, PVO Support Project (656-0217) - Grant Agreement Food for the Hungry - Grant # 656-0217-G-SS-0016-00, August 20, 1990.

USAID/Mozambique - PVO Support Project (656-0217) - Project Amendment # 1, July 30, 1991.

USAID/Mozambique - PVO Support Project (656-0217) - Project Amendment # 2, September 9, 1992.

USAID/Mozambique - PVO Support Project (656-0217)- PVO Evaluation Scope of Work, April 1994

USAID/Mozambique - USAID Assistance to Mozambique - Transition Strategy (1993).

United States Department of State, Mozambique Post Report, 1993.

Winch, Tony and Lloyd Strachan, "Evaluation Report: World Vision Mozambique Agricultural Recovery Program," Maputo: World Vision Mozambique, April, 1993.

World Bank, "Mozambique "Vision Document," 1993, World Bank, Washington, D.C.

World Relief Mozambique, Final Report: Emergency Water Supply Programme, Limpopo Corridor, Gaza Province," August, 1993, Maputo: World Relief Mozambique.

World Vision International, "A Rehabilitation Strategy for Crop Production by the Family Sector in Central and Northern Mozambique: Operational Plan 1994," Maputo: World Vision Mozambique.

World Vision Mozambique, "Monthly Report: Agricultural Recovery Program (various)," Maputo: World Vision Mozambique.

World Vision Mozambique, "Tete Child Survival Program, Monthly Report (various)," Maputo: World Vision Mozambique.

World Vision Mozambique, "Zambezia Child Survival Program, Monthly Report (various)" Maputo: World Vision Mozambique.

167

World Vision Relief & Development Inc, "Midterm Evaluation: Child Survival Project, Changara District, Tete Province, Mozambique." Oct. 15, 1992, Maputo: World Vision Mozambique.

World Vision Relief & Development, Inc., "Final Evaluation: Child Survival Project, Zambezia Province, Mozambique," Sept. 15, 1993, Maputo: World Vision Mozambique.

World Vision Relief & Development Inc., "Final Evaluation: Tete Child Survival Project, Changara District, Tete Province," Nov. 30, 1993, Maputo: World Vision Mozambique.

World Vision Relief & Development Inc., "Final Evaluation Survey Report: Zambezia Child Survival Project, Nioadala District, Zambezia Province, Mozambique," Maputo: World Vision Mozambique.

168

ANNEX E

QUESTIONNAIRE FORMS

MOZAMBIQUE PVO SUPPORT PROJECT (656-0217)

MID-TERM EVALUATION

**ORGANIZATIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE
MOZAMBIQUE PVO SUPPORT PROJECT (656-0217) MID-TERM EVALUATION**

I. GENERAL PROFILE - MOZAMBIQUE PVO

Name of PVO:

Date program
started:

Person Interviewed/Title:

Address:

Phone:
Fax:

Date of Interview:

Interviewer:

Objectives of PVO organization in Mozambique:

Current activities (w/priority ranking):

Title

Funding

Source

Start Finish
Date Date

Location

TOTAL FUNDING: \$ _____
Percent USAID Funding: _____ %

170

II. PROJECT GRANT BACKGROUND

Purpose, objectives, anticipated output of USAID grant.

Geographic Coverage:

Funding:

<u>\$ U.S.</u>	<u>Metricais</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Start</u>	<u>Finish</u>
----------------	------------------	-------------	--------------	---------------

Grant Title:
USAID Contribution
PVO Contribution
Other:

Beneficiaries:

<u>Type (Gender Specific)</u>	<u>Number</u>
-------------------------------	---------------

Grant Title:
USAID Contribution
PVO Contribution
Other:

Beneficiaries:

<u>Type (Gender Specific)</u>	<u>Number</u>
-------------------------------	---------------

Grant Title:
USAID Contribution
PVO Contribution
Other:

Beneficiaries:

<u>Type (Gender Specific)</u>	<u>Number</u>
-------------------------------	---------------

Did you have problems getting the approval of provincial/local authorities in the districts where you work? How long did this take?

Nature of local approval. Documentation?

To what extent has your organization involved government in planning and implementing grant activities?

III. GRANT PROCESS

Summarize the process your organization has gone through in developing the grant proposal and in receiving a grant. Assess the appropriateness of this process.

To what extent did USAID staff assist you in preparation of your proposal?

Did this involvement significantly change your project or improve the quality of your project?

How many months did it take for you to prepare your proposal?

How many months did it take from the submission of your first proposal to the time it was approved?

What resources (human, financial) did your organization devote to proposal preparation?

If baseline data and data collection were to become a requirement for proposal submission, would your organization be able to bear the cost of baseline data collection as part of your design costs?

After signing the grant, were there any problems/constraints in beginning implementation? (e.g. GRM custom clearance, disputes or duty and tax payments, USAID waiver delays, inflation and/or reductions in local currency funds for project implementation.) How has your organization coped with these constraints?

V. MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

What are your organization's reporting requirements (monitoring, evaluation, audit, other)?

<u>Kind</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	

Have you been able to meet these requirements?

Do you find these requirements easy or difficult to comply with?

To what degree are these requirements appropriate?

What has been the effect of USAID's requirements and interventions (as detailed in your grant agreement) on your organization's ability to deliver services. Summary rating:

Positive effect _____
Some good effect _____
No effect _____
Negative effect _____

Have you received satisfactory feedback from USAID on the reports you submit?

How do other donor requirements compare with those of USAID?

174

Are annual workplans prepared?

What indicators (including gender specific measurements) are used to assess project progress?

Describe the nature of the baseline survey(s) conducted for your project.

How is monitoring of progress accomplished?

How is project impact evaluated? How often? By whom? When was the most recent evaluation?

Assess the usefulness and appropriateness of the evaluation process.

How would you characterize your interaction with USAID staff? Frequency of meetings and purpose (technical, financial, managerial, proposal preparation, collaborative relations, input into USAID country strategy).

125

Nature of relationships (e.g. partnerships) with:

NGOs (local and international)
Research institutions
National or local government
Other service providers
NGO councils/networks
PVOs (local and international)

Sustainability:

Estimates of recurrent costs.

To what extent has your organization applied criteria in a) selecting the most effective technology, implementation and management approaches; and b) potential for sustainability?

Does the PVO expect the activity to be sustainable beyond LOP? How? By whom?

What would be necessary to make the activity self-sustaining?

Are there any incentives in the PVO's grant to make the activities more sustainable?

What approach has the PVO taken to ensure sustainability beyond life of project?

VI. FUTURE PLANS

Priorities/focus areas for the next four years.

Strategy/rationale and program plans.

Anticipated funding levels and sources.

USAID's/Mozambique's country strategy is beginning to shift from relief and rehabilitation to development. Do you regard movement from relief to development activity as a continuum?

Would your organization be capable of relief and development at the same time?

What do you see as your role in this new development strategy in Mozambique?

What qualifies your organization for assuming such a role?

Does your organization have cross-sectoral capacity? Where does this capacity reside?

What is your organization's willingness to undertake new sectoral activities and/or to undertake new activities in other geographical areas?

Type and geographic location.

Quantity and type of technical expertise/resources available or which could be made available.

Ease of response to new initiatives.

Constraints to undertaking new initiatives?

Technical

Management

Funding

Other

VII. OTHER DONORS

List other donors you work with:

How would your organization rank USAID as a donor?

More helpful and professional than most _____

About the same as others _____

Less helpful and more difficult _____

Additional comment:

USAID QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INITIAL DIAGNOSTIC INTERVIEWS
MOZAMBIQUE PVO SUPPORT PROJECT (656-0217) MID-TERM EVALUATION

A. Personal Information

Name:

Title:

1. Status: U.S. Direct Hire____; FSN____; PSC_____.
2. Category: PVO Support Project staff____; Tech and backstopping____; Mission Management_____.
3. Years in USAID/Mozambique position:
4. Extent and type of previous PVO/NGO experience.

5. How would you characterize your direct contact with PVOs/NGOs in Mozambique?

Regular and close contact_____

Occasional contact_____

Mainly peripheral and/or bureaucratic_____

6. In the last year in your official capacity have you had the opportunity to visit PVO/NGO projects in the field?

How many times?_____

Made headquarters visits to PVO/NGOs?

How often?_____

7. What percent of your time is annually given to PVO/NGO project management or backstopping?

B. General Perceptions of PVOs/NGOs (non-project specific)

8. How do you perceive the importance of PVOs/NGOs in general (whether funded by AID or not) to the development of Mozambique?

- a. Very important? _____
- b. Somewhat important? _____
- c. Minimally important? _____

9. Whatever the above rating, what do you think are the three most important things, in descending order, PVOs/NGOs can contribute to Mozambique's development?

List:

- a.
- b.
- c.

10. How do you characterize your "development philosophy" that is assumedly behind answers to the above three questions. (Enter some notes about the answer)

C. Specific USAID/Mozambique PVO/NGO Interactions

11. (Note: Point out that we are now talking about USAID more specifically.) In the Mission's overall portfolio, to what degree do you think PVOs/NGOs have made or are making toward the achievement of the Mission's key objectives?

- a. Very significant _____
- b. Somewhat significant _____
- c. Of minimum significance _____

180

12. Overall do you consider expenditures under PVO Support Project represent an efficient and effective expenditure of USAID/Mozambique funds?

a. Examples of most cost-effective programs.

b. Examples of least cost-effective programs.

13. In what fields of activity do you consider PVOs/NGOs most able and effective in Mozambique?

hi / medium / low

	Current	Next 5 yrs
a. Food relief		
b. Emergency relief		
c. Child survival		
d. Primary health care		
e. AIDs		
f. Family planning		
g. Agricultural development		
h. Physical infrastructure		
i. Introduction of appropriate technology		
j. Enterprise development		
k. Women's credit		
l. Community participation and organization		
n. Democratization and governance		
o. Community natural resource management		
n. Other		

14. Do you think AID should increase or decrease funding of PVOs/NGOs in Mozambique? By how much?

15. To what extent do you favor other strategies for effective use of USAID funds for development over PVO/NGO support. Give examples.

181

16. To what degree do you see the PVO Support Project is meeting its objectives:
- a. EOPS
 - b. Beneficiary impact indicators
17. Can you suggest specific indicators (that are easy to track and collect) which might be more valuable in monitoring progress of future PVO/NGO activities.
18. Do you consider the use of your time on the PVO Support Project practical?
- a) Yes_____
 - b) Difficult to say, but overall probably_____
 - c) No_____
19. What do you perceive are the greatest constraints to project implementation?
(Take notes on a separate sheet)
20. What would you say are the three largest challenges facing the Mission in effectively running the PVO Support Program?
- List:
- a)
 - b)
 - c)
21. Is there anything in particular about the Mission's PVO Support activities that you particularly hope the evaluation team will explore, or that we can shed light on for better informed future management decisions?

182-

D. Grant-management

22. Describe current involvement in grant-management under the project.

Person-hours/mo

- a. **Propozal preparation support.**
- b. **Proposal review.**
- c. **Grant monitoring.**

Summary Characterization: Re disposition towards Mozambique PVO Support Project

- 1. Unfavorably disposed
- 2. Neutral
- 3. Favorably disposed the project as currently structured
- 4. Favorably disposed if the project is redesigned

1/23

ANNEX F

EVALUATION TEAM

Leslie Fox, Team Leader, has extensive experience in the evaluation, management and design of technical assistance projects aimed at strengthening the institutional capacity of indigenous non-government and community-based organizations. He has long-term experience in grants management having worked on USAID-funded PVO/NGO Umbrella Projects and under Cooperative Agreement arrangements including compliance with Standard Provision. He has in-depth knowledge of all aspects of grants management process including design of grant selection criteria and grants review and approval; negotiations and preparation of grant agreement contracting instrument; and disbursement, monitoring and reporting of grant funds. His M.A. is in international affairs, Johns Hopkins University, School of Advanced International Studies.

Edwin F. Connerley, evaluation research specialist, has extensive experience analyzing the problems and opportunities of (1) decentralization; (2) democratization; and (3) governance. He possesses a detailed knowledge of institutional arrangements for decentralized maintenance of rural infrastructure, and is also familiar with the requirements for successful multi-disciplinary social science research in LDCs. He is currently an Adjunct Professor at the Sacramento Public Affairs Center, University of Southern California, and holds a Ph.D. in Public Administration from the University of Southern California.

John H. Eriksen, evaluation research specialist, currently works as an international consultant for organizations sponsoring or participating in economic research and development programs. He served as the Regional Agricultural Economist for West Africa for USAID, as Peace Corps Director in Swaziland, and has completed over 50 international consulting assignments. His Ph.D. is in Agricultural Economics from Cornell University.

Weston Fisher, Evaluation Specialist, is an NGO project management, design and evaluation expert. As Special Projects Officer at USAID/Somalia, he managed the PVO Development Partner's Project, the Experiment in International Living Contract and the Refugee Settlement Project. He also served as the Mission PVO Officer and the energy and technical advisor for the Africa Bureau. He received a M.S., in Geology from Stanford and an M.A. from the Hubert Humphrey School of Public Affairs at the University of Minnesota.