



2011:15

Sida Review

Ian Christoplos
Rosario Matavele

External review of the Moz-SAKSS programme in Mozambique

Final Report

External review of the Moz-SAKSS programme in Mozambique

November, 2011

**Assignment performed by:
Ian Christoplos
Rosario Matavele**

**Sida Review 2011:15
Sida**

Authors: Ian Christoplos, Rosario Matavele, Indevelop AB

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida.

Sida Review 2011:15

Commissioned by Embassy of Sweden in Mozambique

Copyright: Sida and the authors

Date of final report: November 2011

Published by Citat

Art. no. Sida61471en

URN:NBN urn:nbn:se:sida-61471en

This publication can be downloaded from: <http://www.sida.se/publications>

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm

Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64

Postgiro: 1 56 34-9. VAT. No. SE 202100-478901

E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

Final Report

External review of the Moz-SAKSS programme in Mozambique

November 22, 2011

Assignment performed by:
Ian Christoplos
Rosario Matavele

ACRONYMS	3
1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
2. INTRODUCTION.....	7
2.1 BACKGROUND	7
2.2 METHODS	9
2.3 SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS.....	10
2.4 UNDERLYING ISSUES RELATED TO THE PROGRAMME THEORY OF CHANGE	11
3. SUMMATIVE FINDINGS	13
3.1 GENERAL FINDING RELATED TO THE COMPONENT STRUCTURE.....	13
3.2 COMPONENT 1: MINAG’S AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS	13
3.3 COMPONENT 2: REINFORCED DE POLICY ANALYSIS AND STRATEGIC PLANNING CAPACITY	14
3.4 COMPONENT 3: IMPROVED MINAG KNOWLEDGE AND INFORMATION SHARING, INCLUDING AT FARMER LEVEL.....	14
3.5 COMPONENT 4: REINFORCED FLOW OF KNOWLEDGE AND INFORMATION AT REGIONAL LEVEL.....	15
3.6 COMPONENT 5: IMPROVED SKILLS AND INCREASED RELIANCE ON DOMESTIC INPUTS	15
3.7 OVERALL PROGRAMME STRUCTURE, LEADERSHIP, COORDINATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY	15
3.8 OVERALL PERFORMANCE IN RELATION TO OUTPUT DELIVERABLES	17
3.9 OVERALL PERFORMANCE IN RELATION TO CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT OUTCOMES.....	18
3.10 OVERALL PERFORMANCE IN RELATION TO ENHANCED EVIDENCE-BASED DECISION MAKING	20
3.11 OVERALL EFFICIENCY IN ACHIEVING OUTCOMES.....	21
4. FORMATIVE FINDINGS	22
4.1 RELEVANCE OF MozSAKSS FOR EMERGING NEEDS.....	22
4.2 RELEVANCE OF MozSAKSS IN RELATION TO OTHER ACTORS AND PLATFORMS FOR POLICY SUPPORT	23
4.3 RELEVANCE OF CGIAR SUPPORT IN RELATION TO EMERGING NEEDS AND DEMANDS	23
4.4 OBSERVATIONS REGARDING THE CURRENT ROLE OF DE IN RELATION TO NEEDS AND OPPORTUNITIES.....	24
5. CONCLUSIONS	25
5.1 LACK OF CLARITY AND UNREALISTIC ASSUMPTIONS IN THE PROGRAMME DESIGN	25
5.2 CHOICE OF PARTNERS AND THEIR ROLES AND THE NATURE OF OWNERSHIP AT MINAG-DE	25
5.3 CAPACITIES TO MEET THE CHALLENGES AHEAD IN IMPLEMENTING PEDSA AND CAADP.....	25
5.4 ACCOUNTABILITY, REALISM AND FOCUS	26
5.5 CONCLUSIONS IN RELATION TO OVERALL RESULTS IN EVIDENCE-BASED POLICY FORMATION	27
6. RECOMMENDATIONS	28
6.1 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE CURRENT PHASE.....	28
6.2 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INITIATIVES WITHIN A SIX-MONTH EXTENSION	28
6.3 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STRATEGIC INVESTMENTS IN FUTURE OVERALL POLICY ANALYSIS	28
6.4 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STRATEGIC MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF PEDSA/CAADP	29
ANNEX 1 – TERMS OF REFERENCE	30
ANNEX 2 – DOCUMENTS REVIEWED.....	34
ANNEX 3 – PROGRAMME AND PERSONS MET.....	35

Acronyms

APSIM	Agricultural Production Systems sIMulator
CAADP	Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme
CEPAAD	Centre for Applied Research on Agro-Food System Policies and Programmes
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CLEAR	Regional Centres for Learning on Evaluation and Results
DE	Ministry of Agriculture – Directorate of Economics
ICRISAT	International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics
IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
IIAM	National Institute of Agronomic Research
IWMI	International Water Management Institute
MINAG	Ministry of Agriculture
MozSAKSS	Mozambique Strategy Analysis and Knowledge Support System
MSU	Michigan State University
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
ODI RAPID	Overseas Development Institute Research and Policy in Development Programme
PAPA	Food Production Action Plan
PEDSA	Strategic Plan for Agricultural Development
Proagri	Sector Programme for Rural Development
ReSAKSS	Regional Strategy Analysis and Knowledge Support System
SADC	Southern African Development Community
UEM	Eduardo Mondlane University

1. Executive summary

The purpose of this review is to assess the results of MozSAKSS and to give recommendations about possible immediate and longer-term adjustments in Sida support to policy analysis in the agricultural sector. The review has focused on assessing the perceived relevance of the structure and content of the programme “Capacity Strengthening through Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support for Agricultural Development in Mozambique” (MozSAKSS) to recent and emerging demands for developing capacities for Mozambican-led, evidence-based policy advice.

MozSAKSS was intended to be a programme to develop the capacity of Mozambican stakeholders, the Ministry of Agriculture’s (MINAG) Directorate of Economics (DE) in particular, to undertake policy analysis that would feed into overall policy processes in MINAG and among other relevant stakeholders. It was hoped that an open “think tank culture” would emerge and that DE would develop capacities to take on a leadership role in the development of evidence-based agricultural policies. This was to be accomplished largely as an outcome of collaborative research activities with three Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) centres – the International Water Management Institute (IWMI), the International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT) and the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI).

These research outputs have all been delayed and though the programme will end in December 2011, it is still unclear how many of the outputs will be completed and communicated to policymakers. The programme has been characterised by a lack of trust and communication among the partners and, as a result, has fragmented into a set of weakly coordinated activities. Among the stakeholders interviewed in this review there is currently little awareness of what MozSAKSS as an overall programme was expected to achieve.

Ideally, DE should have addressed these problems through their leadership of MozSAKSS. This has not emerged due to uncertainties, misperceptions and unclear lines of accountability between the CGIAR centres and DE. The programme has revealed an inherent misfit between Sida norms of encouraging national ownership and the norms, incentives and standard modus operandi for research collaboration commonly applied by CGIAR institutions, where production of peer reviewed publications is generally seen as a more important performance indicator than ownership by national partners. The review team heard conflicting claims about how ownership was fostered/discouraged during the pilot phase and in initial planning. Efforts to resolve these problems have gradually led to more pragmatic and effective cooperation, as evidenced by an increased pace of production of outputs over the past six months. But nonetheless, the overall structure of work and lack of clear leadership are viewed as unsatisfactory by all of the partners.

In addition to undertaking research, IWMI in particular has also been active in drafting other types of papers, such as a discussion paper on the CAADP process and a detailed review of current MINAG information systems. The main IWMI output that was carried out with significant participation from DE has been a sectoral performance review. Even before it has actually been published it has received considerable attention in the national media, and the Minister of Agriculture has been quoted as calling for the review to be continued on an annual basis.

Most of the MozSAKSS research deliverables have been largely written by international researchers, with DE staff often not included among the co-authors. In research activities DE perceives that an inappropriately large proportion of the support they receive is for learning how to undertake field surveys and they repeatedly describe themselves as having been “used as research assistants” as

opposed to developing capacities for policy analysis. This is one of the reasons they state for their lack of ownership for MozSAKSS.

By contrast, there is a higher degree of satisfaction with support for managing multi-stakeholder engagements with other research initiatives, policymakers and civil society as part of the CAADP process.

The most problematic aspect of capacity development has been in the focus on encouraging learning through collaborative research, when coaching approaches would have been more appropriate. The CGIAR system generally supports capacity development through collaboration with national research institutions on joint research. This collegial process is expected to generate capacities through “learning by doing”. This was initially the implicit theory of change in MozSAKSS. A collaborative approach is dependent on a relatively high degree of capacity within national partners at the outset in order for this to work (both technical capacity and ability to devote staff time to research activities). It became apparent early in the programme that the collaborative approach was not appropriate for work with DE, given their lack of human resources and time to apply to programme activities. This is also due to the fact that DE, as a ministerial directorate, is not a research institute of the type that CGIAR institutes are accustomed to collaborating with. One of the clearest lessons learnt in MozSAKSS is that the type of collaborative research that characterises CGIAR work with most national agricultural research centres is not appropriate for supporting DE. A coaching and mentoring approach is required, preferably paired with a strong engagement with a broader array of Mozambican institutional stakeholders.

As the obstacles to the collaborative approach have become clear to all partners, there has been a partial shift to coaching within MozSAKSS, but DE still remains dissatisfied with the overall MozSAKSS approach in this regard. IFPRI and ICRISAT note the difficulty of ensuring regular and systematic access to DE staff as a major obstacle in improving coaching support. When outside researchers have come to Maputo for planned periods of coaching, their colleagues at DE have often not been available. The review team concludes that a greater degree of ring-fencing of DE resources for specific tasks is a precondition for effective coaching. It is not clear if DE recognises this.

It is important to stress that capacity development efforts have overwhelmingly focused on human resource development, whereas DE also suffers from dysfunctional organisational structures and management systems. DE’s capacity faults cannot be attributed entirely to weak human resources.

In order to address the shortcomings experienced thus far, future investments in MozSAKSS (or related initiatives) would require a more well-defined accountability structure, preferably with DE restricting its role to convening, coordination, synthesis and leadership. MozSAKSS would also need to be accountable to a strong steering committee. Such a governance structure would need to be tasked with ensuring that roles and responsibilities are unambiguous.

In the future DE will need MozSAKSS more than ever as governmental demands are apparently set to increase, and as the donor community has expectations of a more proactive governmental role in leading strategic analyses in relation to implementation of the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) Compact and the Strategic Plan for Agricultural Development (PEDSA). Both MINAG and its international partners recognise that a new structure for monitoring and evaluation of these investments is sorely needed. As such, a new type of MozSAKSS would be highly relevant for emerging needs. In order to find a more appropriate approach, DE and potential partners would need to work constructively to redefine, refine and narrow MozSAKSS priorities.

The review team deems that the highest priority emerging needs relate to monitoring and evaluation in connection with the investment plan that will be developed soon for implementing CAADP/PEDSA. CGIAR institutions are unlikely to be capable of alone providing an appropriate package of support for DE and the other Mozambican institutions that will (hopefully) be undertaking these tasks.

The review recommends that Sida consider how to continue with a New MozSAKSS, based on a more structured analysis of DE, including a more realistic assessment of which tasks DE should and should not be expected to undertake. This would involve support to DE's leadership and coordination role in relation to two areas: policy analysis and monitoring and evaluation. Actual implementation of studies and evaluations would be best carried out by other actors, including perhaps a new policy research centre that is being considered for establishment at the Eduardo Mondlane University. The CGIAR institutions may have a potential supporting role even in the future, but only if they partner with other institutions with relevant skills, and if they accept and support modalities to support a greater degree of Mozambican leadership.

2. Introduction

2.1 Background

The Mozambican government appears to be moving toward increased commitments to agriculture. The government launched the Green Revolution Strategy (ERV) in 2007, and approved the Food Production Action Plan (PAPA) in 2008. This year the government has approved a Strategic Plan for Agricultural Development (PEDSA). It appears that a New Partnership for Africa's Development's (NEPAD) Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) Compact will be signed soon, which will be implemented together with the PEDSA. These new policies are generating a growing need and demand for evidence-based analyses to support the development of implementation plans and for monitoring and evaluation.

The Ministry of Agriculture (MINAG) naturally coordinates agricultural development policies, but it does so in collaboration with other parts of the government. Given the broad nature of agricultural development, relating to areas of infrastructure, financial services, industrial development, commerce, private sector development, nutrition, etc., internal and external policy coordination among sectors in order to achieve the goals of PEDSA and CAADP is essential.

Sweden provided support to MINAG in the forms of a sector programme between 2000, when the Sector Programme for Rural Development (Proagri) I was launched and 2010, when Swedish support to Proagri II ended. Due to uncertainties regarding the direction of agricultural policy and the systems and means by which deficiencies in Proagri will be addressed, sectoral support by donors to agriculture has diminished significantly after 2010. For 2012, only two donors are currently contemplating providing sectoral support. This decline in commitments is related to uncertainties about government priorities and modalities, which are in turn partially attributable to repeated changes in MINAG leadership, with three new ministers being appointed in the past three years. There are hopes that PEDSA and the soon to be signed CAADP Compact will provide a basis for a new sector programme, to be worked out during 2012, for implementation starting in 2013.

Swedish support to "Capacity Strengthening through Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support for Agricultural Development in Mozambique" (MozSAKSS) was designed in 2007, to channel resources to MINAGⁱ to develop greater capacity to apply evidence to the leadership of these policy-development processes and to create strong links to the Regional SAKSS programmes (ReSAKSS) that support CAADP implementation. ReSAKSS in Southern Africa is managed by the International Water Management Institute (IWMI) regional office in Pretoria. CAADP supports the creation of SAKSS nodes in each country, largely in order to provide an evidence base for monitoring and evaluation of CAADP investment plans. Staff of the NEPAD office in Pretoria report that in order to do so, ReSAKSS strives to enhance the quality of data for assessing impact, providing a basis for planning and general learning. The lack of solid data and analytical capacity are major constraints to developing realistic and evidence-based strategies for agricultural development that accelerate pro-poor economic growth. ReSAKSS has encouraged the establishment of SAKSS nodes in all countries, but the nature of these nodes varies from country to country.

MozSAKSS is a far larger and more ambitious node than that created in most African countries. This was apparently deemed necessary due to the greater and more pressing need to strengthen MINAG policy formation capacities in the interim period after Proagri I, and before new structures for a new sector programme are put into place. As such, MozSAKSS can be seen as much more than a node for supporting implementation of the CAADP Compact. Rather, it is a form of consolidated support to MINAG policy capacities and for aid harmonisation and alignment, more generally.

The programme reviewed, MozSAKSS 2008–2011, follows a pilot phase that was undertaken between March 2007–June 2008. During the pilot phase, the ReSAKSS office for Southern Africa, together with a consortium of three Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) centres – IWMI, the International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT) and the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) – together with MINAG’s Directorate of Economics (DE) collaborated in the design of MozSAKSS. Support for MozSAKSS has been provided by Sida and USAID.ⁱⁱ MozSAKSS was designed to build on a history of support to capacity development at DE, most notably assistance from Michigan State University (MSU). MozSAKSS was expected to be accountable to a Steering Committeeⁱⁱⁱ selected from a range of Mozambican institutions and chaired by MINAG, but this Steering Committee has only met once during the course of the programme. Within MINAG, DE is in charge of strategic planning, monitoring and evaluation, agricultural policy formulation and analysis. DE is also responsible for generating agricultural statistics and analysing agricultural data in order to feed into policy processes.

The overall objective of MozSAKSS is to contribute to the strengthening of the capacity of national institutions, in particular DE, in strategic analysis and knowledge support so that they are able to effectively identify, coordinate and support the planning and implementation of agriculture and rural development strategies. Through a partnership with MINAG and other in-country partners (public and private), the programme has been expected to provide capacity for strategic analysis and to undertake analytical work that will inform current and future policy and investment options for agriculture in Mozambique. The program was expected not only to contribute to strengthening of domestic capacity to undertake such work in the future, but to also help promote a think tank culture within national systems—ultimately strengthening the country’s reliance on research-based evidence during national dialogues and decision making.

MozSAKSS is hosted by DE in joint collaboration with the consortium of three CGIAR centres: ICRISAT, IFPRI and IWMI. Due to shortage of office space, MozSAKSS has not been able to set up offices together with DE, and is instead located at the National Institute of Agronomic Research (IIAM). The three CGIAR institutions have been expected to bring scientific expertise of an international standard that is critical to the success of the programme. IFPRI is the primary contractor of the programme with Sida, and thus ultimately carries the fiduciary responsibility of ensuring that the programme delivers high quality products and services in a timely and efficient manner across all collaborating partners. This approach to partnership was assumed to be in line with CGIAR corporate commitments to collaboration with national partners, which were reinforced with the reorganisation of the CGIAR system that was initiated in 2009.^{iv}

MozSAKSS has five main results-oriented components:

1. MINAG’s agricultural statistics and information system
2. DE policy analysis and strategic planning capacity
3. MINAG knowledge- and information-sharing, including at farmer level
4. Improved flow of knowledge and information with wider regional efforts
5. Improved skills and increased reliance on domestic inputs

The components have been structured around a number of activities led by the three CGIAR institutes. This evaluation will describe how a range of complications have arisen due to a focus on the “deliverables” associated with each component, a focus that has often distracted from the capacity development results that were intended.

2.2 Methods

The approach of this review has focused on assessing the perceived **relevance** of the structure and content of MozSAKSS to recent and emerging demands for developing capacities for Mozambican generated, evidence-based policy advice. Three basic hypotheses were generated by preliminary reading of programme documentation. These hypotheses were as follows:

1. Demands for MozSAKSS outputs and human resource development inputs have been out of sync with the opportunities for human resource development and the nature of the current organisational development process within DE.
2. The structure of MozSAKSS has been focused on a limited toolkit for capacity development and production of policy advice deliverables. This has been an obstacle to gaining consensus on a clear strategy and incentives for creating a “think tank culture” and engaging in the wider process of institutional development through which Mozambican agricultural policies are being informed and shaped.
3. IWMI, ICRISAT and IFPRI each have a somewhat different organisational culture and long-term relationship with DE, which influences their roles in MozSAKSS. They also all have different operational and incentive structures. However, as research institutes accustomed to working with national research institutes, none of them actually specialises in the type of capacity development role required, even if there are apparently individuals within these organisations with very relevant and strong skills. Therefore, the quality of the current programme will be strongly related to the ways in which these partners have adapted their usual institutional roles and mandates to the task in hand.

An early finding of the evaluation was that the programme document, the logical framework and the Sida Assessment Memorandum stress differing goals and even overall perceptions of the programme. Above all else, there were inherent contradictions regarding whether MozSAKSS was intended to be a research programme or a capacity development programme. Rather than devoting undue attention to trying to follow what is at this point universally recognised as an obviously flawed results framework^v, this evaluation has been structured so as to formatively explore the reasons behind this confusion, its consequences and to identify options to transcend these issues in the future.

Interviews focused on collecting and analysing a range of subjective perceptions of MozSAKSS performance in relation to the hypotheses above. In general, most interviews largely confirmed these hypotheses, but there were very divergent explanations of how the current state of affairs arose. The team heard a variety of at times conflicting claims regarding what had been decided at various stages in the programme, most notably in relation to decisions on the structure at the start of the programme. The team decided that these conflicting claims about early decisions were unverifiable and in many respects a distraction from the formative focus of the evaluation. Therefore, apart from drawing conclusions regarding importance of transparency and clearer accountability in the future, the evaluation does not delve into these conflicting views about the details of how the programme was designed.

Similarly, the team also heard many claims and accusations regarding who was to blame for the problems encountered in the course of the programme. These were primarily from IWMI in relation to IFPRI’s leadership, but also mutual accusations were made between IFPRI and DE. The team was not able to verify most of these claims and does not feel that assigning blame among the different programme partners is an appropriate focus in a utilisation-focused evaluation such as this.

The evaluation was initiated with discussions with Sida Stockholm and review of programme documentation. The evaluation team read a range of (mostly draft) research reports, but has not attempted to judge the scientific quality of these reports. The peer review process used to assess these products is judged as sufficient. Also, the evaluation has not questioned the accuracy of the programme reporting reviewed, though the team has delved into the perceived credibility and relevance of the reports and studies, as well as the extent to which they are perceived to be DE versus CGIAR products.

An inception report was prepared that was shared with Sida. Upon arrival in Maputo it became apparent that many of the concepts in the inception report were no longer valid due to misinterpretations of some of the documentation and the processes that were already underway in Mozambique. It was ultimately not used as a guide for the evaluation, apart from the implicit focus on the hypotheses presented above.

Methods used during the mission in Maputo primarily consisted of interviews with the following categories of informants:

- DE staff
- Other MINAG staff who have been engaged in recent policy development processes
- Current and past IFPRI/IWMI/ICRISAT staff involved with the programme in Maputo and elsewhere
- Other agricultural policy researchers
- Donors active in the CAADP/PEDSA process
- Other organisations involved in support to DE
- Civil society representatives responsible for CAADP
- NEPAD Planning and Coordination Agency staff in Pretoria

Most of the interviews were conducted individually, but the interviews with DE were conducted in groups due to shortage of time and availability.

The evaluation team presented its initial findings three times: at a meeting of the donors' Agriculture and Rural Economic Development Network (AgRED), at a workshop for DE, MSU and the CGIAR partners, and at the Swedish Embassy. The feedback received has been incorporated into the findings.

The team originally intended to visit two districts to obtain an impression of the challenges faced in decentralised research and policy analysis activities but these plans had to be cancelled due to time pressures.

2.3 Scope and limitations

The purpose of the review is to assess the results of MozSAKSS after two years of implementation and to give recommendations about possible adjustments in the immediate and longer term in the project design. The longer term findings will form part of any future decision for policy level support to the agricultural sector, bearing in mind the lessons learned from the current support and its design. Continued or adjusted forms of long-term support are expected to also support the strategic thinking of MINAG in the formulation of a new sector programme.

The review is thus highly formative, with a focus on how the lessons from the current phase can inform both specific plans regarding possible continued support to MozSAKSS and also alternative approaches to strengthening evidence-based policy formation and decision-making. This broad scope proved to be highly appropriate, as the findings and recommendations have had to respond to a very dynamic situation.

The review revealed a context of weak ownership and governance of MozSAKSS within MINAG. Some interviews were undertaken with ministry stakeholders, but it was not possible to verifiably assess the undoubtedly complex reasons and motivations behind this. The team could only note that this appeared to be symptomatic of broader donor concerns about the lack of close and constructive dialogue among MINAG, the donor community and policy researchers regarding policy outcomes. Indeed, this was one of the major justifications for supporting MozSAKSS.

The team encountered some difficulties in arranging interviews with the very wide range of stakeholders involved in agricultural policy development in Mozambique today. This seems to have been due to the lack of awareness of the work of MozSAKSS, which created hesitancy about accepting to be interviewed. The team feels that the range of interviewees was largely appropriate but regrets that it was not possible to meet with IFAD, FAO or AGRA. Also, the team had hoped to engage with non-traditional donors and sources of policy support, including Brazil and Vietnam, but it was not possible to identify suitable individuals for such discussions.

The greatest limitation of the review was the unfortunate situation that the majority of key MINAG-DE staff were not available for most of the mission (despite assurances when deciding the timing of the review that they would actively participate), and, as a result, the team did not have an opportunity for as much discussions with DE as was expected and hoped for.

2.4 Underlying issues related to the programme theory of change

The programme document and logical framework include a mix of outcome objectives related to capacity development (primarily within DE) and outputs that primarily consist of research deliverables. The intended relationship between these outputs and outcomes, and the choice of modalities to ensure that the research outputs lead to capacity outcomes is not entirely explicit. Nonetheless, it can be surmised that there was an expectation by all partners (CGIAR, DE and Sida) that capacities would be enhanced as part of the relationship that CGIAR institutions normally have with national research partners, i.e., through learning in the course of undertaking collaborative research activities. This review will raise questions about the validity of this expectation.

Another aspect of the original programme document that was not entirely explicit was the role that MozSAKSS – as a local structure of ReSAKSS – would have in providing an evidence base to monitor and evaluate the CAADP process. The document does not strongly emphasise engagement with CAADP. This was presumably due to the uncertainties that existed when the programme was being designed regarding if/how Mozambique would engage with CAADP, combined with a primary concern at the time about defining new modalities for aid harmonisation and alignment in the post Proagri period. This lack of emphasis on CAADP is understandable in light of the circumstances at the time, but in order to judge the progress of MozSAKSS in a ReSAKSS perspective, it is important to recognise that this was not clear in the original plans.

Another related aspect of the theory of change which deserves particular note are the assumptions and expectations regarding how MozSAKSS was expected to improve overall statistical data collection systems. Interviews with the NEPAD Planning and Coordination Agency staff responsible for ReSAKSS indicated that the greatest problem in monitoring and evaluating progress in CAADP is not lack of data per se, but rather poor and unstructured use of institutional resources for statistics, non-commensurable data, and weak links between existing systems and overall needs, i.e., systemic issues. MozSAKSS has provided significant support for various important data collection activities and for developing skills to collect data, but there does not seem to have been an ambition to address the broader systemic challenges in reforming the Mozambican agricultural statistics system. Whereas this

review does raise attention to this gap between programme goals and the intentions of the ReSAKSS process, it is important to highlight that it would be inappropriate for MozSAKSS to be seen as accountable for the failures to address these more systemic challenges. However, it can be noted that a general failure to map the range of actors engaged in policy analysis beyond the CGIAR system and MSU has been an obstacle to more strategic thinking within the programme.

3. Summative findings

3.1 General finding related to the component structure

Despite being ostensibly a “capacity development programme”, the structure of the programme document overwhelmingly emphasises the outputs for each component, rather than how and what capacities were expected to be developed. The component headings refer to “results”, but the theory of change by which the capacities suggested in the component headings would derive from the specific planned activities is not made clear. In effect, there seems to be an implicit assumption throughout the document that capacities to undertake similar tasks in the future would almost automatically arise out of collaboration in these activities as the programme produced its “deliverables”. For this reason, this review summarises the specific component findings rather briefly, before proceeding to primarily focus on analysis of capacity development issues.

It is also important to note that much of the core capacity development aspects of the programme were crosscutting activities, including training, capabilities to communicate research findings, etc. However, in order to have a convenient system for budgeting and monitoring, these functions were largely allocated to specific components. For example, training was part of component five, even though there were human resource development needs in all components. Therefore, the CGIAR partner responsible for the overall training component was often different from the partner that was responsible for the specific training topics in the other components. If the MozSAKSS consortium had functioned well and if there was strong internal communication and trust, this would probably not have been a problem. Regrettably, communication and trust were exceedingly weak, and this has indeed been a problem, even if more pragmatic forms of collaboration have emerged during the course of implementation.

3.2 Component 1: MINAG’s agricultural statistics and information systems

This component focused on two analyses; one of information systems and the second a sectoral performance review. The former was largely undertaken by the IWMI Programme Coordinator, whereas the latter was managed by IWMI together with DE staff through “learning by doing”.

The first output has been completed and is being peer reviewed before publication. It should prove to be a useful basis for planning a range of decentralised interventions related to information and performance management. It could also be used as a point of departure for the future functional analysis proposed in this review (See Recommendations).

The potential impact of the sectoral performance review is discussed elsewhere in this review (See Section 3.8). It is unlikely that DE now has the capacity to independently produce such a review on an annual basis without considerable outside technical assistance. The process of preparing the review involved discussion and agreement on indicators and would appear to nonetheless have resulted in enhanced capacities. Progress also appears to be better regarding DE and overall MINAG commitments to lead this activity in the future (compared to other activities), as evidenced by strong DE ownership for this study and high-level ministerial endorsement of the findings.

As noted above, this component was not intended as overall support to agricultural statistics and information systems (as the title would seem to indicate), but it is important to note that systemic weaknesses are frequently cited as the main challenge facing DE and indeed in providing an evidence base for most policy analyses. Stakeholders interviewed stated different views regarding the roles of MozSAKSS and DE in statistics vis-à-vis other projects and governmental departments. DE is formally mandated to have a central synthesising role in managing statistics and databases, but the team was informed that other governmental departments interpret the division of responsibilities differently. IWMI feels that “one of the main contributions of MozSAKSS has been [to] bring out the evidence

demonstrating the need for harmonization”. It does not appear that the programme has led to a consensus regarding how this harmonisation should occur. The review was not able to judge which of these different perspectives was most appropriate, but it can be concluded that MozSAKSS is effectively “one project among many” supporting statistics.^{vi} It is recognised by the NEPAD/CAADP office and also more generally that a proliferation of small projects should be avoided in support to statistical systems.^{vii}

3.3 Component 2: Reinforced DE policy analysis and strategic planning capacity

One of the tasks in this component was an economy-wide public sector investment analysis. After initially promising efforts, difficulties have arisen. IFPRI has had good, constructive collaboration with Eduardo Mondlane University (UEM) researchers in undertaking this study, but progress has been stymied at other levels. High transaction costs in DE-UEM collaboration and seemingly inexplicable denial of access to key data have obstructed completion of these studies. This can be interpreted as indicating a need for special attention to issues around collaboration between different Mozambican institutions and not just the questions of collaboration between DE and CGIAR raised elsewhere in this report. If this study could be completed, which regrettably appears uncertain, this could provide a very useful baseline for future monitoring and evaluation of PEDSA/CAADP.

The rest of this component consists of ICRISAT-led studies on fertiliser recommendations, input–output markets and irrigation. These are all underway and will probably be able to be completed, peer reviewed and published by mid-2012 (if there is a programme extension). ICRISAT initially had difficulties mobilising DE staff to engage in these studies and there is some resentment from DE staff that they see themselves as “treated as research assistants” in this work. ICRISAT moved from a collaborative research approach to coaching (See Section 3.9 below), but there were at first difficulties in ensuring that DE staff were available to be coached when ICRISAT staff come to Mozambique.

3.4 Component 3: Improved MINAG knowledge- and information-sharing, including at farmer level

After a very slow start, during the past year there have been a number of well-attended events to present research results and discuss policy issues. This is evidence of the relevance and feasibility of MozSAKSS support to creating a “think tank culture” and the readiness of DE to take a central role in open policy discussion. The review team was not able to attend any of these events, but feedback received indicates that DE played a major role in these proceedings, even though much of the research presented was undertaken by the CGIAR institutions and MSU. A number of the planned public events have still not taken place and it is unlikely that all outputs will be completed.

A website has been launched. DE itself, however, lacks effective Internet access. This appears to be partly due to the fact that they have moved offices three times and partly due to their weak internal capacity to manage the procurement process required by MozSAKSS.

There has apparently been no information-sharing at farmer level and this was clearly not an appropriate objective for a programme of this type.

It is not possible to assess whether DE has the human resource capacity to convene policy dialogues and similar seminars without MozSAKSS support in the future. This component is a crosscutting activity that could perhaps have been undertaken more efficiently and effectively if a professional information specialist had been engaged in implementation.

3.5 Component 4: Reinforced flow of knowledge and information at regional level

This component covers assorted international contact and exchange visits. Some of these, such as a visit by the DE director to China, have been undertaken and DE staff have made visits to South Africa for training and familiarisation with regional agricultural research activities. Planned visits to learn about how other SAKSS nodes function have not yet taken place. In general, results from this component have been limited as few regional trips have been made or requested by DE. This is regrettable, as there would seem to be useful lessons that could have been learnt regarding how ReSAKSS functions in other countries, and as much of the added value of having regional initiatives such as ReSAKSS would seem to come from the opportunities it would provide for South–South exchange.

3.6 Component 5: Improved skills and increased reliance on domestic inputs

This component was expected to be driven by a capacity strengthening plan, which was not undertaken. Development of such a plan would have provided a useful basis for clarifying the unique role of MozSAKSS vis-à-vis other human resource development efforts targeted at DE and even other MINAG departments engaged in policy analysis, monitoring and evaluation.

Performance has been fairly good in terms of short-term training activities and technical support and preparation of guides (e.g., Geographic Information Systems). ICRISAT was successful in providing such support in relation to the Agricultural Production Systems sIMulator (APSIM) approach to modelling. Difficulties were reported in aligning “on the job” and other individual training to a structured work plan for specific staff members of DE due to the problems experienced by these staff in allocating time for MozSAKSS activities.

3.7 Overall programme structure, leadership, coordination and accountability

In the relatively short period of time that MozSAKSS has been operating it has fragmented into a set of weakly coordinated activities. The CGIAR institutions were expected to act as a consortium, but this has only functioned in relation to administration. The original division of responsibilities was not clear to any of the consortium partners, with the Programme Coordinator (from IWMI) being effectively subordinate to the Programme Leader (from IFPRI), thereby raising uncertainties about coordination roles and ultimately leading to distrust. Some of those interviewed pointed out the “poor personal chemistry” between key staff. Communication between the CGIAR (erstwhile) partners remains poor and each largely manages its own relationships with DE and with other stakeholders. This has led to fragmentation within the programme and also in outreach. During the course of the review the team heard many accusations of poor performance, primarily from IWMI directed at IFPRI. The team interprets this as demonstrating a tendency among the CGIAR “partners” to focus on placing blame for programme shortcomings. This has often stood in the way of a constructive search for joint solutions.

Awareness outside the programme is greater of what the individual centres of IFPRI and IWMI are doing (most outside stakeholders interviewed did not know that ICRISAT is also a partner) than of what MozSAKSS as an overall programme was expected to achieve. Outside stakeholders interviewed were often aware of individual studies, but not of how these studies were initiated, nor of how the overall programme was striving to support evidence-based policy formation. Some of those interviewed expressed confusion about how to perceive the roles of the individuals involved in the programme, who have sometimes presented themselves as MozSAKSS, more often as representatives of their respective institutions, and on occasion even as independent consultants. One observer described his impressions of MozSAKSS as a “jungle”. Due to the emphasis on deliverables, few outside stakeholders were aware that MozSAKSS was intended to be a capacity development programme.

The review team did not have an opportunity to verifiably assess the levels of awareness and ownership for MozSAKSS within higher levels of MINAG. It can be noted, however, that there were three meetings with the Minister during the pilot phase, but since then there have been none (nor any meetings with vice ministers or permanent secretaries). One highly placed interviewee stated that he doubted that the Minister or Vice Minister were aware of the existence of MozSAKSS.

Ideally the leadership for a programme such as this should lie with DE. This has not emerged due to uncertainties, misperceptions and unclear lines of accountability between IFPRI and DE. The IFPRI Programme Leader was expected by Sida to be fully accountable to DE, but this has not happened in practice. Indeed, weak leadership and engagement from DE meant that such a relationship was not possible in MozSAKSS. It should be noted that a much higher level of accountability to national partners would be normal in most Sida-funded capacity development programmes, but would be highly unique for IFPRI. There is an inherent misfit between Sida norms of encouraging national ownership, DE's weak engagement in the programme and IFPRI norms, incentives and standard *modus operandi* for research collaboration, where production of peer-reviewed publications and contribution to IFPRI's core research portfolio are generally seen as more important performance indicators than ownership by national partners. This is in many respects true for the CGIAR system more generally.

Ambiguity regarding programme leadership appears to have contributed to weak ownership of the programme by DE. The exact origins of this lack of leadership and ownership are unclear, as the review team heard conflicting claims about how ownership was fostered/discouraged during the pilot phase and in initial planning. During the first year of the programme the CGIAR partners strongly encouraged DE to set their own agenda, and thereby assume leadership of the programme, but distrust by DE prevented this from occurring. The Sida Assessment Memo states that MINAG will decide on the work programme, but DE has indicated that they did not feel empowered to do so, despite encouragement from their CGIAR partners. The reasons for this hesitation to assume leadership of the programme are unclear.

One outcome of this lack of leadership by DE has been that the limited ministerial demands on MozSAKSS have created a vacuum in which priorities have been overly influenced by the interests of the CGIAR institutions. It is, however, not possible to clearly verify the extent to which the CGIAR institutions have actively promoted their own research interests or if they have merely tried to implement an adapted version of the studies proposed in the original programme document (which was said to have derived from research priorities jointly identified in the pilot phase). It can nonetheless be stated that the studies undertaken do not all reflect current priorities for policy analysis.

Efforts to resolve these problems have gradually led to more pragmatic and effective cooperation, as evidenced by the increased pace of production of outputs over the past six months. But nonetheless, the overall structure of work and lack of clear leadership (by either DE or CGIAR) are viewed as unsatisfactory by all of the partners.

In the absence of clear leadership, accountability between partners for outcomes and production of outputs is largely related to the type of relationship that has emerged between each CGIAR institution and DE (in addition to formal financial and administrative accountability through IFPRI). This is not ideal, but is likely to be sufficient for continuing the work of the programme until the end of the current phase.

Also, a significant aspect of accountability in MozSAKSS was expected to be via the Steering Committee, which was intended to be the main forum for key Mozambican stakeholders to follow the progress of the programme and present their recommendations for improvement. The committee has only met

once. A second meeting was repeatedly delayed for a variety of reasons, and the review team can only conclude that the functioning of this committee was not seen as a priority by the partners.

Finally, it should be noted that the concept of accountability in relation to ReSAKSS and CAADP is one of “mutual accountability” (deriving from the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness). This is described as follows: “An effective mutual accountability system requires that there are supportive mechanisms for coordination, harmonisation and alignment cutting across the public sector, private sector, civil society and among the development partners.”^{viii} Furthermore, NEPAD recognises that there is “the need to ground mutual accountability in “domestic accountability” with a focus on government-citizenry accountability and establishment of mechanisms that channel the voices and concerns of critical players such as farmers and their organizations.”^{ix}

3.8 Overall performance in relation to output deliverables

It is beyond the scope of this review to scientifically assess the quality of the outputs of the programme but it appears that the conventional peer-review mechanisms for production of scientific papers is in place and there is no reason to doubt their scientific quality. Based on an admittedly limited review of the draft outputs, it should be noted, however, that there has been little attention given to gender or environmental issues in the research.

In addition to the more research-oriented outputs, IWMI, in particular, has been active in drafting other types of papers, such as a discussion paper on the CAADP process and a detailed review of current MINAG information systems. It appears that DE has not actively collaborated in producing these outputs. The main output developed with strong support from IWMI and significant participation from DE has been the sectoral performance review (*“Monitoring Agricultural Sector Performance, Growth and Poverty Trends in Mozambique”*). Again, it is beyond the scope of this review to assess the accuracy and specific qualities of this output, but the relevance and overall comprehensiveness of the issues covered seems very appropriate. Even before it has actually been published it has received considerable attention in the national media and the Minister of Agriculture has been quoted as calling for the review to be continued on an annual basis.

Most of the research deliverables have been largely written by international researchers, with DE staff often not included among the co-authors. With the notable exception of the sectoral performance review, these outputs are consequently effectively credited primarily to the respective CGIAR institutes. IFPRI is aware of how this issue is problematic from an ownership perspective and has compromised regarding their usual procedures in allowing reports to be published under the DE report series rather than their own. Despite this acceptance of using a DE heading, the failure to present most products as full-fledged DE initiatives perhaps reflects the correct *de facto* participation in the research process, but this naturally does not engender DE and MINAG ownership of these deliverables. Interviewees stated that MINAG demands outputs from Mozambican institutions and perceives these as being by nature more credible and relevant than reports from international research institutions. Therefore, the influence of MozSAKSS on policy has been weakened due to the high profile of the CGIAR institutions in this research.

Even some events are described in the reports of the CGIAR institutes as being events of the respective institutes and not being activities of DE or MozSAKSS. The review team did not have an opportunity to observe any policy dialogues or other presentations and, therefore, cannot directly assess the ways that ownership was addressed in these events.

A major concern of all partners has been the delay in production of programme deliverables, all of which have been (or are being) produced behind schedule. IFPRI headquarters, in particular, views this aspect of performance as being unacceptable, and this is a major reason for their decision not to remain part of MozSAKSS in the future. Pressures from headquarters and assumed pressures from Sida (assumptions which appear to be based on preconceived notions about donor priorities) to produce these deliverables in a timely manner, while maintaining quality standards, have led IFPRI to give higher attention to improving this aspect of performance, as opposed to focusing on capacity development. IWMI has apparently taken a more flexible stance, seeing these deliverables more as a “means to an end”, i.e., capacity development at DE. ICRISAT has been concerned with delays and has struggled to improve performance, but their physical distance from DE has meant that they can only contribute to capacity development as part of the production of scientific studies, so they have not been faced with the same *de facto* choice as the other partners of where to emphasise their efforts. They also have not had an opportunity to stoke interest in the activities they manage either within or beyond DE. Finally, it should be noted that some of the delays in the release of research results have been due to IFPRI’s relatively strict demands for peer review.

Finally, interviewees presented different perceptions and claims about the process behind the choice and prioritisation of research activities and the decisions about which CGIAR institute would be responsible for which activities. There are notable anomalies, for example, ICRISAT rather than IWMI being responsible for irrigation. The review team cannot verify the reasons behind these decisions.

3.9 Overall performance in relation to capacity development outcomes

Overall performance in capacity development must be assessed in relation to whether the “right” capacities are being developed. To varying degrees MozSAKSS has contributed to the following types of capacities:

- To undertake policy analyses
- To undertake field surveys
- To manage statistics and databases
- To support multi-stakeholder engagement in policy discussions

In research activities DE perceives that they have received relatively more support than they wished for learning how to undertake field surveys and they repeatedly describe themselves as having been “used as research assistants” as opposed to developing capacities for policy analysis. This is one of the reasons given for their lack of ownership for MozSAKSS. Other information provided to the review questioned whether this was actually true, but these concerns highlight differences of perspective on what skills DE needed to develop to carry out their responsibilities and their “niche” among the spectrum of actors involved in policy research.

There is a higher degree of satisfaction with support for managing multi-stakeholder engagements both within DE and among partners in civil society, as part of the CAADP roundtable process. This even holds true for DE and civil society impressions of the discussions organised at provincial level.

The situation with support to statistics is more complicated given that DE is receiving support from MSU and FAO as well. There is not a high degree of satisfaction with these outcomes among DE, the CGIAR institutes or other stakeholders. Agricultural statistics production appears to be fragmented and not fully relevant to the needs of decision-makers. This appears to be related to a failure, at the outset, to clearly define the objectives and ambitions of MozSAKSS in relation to these other actors. The review team did not have an opportunity to have sufficient discussions with all stakeholders regarding this aspect of capacity development and does not feel capable of presenting rigorous conclusions.

The review team judges that the most problematic aspect of capacity development has been in relation to the choice between two approaches: ***collaborative research versus coaching***. The CGIAR system generally supports capacity development through collaboration with national research institutions on joint research. This collegial process is expected to generate capacities through “learning by doing”. A collaborative approach assumes a relatively high degree of capacity within national partners at the outset in order for this to work (both technical capacity and ability to devote staff time to research activities). Capacities of national partners do not need to be at the same level of the CGIAR institutions, but basic methodological skills and organisational structures conducive to joint research would seem to be essential. This approach is particularly common with IFPRI, which, since its research is not field trial based, has relatively few staff based in developing countries and, therefore, usually undertakes joint studies at a distance, relying on e-mail contacts and brief visits. It became apparent early in the programme that the collaborative approach was not appropriate for work with DE given their lack of human resources and time to apply to programme activities. This is also due to the fact that DE, as a ministerial directorate, is not a research institute of the type that CGIAR institutes are accustomed to collaborate with.

As the obstacles to the collaborative approach have become clear to all partners there has been a partial shift to coaching within MozSAKSS, but DE still remains dissatisfied with the overall MozSAKSS approach in this regard. IFPRI and ICRISAT note the difficulty of ensuring regular and systematic access to DE staff as a major obstacle in improving coaching support. Even when outside researchers have come to Maputo for planned periods of coaching, their colleagues at DE have often not been available. The CGIAR institutions generally feel that they succeeded, over time, in reorienting their approaches towards a coaching mode, but the (in some cases) weak engagement on the part of DE meant that this failed to yield the results that were hoped for. The review team concludes that a greater degree of ring-fencing of DE resources for specific tasks is a precondition for effective coaching. It is not clear if DE recognises this.

It is important to note that there is a danger that coaching can deteriorate into a relationship where outside experts carry out tasks that are the responsibility of the institution being coached. This is said to be common in some projects in Mozambique. A positive aspect of the distance between MozSAKSS and DE has been that, apart from the production of research outputs, the MozSAKSS staff have avoided falling into such a role.

Whether the support is for collaborative research or for coaching, the ultimate responsibility for research outputs in a capacity development programme such as MozSAKSS should ideally be with DE. But a tendency to focus on placing blame for shortcomings seems to have stood in the way of assuming such responsibility. The review team did not receive clear indications from DE about their sense of responsibility since the focus of attention was largely on expressing dissatisfaction with the prevail arrangements.

Formal short-term “in-service” training for DE and other MINAG staff has been appreciated and though it is too early to confirm, shows potential for impact. This training has also apparently acted as a significant incentive for a more positive spirit of cooperation with MozSAKSS at DE. This is particularly important as MozSAKSS is not able to provide the same financial incentives for participating in programme activities as other donor-funded programmes. The review team has been surprised that greater attention was not given to short-term training at the outset of the programme. It is recognised, however, that language issues related to sourcing training in neighbouring countries and a past history of newly educated staff leaving for more lucrative employment may be reasons for this. DE has received human resource development support from MSU for many years, largely in the form of degree

programmes, but has had great difficulty in retaining staff once they have been trained and have become more attractive on the job market. As the pool of well-trained Mozambican agricultural researchers grows, this problem may be resolved, but this is a long-term process. It could be assumed that short-term training would not carry with it as a high risk of brain-drain as degree programmes.

It is important to stress that capacity development efforts have overwhelmingly focused on human resource development, whereas DE clearly suffers from dysfunctional organisational structure and management systems. DE's capacity faults cannot be attributed entirely to weak human resources; therefore human resource development support alone will not lead to the organisational development that is needed. The review team did not have enough discussions with DE to be prepared to suggest a specific strategy for future organisational development, but it is clear that such a strategy is needed. The CGIAR system is not necessarily an appropriate set of institutions from which to source such support, given that they are accustomed to working with research institutions and not ministerial directorates. Furthermore, the CGIAR system tends to perceive capacity development as primarily a human resource issue, rather than an organisational development or institutional change process.^x

Finally, the staff and leadership of DE are relatively gender balanced, so the beneficiaries of the human resource development support have also been balanced. The CGIAR researchers involved in the programme are, however, virtually all male.

3.10 Overall performance in relation to enhanced evidence-based decision-making

The review was not able to obtain a clear and verifiable overview of how well MozSAKSS has enhanced evidence-based decision-making. The delays in the production of reports have meant that it is in many respects too early to judge this aspect of the programme. Some products, most notably the sectoral performance review mentioned above, do appear to have contributed to evidence-based decision-making.

It is also important to note that decision-making has in many cases moved ahead of the programme's production of evidence due to the approval of PEDSA and preparation of the CAADP Compact. In effect, DE is being primarily called on to use evidence to steer implementation of policy decisions that have already been made, rather than influencing the policies themselves. This turn of events has of course been beyond the control of the programme but is an important factor in relation to the perceived relevance of deliverables chosen over two years ago. The demand in the future is likely to be primarily related to information related to monitoring and evaluating the PEDSA/CAADP investment strategy.

Support from MozSAKSS has been cited by interviewees as being important for developing an open and democratic process by DE as it has convened stakeholders in the CAADP roundtable process. Feedback from NGOs and others stressed the inclusiveness of this process. Even though DE did not apparently always present "evidence" as a point of departure for these discussions, their success at convening actors could be interpreted as potentially boding well for future efforts to promote evidence-based decision-making among groups of stakeholders.

The policy dialogues initiated by the programme were slow to get started but are now becoming a regular feature of the programme. They are well-attended by a wide range of stakeholders and are said to have generated open debate on public policies based on evidence. The review team did not have an opportunity to attend any of these events, but from the descriptions of the policy dialogues it appears that these demonstrate the demand and potential to develop a "think tank culture" around agricultural policy.

As noted above, the lack of clarity among many stakeholders regarding what MozSAKSS does, what it is responsible for and who it consists of have weakened its role as a convener and led to it being seen as “just another project”. This would not be a problem if DE was able to present itself as the “owner” of these outputs. Unfortunately, this has not happened either, which has led to a vague profile for the programme and DE in the evidence-based policy discourse.

The following chapter of this report will consider the prospects for future investments in “MozSAKSS-like initiatives” in the perspective of this changing landscape of decision-making. The relatively poor performance of MozSAKSS in many respects suggests that plans for the future must be made in a wider perspective. As such, the following findings refer to a broader set of options than reform of the current approach.

3.11 Overall efficiency in achieving outcomes

Due to the fragmentation in programme management overall financial planning in MozSAKSS is very weak. At the time of the evaluation no clear information was available regarding whether the final programme disbursement of SEK 7 million would be needed or utilised during 2011, since IFPRI had not yet received financial reports from its partners. Conflicting information was provided regarding IFPRI’s willingness to undertake a no-cost extension.

The structure of the budget makes it very difficult to draw conclusions about “value for money” given that much of the expenditure on human resource (capacity) development and communication to policy makers (i.e., the “values”) are separate from the components related to “deliverables”. The review team does conclude that there has been limited capacity developed and if the programme comes to an abrupt halt at the end of the year this will mean that (unless DE proceeds with producing policy briefs, etc., on their own) the impact on policy thinking will be limited as well, since few reports will have been peer reviewed, finalised, published and promoted.

4. Formative findings

4.1 Relevance of MozSAKSS for emerging needs

ReSAKSS is, in principle, a support function for monitoring and evaluation of the CAADP process. MozSAKSS in its current structure produces information that could inform such monitoring and evaluation, but much of this is in the form of research that would be expected to support monitoring and evaluation indirectly. This is inherent in the programme's emphasis on selected research projects, rather than evaluation tasks. The needs for monitoring and evaluation support in relation to CAADP (and by extension – PEDSA) will become acute in the very near future when the CAADP compact is signed, as it will be essential to integrate a monitoring and evaluation plan within the investment strategy. Considerable work is needed in order to ensure that the results frameworks developed for the investment strategy underpin the needed linkages to PEDSA. There are currently significant gaps. Most notably, PEDSA lacks clear outcome indicators and there is a danger that monitoring and evaluation systems could focus unduly on production/output targets and institutional coverage (e.g., ratio of extension agents to farmers) that would not be fully relevant for decision-making needs. In addition, the links between PEDSA and investment strategies at the level of the development "corridors", where a large proportion of activities are likely to be concentrated, are not clear. DE presently has by their own admission virtually no capacity to meet emerging demands for monitoring and evaluation support.

Currently, monitoring and evaluation efforts are fragmented. For example, project level evaluations are undertaken independently, commissioned by respective donors, but there are few structures through which to draw broader conclusions about how credit or irrigation investments are impacting on livelihoods, production or profitability, or regarding which methods are most appropriate under different circumstances. There is a significant danger that PEDSA and CAADP could be treated as a loosely connected portfolio of projects if structures are not put into place for utilisation-focused evaluation that can generate broader lessons. Links between performance assessment and budgetary decisions could also be weak. Furthermore, a comprehensive and consolidated monitoring and evaluation process would seem to be a precondition for regenerating the trust that would be needed to initiate any new broad-based sectoral programme.

In addition, DE still has very weak organisational capacities to respond to new challenges. It has had great difficulties establishing and following work plans and in establishing constructive collaborative relations with partners. It also lacks human resource capacities related to core aspects of its mandate. DE will need MozSAKSS even more than ever as demands from MINAG are apparently set to increase and as the donor community's expectations of governmental capacity to lead strategic implementation of CAADP and PEDSA are likely to be tested in relation to monitoring and evaluation of investments and sectoral trends.

Therefore, the "old MozSAKSS", i.e., the current programme structure, is not highly appropriate for responding to emerging needs. However, a structure for acting on the core monitoring and evaluation mandate of ReSAKSS is more needed than ever. As such, a new type of MozSAKSS is clearly relevant for emerging needs.

4.2 Relevance of MozSAKSS in relation to other actors and platforms for policy support

MozSAKSS, in its current structure, is not fully relevant in relation to other stakeholders due to the amorphous nature of its mandate and activities, the confusion that exists among other actors regarding the nature of its work, and unclear systems for accountability and prioritisation of its outputs. Nonetheless, these are problems that could be addressed relatively easily in the future if DE (with support from MozSAKSS in its final months or possibly from consultancy inputs) works constructively to redefine, refine and narrow MozSAKSS priorities. In order to improve the programme's engagement with other actors this would need to be done in an open manner together with a range of potential partners and users of policy advice. One of the reasons that the programme has not found a clear role vis-à-vis other actors is that the original programme document did not rest on a solid mapping of who does what in Mozambican agricultural policy support.

MozSAKSS has partially overcome initial uncertainties about its role in relation to other support to evidence-based policy-making and decision-making, primarily through close coordination with MSU. A constructive division of responsibilities seems to have been maintained. Coordination with statistics-related support provided by FAO and with EC support appears to have been more limited. The reasons for this weaker coordination are not clear. It is apparent that MozSAKSS functions as one of several actors supporting MINAG statistics capacity and has not assumed an overall coordination role, nor a role supporting DE to coordinate the assistance it receives. There is therefore still an outstanding need for greater harmonisation and alignment of support to agricultural statistics.

Discussions are underway regarding the possible establishment of a new policy research centre at UEM to be tentatively called the Centre for Applied Research on Agro-Food System Policies and Programmes (CEPAAD). Such a centre would potentially help to reduce the burdens of DE in terms of undertaking its own studies. It would also provide a potentially useful counterpart institution if DE takes on a larger role in synthesising/analysing research in relation to policy implications and in commissioning evaluations. Given the early stage in the discussions of the centre and the impending signing of the CAADP compact, there could be opportunities for including the planning of CEPAAD in a constructive planning process in relation to roles and responsibilities of Mozambican institutions in policy analyses and monitoring and evaluation in the very near future. The experience of MozSAKSS could inform this process, especially with respect to the vital importance of identifying and confirming the existence of drivers of Mozambican leadership and ownership for such a centre and for a future MozSAKSS.

Finally, a significant aspect of relevance is the extent to which MozSAKSS has contributed to decentralised capacities for policy analysis, monitoring and evaluation. Little has been accomplished in this regard. The review team did not have an opportunity to directly assess potential for decentralisation. But interviews highlighted this as a significant concern and despite acknowledgement of extremely weak current provincial and district capacities, improvement in data collection systems and relevance to programming needs for evidence of policy impacts may depend on links to decentralised capacity development.

4.3 Relevance of CGIAR support in relation to emerging needs and demands

Several interviewees have noted the seemingly odd role of the CGIAR institutions in MozSAKSS, especially the role of IWMI in activities that have little to do with water management. Given the apparent importance of a coaching relationship with DE and the difficulties encountered in establishing this at a distance, the practical relevance of ICRISAT support can be questioned, even though ICRISAT may have a relevant role in non-DE related policy research initiatives. The weaknesses of MozSAKSS have demonstrated that concerns about the relevance of a CGIAR-led MozSAKSS are in some respects

valid. The lack of obvious specialised expertise in many of the required aspects of monitoring and evaluation in the CGIAR system (with the notable exception of overall sectoral monitoring) implies that their relevance may be even more questionable in the future. Interviews indicate that IWMI has a particular challenge in proving its relevance and improving its reputation among some key stakeholders.

Nonetheless, IWMI is leading ReSAKSS in Southern Africa, with IFPRI playing a central role in Africa more generally. Also IWMI has developed a relatively high degree of trust with DE. There is also potential to use ReSAKSS as a link to regional learning processes within, for example, the Southern African Development Community (SADC). Interviewees reported a demand at MINAG to learn from the CAADP experience in other countries, and ReSAKSS is well-placed to provide this service. These “facts on the ground” suggest a continued relevance of CGIAR support. Furthermore, IWMI has demonstrated clear flexibility and pragmatism regarding its core mandate when choosing staff and planning its engagements in Mozambique. The recommendations below would, however, represent a challenge for any CGIAR institution to partner far more broadly than would usually be the case in their normal roles as research institutions.

In sum, although questions are valid regarding the choice of CGIAR institutions for the tasks ahead, they may be appropriate for continuing with more narrowly defined tasks. It would seem imperative, at a minimum, to also consider if and how IWMI (or a different CGIAR institution) could collaborate with other actors in monitoring and evaluating capacity development (e.g., the CLEAR Regional Centre for Learning on Evaluation and Results in Johannesburg) and for promoting the use of research in policy (e.g., the Overseas Development Institute Research and Policy in Development Programme – ODI RAPID).

4.4 Observations regarding the current role of DE in relation to needs and opportunities

DE recognises that it cannot undertake all of the tasks that different stakeholders hope for, expect or even demand. Above all else, it currently has to reply to sudden demands that come from MINAG, and this conflicts with effective performance in relation to these other more strategic needs and demands.

Beyond responding to immediate requests from the ministry, DE needs to be able to synthesise relevant research for use by policymakers. In the very near future it will, as part of PEDSA/CAADP implementation, be tasked with coordinating monitoring and evaluation. In order to undertake these two core responsibilities it needs to (a) judge the quality of data and maintain databases; (b) learn about and establish monitoring and evaluation systems and methods; and (c) create structures by which to arrange (and perhaps become a “good buyer” of) services from researchers and consultants tasked with producing useful research and actual monitoring and evaluation tasks. In the view of the review team, continued support for DE staff to undertake their own field surveys is a waste of very scarce resources given the enormity of these higher priority tasks.

An important area where DE has begun to utilise MozSAKSS support is in convening policy dialogue. This deserves greater attention in the future. In addition to policy dialogue around research and findings related to sectoral trends, DE could have a very important role in promoting the utility of evaluations by bringing together stakeholders to discuss findings and even to consider priority evaluation questions for terms of reference for evaluations, and to identify programmes wherein critical analysis could inform broader reflection on key themes (e.g., credit, extension, land administration, etc.).

5. Conclusions

5.1 Lack of clarity and unrealistic assumptions in the programme design

MozSAKSS was originally planned by Sida to be a capacity development programme that would produce a number of research deliverables as almost a “positive externality”. By contrast, it has been primarily (but not entirely) implemented as a set of contracted research tasks wherein capacity development has been treated as a “positive externality”. This divergence of goals can primarily be attributed to lack of consensus among partners about how to interpret the mandate of the programme. It is also related to IFPRI (and to some extent the CGIAR) *modus operandi* and institutional incentive structures. This set of “misunderstandings” was raised at the start of the programme by IFPRI (and to an extent by others) but was not effectively addressed, apparently due to distrust and lack of consensus among partners. Recently, these challenges have been partially overcome through more pragmatic cooperation. The weak performance of the programme is related to this very dysfunctional start-up.

5.2 Choice of partners and their roles and the nature of ownership at MINAG-DE

DE has not been satisfied with the choice of partners and their roles for MozSAKSS and largely blames this unfortunate structure for their limited ownership for the programme. Nonetheless, relations with (and between) partners appear to have settled into a modestly constructive pattern. A transparent approach to plans for partnership is a precondition for improved relations in the future.

One of the clearest lessons learnt in MozSAKSS is that the type of collaborative research that characterises CGIAR work with most national agricultural research centres is not appropriate for supporting DE. A coaching and mentoring approach is required, preferably paired with a strong engagement with a broader array of Mozambican institutional stakeholders. However, even effective coaching is reliant on a considerably higher level of engagement from DE than has been exhibited in MozSAKSS.

Also, MINAG’s limited ownership for the programme is exemplified by the failure to recruit additional staff (which was promised at the start of the programme) and generally to ring-fence resources for MozSAKSS related tasks. IWMI reports that the involvement of DE staff in MozSAKSS activities has been “at the most ad hoc.” Many of the problems that have been encountered with MozSAKSS would have been less severe and perhaps could have been resolved entirely if additional DE staff were in place and their time ring-fenced for the use of the programme. Effective future investments in DE would be reliant on earlier commitments being acted upon.

Agreements regarding commitments to provide investments, human resources and questions of which partners should be engaged also need to be based on discussions between the Swedish Embassy and MINAG (perhaps even including dialogue with the NEPAD office in South Africa). This should not be left to be negotiated between the CGIAR institutions and DE.

5.3 Capacities to meet the challenges ahead in implementing PEDSA and CAADP

DE has enhanced its convening capacity to bring stakeholders together for discussions of how to proceed with PEDSA/CAADP. The policy dialogues have shown the potential for wider evidence-based discussions of agricultural policies. The sectoral performance review is a product that has generated strong interest within the MINAG leadership, along with higher expectations about the way the DE will support policy-makers. These are indications that first steps have been taken in creating a “think tank culture” and strengthening the use of evidence in following the process of PEDSA/CAADP

implementation. The experience of MozSAKSS indicates that the structural limitations within DE mean that it is unlikely to develop into either a full-fledged think tank or a research institute. But it could play a key convening and synthesis role, together with research institutions and civil society. This would require DE focusing its efforts on a more realistic set of tasks and maintaining a more structured work plan.

5.4 Accountability, realism and focus

Many of the difficulties between partners that have been encountered in MozSAKSS can be attributed to a lack of clear and appropriate accountability structures. In many respects IFPRI saw MozSAKSS as a set of (primarily research) activities contracted by Sida. They are not accustomed to Sida's approach to local ownership and it is highly doubtful that they would accept the kind of accountability to national partners that is normally expected by Sida. Therefore it is appropriate that they have chosen not to consider active participation in a future phase of MozSAKSS.

At the same time, DE has not been proactive in assuming full ownership or leadership of the programme, as evidenced by frequent complaints that their partners have not been clear enough in instructing them what they should do. Therefore, future investments in DE would require a more well-defined accountability structure, preferably with DE restricting its role to convening, coordination, synthesis and leadership. MozSAKSS would also need to be accountable to a much stronger steering committee (with regular meetings). Such a governance structure would need to be tasked with ensuring that responsibilities are unambiguous. Given these overall findings it is also apparent that future investments in MozSAKSS must avoid the ambiguous and multiple identities (as DE, CGIAR researchers and independent consultants) that have affected current credibility and have been an obstacle to finding a clear role in the agricultural policy community. This suggests that those managing a MozSAKSS node in the future must be prepared to downplay the corporate profile of their home institutions and present their work as being entirely MozSAKSS products.

Realism is essential regarding the amount of time and resources that DE will be able to ring-fence for MozSAKSS-related activities given the sudden and unpredictable demands that come from MINAG. Nonetheless, a stronger MINAG commitment in terms of provision of both human and financial resources would seem to be essential if more donor resources are to be invested in MozSAKSS. Furthermore, clearer indications from DE of readiness to engage more actively are also essential. An overall conclusion from this review is that the recruitment of the five DE staff who were originally expected to be hired as part of establishing MozSAKSS, and a ring-fencing of their time to devote to these tasks, should be a precondition for any major future package of support to DE. In addition, it would seem appropriate that any eventual proposals for continuation of the programme should be developed by DE (and not their CGIAR partners), so that the nature and extent of their engagement can be more accurately assessed. Experience has shown that ring-fencing of resources for MozSAKSS will not be easy to maintain, but it could be assumed that the significantly higher profile role that MozSAKSS would play in the future would create pressures for DE and MINAG to carry through on commitments.

Furthermore, due to unfortunate circumstances beyond the control of the programme it has not been possible to house the current MozSAKSS unit within DE offices. In the longer term this is highly inappropriate and an additional precondition for future support should be the provision of facilities for joint offices for DE and its MozSAKSS node in any future phase.

If MINAG does not invest additional human resources in DE it would be advisable to look for alternative channels to manage some of the activities described below. The review team deems that CEPAAD could

become a structure that could undertake relevant research and studies, but to have impact on agricultural policies it would have to be designed around clear strategies and entry points for this. Above all else, it would need to be structured so as to be accountable to relevant Mozambican stakeholders. Furthermore, as an institution that would presumably be undertaking research and evaluation, there would need to be a separate contracting body to avoid conflicts of interest and to overcome tendencies to focus on areas of interest to researchers rather than policy-makers.

5.5 Conclusions in relation to overall results in evidence-based policy formation

The following conclusions summarise MozSAKSS outcomes in relation to five factors that have been proposed by the ODI Research and Policy in Development Programme (RAPID)^{xi} for assessing policy influence:

- *Attitudes* appear to have changed somewhat during the course of the programme regarding the importance of DE (re)gaining leadership in ensuring that evidence is applied in policy formation in Mozambique. It is not possible to assess how much of this change is attributable to MozSAKSS and how much is being driven by the wider pressures to develop a credible Mozambican owned approach to implementing PEDSA and CAADP.
- *Commitments* to evidence-based policy formation have become stronger for similar reasons. However, commitments to invest Mozambican public funds in the required human resources for policy analysis have thus far proven elusive.
- *Procedures* have begun to be established to include systematic review of evidence as part of policy formation through the steps taken toward the production of an annual sectoral performance review, but it is not clear if internal procedures within DE have improved significantly. The policy dialogues, if continued, may prove an important mechanism for regular multi-stakeholder discussions of evidence and policy.
- *Policy content* appears to have been improved through the work of MozSAKSS in ensuring that the CAADP Compact reflects evidence, even if it is not as strong as would be hoped for. Otherwise, the outputs are generally too recent to have impacted on policy content.
- *Behaviour* has been influenced in the direction of a “think tank culture” through acceptance of more open and democratic discussions as part of the CAADP process.

6. Recommendations

6.1 Recommendations for the remainder of the current phase

- Finalise studies and other activities that can be completed within the remaining timeframe and encourage DE to present these outputs at high levels within MINAG.
- Support DE to better define its role (and capacity development needs) in PEDSA/CAADP implementation in relation to monitoring and evaluation.
- Engage in the process surrounding the possible creation of a policy centre using the results of this review as an input in relation to lessons learnt, especially regarding entry points for evidence-based policy formation at MINAG via DE. This could be done by either MozSAKSS or the Swedish Embassy organising a joint UEM-DE led seminar to discuss the implications of the findings of this review for their future collaboration.

6.2 Recommendations for initiatives within a six-month extension^{xii}

- Support DE (or possibly another institution if a more appropriate alternative is identified and/or if DE does not express a clear demand for additional support) to plan for monitoring and evaluation activities in association with preparation of the investment plan for PEDSA/CAADP. Dialogue on this process should involve the NEPAD Planning and Coordination Agency in Pretoria to ensure synergies with the SAKSS process elsewhere in Africa.
- Some modest support may be needed to finalise ongoing studies that are almost completed and ensure that the findings are communicated to policy-makers (e.g., through production of policy briefs).
- Support the design process for CEPAAD with particular emphasis on determining how such an institution could be anchored in strong Mozambican ownership.
- Commission a detailed functional analysis of DE planning, procedures and decision-making processes, drawing on the study of agricultural information systems already undertaken by MozSAKSS, to determine appropriate entry points for future support to policy analysis and monitoring and evaluation.

6.3 Recommendations for strategic investments in future overall policy analysis

- If DE indicates a commitment to shifting from undertaking studies to instead defining priorities and arranging relevant policy research, they should be supported to reorient their organisation to take on such a role (possibly using a competitive research grant mechanism, support to masters' students to undertake research, contracting arrangements, etc.).
- Consider financial support to CEPAAD if clear structures are put into place to ensure MINAG and multi-stakeholder Mozambican ownership and utilisation of findings. CEPAAD could become a major (but not the sole) supplier of research to DE.
- Link support for policy research to a structure by which DE and relevant researchers together develop policy briefs and/or other outputs, and hold policy dialogues and related events that can help policy-makers and decision-makers to learn from research.
- Technical assistance to DE should involve coaching and mentorship, combined with targeted short-term skills training;^{xiii} and should not be based on collaborative research activities per se.
- DE may need to play a major role in database management, but this area of activity would need to be designed in collaboration with other stakeholders involved with collection of agricultural statistics to ensure that the DE role is appropriate, realistic and complementary to the work of other Mozambican institutions.

6.4 Recommendations for strategic monitoring and evaluation of PEDSA/CAADP

- In addition to the broader support to improved policy analysis proposed in 6.3 above, there is also a need to provide more specific technical support to enhance monitoring and evaluation capacities. These recommendations in 6.4 could be implemented separately from those in 6.3, but there are major potential synergies to be found in linking broader policy analysis with evaluation functions.
- Focus support on first ensuring that utilisation-focused monitoring and evaluation are included in the PEDSA/CAADP investment strategy; and then that these modalities are effectively implemented. This may be done through dialogue with AgRED and/or NEPAD.
- Encourage and support DE to focus on different monitoring and evaluation efforts on three levels:
 - DE should play a direct role in overall sectoral monitoring, with a key aspect of this being continued production of annual sectoral performance reviews (for which capacities have already been partially developed through MozSAKSS). Some aspects of production of these reviews may need to be undertaken by outside partners. IWMI would presumably be well-placed to continue to be the main partner for this process.
 - DE should be supported, together with other relevant government departments, to develop systems for evidence-based performance management linked to monitoring and evaluation systems. This may need to be aligned with overall Mozambican governmental monitoring and evaluation systems. IWMI may not have appropriate capacities for this task, but the Sida-supported Regional Centre for Learning on Evaluation and Results (CLEAR) in Johannesburg may be able to provide appropriate support.
 - DE should be supported to take on a coordination and leadership role on programme and thematic evaluations related to PEDSA/CAADP by, for example, developing terms of reference, contracting consultants and researchers, and playing a central role in promoting utilisation of monitoring and evaluation findings by working with evaluators to produce policy briefs that relate to joint concerns of MINAG and financiers.
- In addition, in order to play this role there may be a need to enhance the quality of database management but this would require further analysis to define modalities and priorities (See above).
- It would be appropriate to investigate appropriate entry points to pilot systems to strengthen provincial monitoring and evaluation capacities, but it is beyond the scope of this review to make specific informed recommendations in this regard. Areas for possible exploration could be creation of collaboration templates and training programmes for replication by different donor governmental/donor groupings at either provincial or “corridor” level.
- There may be value in continuing monitoring and evaluation activities under the “MozSAKSS brand” and retaining links to ReSAKSS in order to ensure continuity and to keep a close link to the CAADP process, but this should not restrict an open-minded approach to identifying a different range of appropriate partners for future activities.
- Consider ways to mobilise exchange to apply the lessons learnt in monitoring and evaluation in a future MozSAKSS node within the broader ReSAKSS learning processes elsewhere in Africa.

Annex 1 – Terms of Reference

Terms of reference/Requirements specification – External Review (MTR) of the Moz-SAKSS program in Mozambique

1 BACKGROUND

1.1 Information about the Embassy

Agriculture is one of the three main sectors identified as focus sectors in Sweden's Cooperation Strategy with Mozambique, 2008-2012. Support to the agricultural sector has, in various forms, been part of the Swedish overall bilateral program in Mozambique since 1975. The current agriculture/rural development portfolio consists of the following programs that are agreed to or in the process of being agreed

- Support to the national agricultural development program 2009-2010, Proagri, ended December 2010
- Support to Moz-SAKSS, 2008-2011 of a total of 22.5 MSEK (disbursed MSEK 13.6
- Support to the private sector development program, Malonda, in the Niassa province, 2010-2013, a total of 61 MSEK
- Support to a cluster of civil society organisations working in the area of Natural Resources. Program managed by Swedish Cooperative Centre (SCC). Total budget 48 MSEK 2011-2015
- Planned support to Local Economic Development, ProDEL, in three provinces in Mozambique, co-financed with the European commission. A total of 45 MSEK 2012-2015
- Planned support to community land rights through the Initiative Para Terras Comunitarias (ITC), a planned contribution of 40 MSEK 2011-2013

1.2 Project description, Moz-SAKSS 2008-2011

The current program 'Capacity Strengthening through Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support for Agricultural Development in Mozambique' (Moz-SAKSS) 2008-2011 is succeeding a pilot phase that was undertaken between March 2007- June 2008. During the pilot phase, the regional SAKSS program for Southern Africa (ReSAKSS-SA) led by a consortium of three CGIAR centres (IWMI, ICRISAT and IFPRI) and the Ministry of Agriculture's Department of Economics (MINAG/DE) was helping to facilitate the establishment of a 'strategic analysis and knowledge support system' for agriculture and rural development in Mozambique (Moz-SAKSS) with the objective of strengthening the capacity of MINAG/DE in providing strategic analysis and information support during the design and implementation of Mozambique's new agricultural strategy. The Ministry of Agriculture (MINAG) is the Government institution with the primary objective and responsibility of promoting sustainable agriculture growth and development in Mozambique. One of the key departments is MINAG/DE which is in charge of strategic planning, agricultural policy formulation and analysis within MINAG. A new agricultural strategy has recently been approved which MINAG/DE has had the responsibility to formulate. DE is also responsible for generating agricultural statistics and analyzing agricultural data in order to feed into the policy process. *A new program was developed and the agreement for the implementation phase of Moz-SAKSS was signed in December 2008.*

The Moz-SAKSS's overall objective is to contribute to the strengthening of the capacity of national institutions, in particular MINAG/DE in strategic analysis and knowledge support so that it is able to effectively identify, coordinate and support the planning and implementation of agriculture and rural development strategies. Through a partnership with MINAG and other in-country partners (both public

and private), the program will help provide capacity for strategic analysis and undertake analytical work that will inform current and future policy and investment options for agriculture in Mozambique.

The program was expected not only to contribute to strengthening of local capacity to undertake such work in the future but to also help promote a think tank culture within national systems—ultimately strengthening the country’s reliance on research-based evidence during national dialogues and decision making. When it comes to program governance, MOZ-SAKSS program is hosted by MINAG/DE in joint collaboration with the consortium of three CGIAR centres: ICRISAT, IFPRI and IWMI. All three bring scientific expertise of international standards that is critical to the success of the program. IFPRI is the primary contractor of the program with Sida, and thus ultimately carries the fiduciary responsibility of ensuring that the program delivers high quality products and services in a timely and efficient manner across all collaborating partners.

In order to contribute directly to the capacity needs of MINAG, Moz-SAKSS have five main results-oriented areas:

1. MINAG’s agricultural statistics and information system MINAG/DE policy analysis and strategic planning capacity MINAG knowledge and information sharing, including at farmer level
2. Improved flow of knowledge and information with wider regional efforts Improved skills and increased reliance on domestic inputs

1.3 Current situation in the agricultural sector

Agriculture has been given increased attention by the current Mozambican government, especially after the increased food prices that reached its peak in 2007. The government launched the Green Revolution document in 2007 and approved the Food Production Action Plan (PAPA) in 2008. MINAG is the coordinating Ministry for agricultural development but given the broad nature of agricultural development, relating to areas of infrastructure, financial services, industrial development and commerce etc, the internal and external coordination among sectors is a challenge. Sweden has been providing support to MINAG in the forms of a sector program since the beginning of 2000 when Proagri I was launched and 2010 was the last year of support to Proagri II under the current agreement with GoM. The rationale behind providing Swedish support to the Moz-SAKSS program outside the sector budget support provided to Proagri II was to ensure sufficient resource allocation to the program and also sustaining strong links to the regional SAKSS programs that have been set up in several African countries to support the initiatives by African leaders such as the New Partnership for Africa’s Development’s (NEPAD)’s Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP). The lack of solid data and analytical capacity are major constraints to develop realistic strategies for agricultural development that accelerate pro-poor economic growth and this is indeed also the case in Mozambique.

1.4 Related programs/projects and other development cooperation activities

During the implementation of the program it has coordinated with the agricultural sector working group (previously called Proagri Working Group, PWG) that was formed as a collaboration between the donors and the Mozambique government to oversee the Proagri I and II programs.

USAID funding to Moz-SAKSS mainly for the CAADP preparation process

Coordination with regard to research through a programme implemented by the Michigan State University, MSU.

Moz-SAKS also works closely with the national CAADP technical team.

2 Scope of assignment

2.1 General information

In the project agreement (both the agreement with IFPRI and MINAG) it is stated that an External Review shall be carried out during 2011. The program has faced delays in the implementation of planned activities. The Embassy has held consultations both with MINAG/DE and the Moz-SAKSS staff in order to find the reasons behind the delay as well as to come up with alternative strategies that would enhance the speed of implementation. The timing of the Review is therefore important not just in the light to fulfill the obligations in the agreement, but also as a mean to collect lessons learned and give some strategic recommendations for any future support to the policy level within the agricultural sector.

The purpose of the review is to assess the results of the project after two years of implementation and to give recommendations about possible adjustments in the project set up on a short-term and on a longer term. The longer term findings will form part of any future decision for policy level support to the agricultural sector, bearing in mind the lessons learned from the current support and its design. The long term support could also be an input to the strategic thinking of MINAG for the formulation of a new sector program. It is envisaged that the process of the review itself will contribute to advancing the current thinking on how to strengthen policy analysis by engaging in dialogue with different stakeholders.

2.2 Scope of work

The specific objectives of the Review are to review the output results of the project and assess the effectiveness and efficiency in the project set up to meet the project goals. The Review will also provide recommendations for how future support to the area of agricultural policy development and analytical capacity development/ research could be provided for instance in the upcoming formulation of a new sector program jointly undertaken by MINAG and donors.

The review objective is to assess the results and analyse the lessons learned from the project Moz-SAKSS and its implementing parties (MINAG; IFPRI, IWMI, ICRISAT). The time period for the Review is August-September 2011 and the total Swedish funds disbursed to the program to date is MSEK 13.6.

The **process** of the evaluation should be used as a vehicle to engage stakeholders in critical reflection over alternative ways forward to meet the objectives set out by the program in the future. Thus, the utility of the review is emphasised in the assignment.. There are several sets of stakeholders that the review should work with such as Mozambican ministries and research institutions, decentralised agricultural institutions (provincial and district agricultural offices), the private sector, CGIAR institutions in Mozambique and internationally.

2.2.1 Review questions

The following questions will be the main questions to be answered by the review. The consultant/s are, however, free to make minor adjustments to the questions if necessary as well as to come up with any additional questions that are necessary to respond to the overall review objective.

- Assess the output (and if possible outcome) results of the program.
- Assess the results achieved under each results area
- Assess the approach to capacity development and how it has been working in practice
- Assess the efficiency of the institutional and organisational set-up (mechanisms for consultations, internal and external sharing of information, real and perceived lines of accountability)

- Has the project been an efficient way to strengthen information based decision making in the agricultural sector?
- Future oriented recommendations: Assess the relevance of the program objectives and set up given the changing context of the agricultural sector (end of Proagri II and new sector Task Force, the national and regional policy context, new investments and partners in the sector etc)
- Give an overview of the current actors and platforms that have a bearing on policy development and data analysis within the area of agriculture, such as universities, research institutes, think tanks, organizations and projects.
- Review the current project set-up, where MINAG/DE, is the main recipient of the capacity strengthening efforts of the program. Give recommendations on alternative ways of providing support to capacity strengthening in areas of agricultural policy analysis and evidence based decision making.

2.3 Budget and profile of the consultant/s

[If applicable, specify the budget or provide a realistic estimate of costs for the project, including equipment components (goods) to be financed by Sida. Alternatively, specify the estimated time needed in person-weeks or person-months to complete the project.]

The team will be comprised of one international consultant and one local consultant. The consultant/s shall have experience from the agricultural sector, policy development and from carrying out reviews. Knowledge of Portuguese is a requirement.

The tentative time plan is as follows:

Time in Sweden, total 10+ 3 days:

4 days preparation

6 days writing up plus 3 additional days in order to provide input to Sida for dialogue with CGIAR institutions.

Time in Mozambique, total 13 days:

2 days in Pretoria to meet with CAADP, IWMI etc

11 days in Mocambique and 1-2 days in province (Gaza or Maputo province) including debriefing meeting in Maputo

2.4 Schedule

The estimated time for the review is 25 days with a preparatory phase focusing on review of documentation and reports and a second phase involving a trip to Mozambique for consultation with stakeholders. A trip to Pretoria to meet with the CGIR partners is also envisaged.

The assignment is planned to start in August 2011

2.5 Reporting and documentation

The report shall be written in English and no more than 30 pages.

Annex 2 – Documents reviewed

- Ashley, S. & Gemo, H. 2010. Assessment of ProAgri Phase 2. IDL Group. 2010-12-13
- CGIAR. Joint Declaration. 2009-12-08
- CGIAR. Voices for Change: The New CGIAR. 2009-12-08
- Cungara, B, Fagilde, G., Garrett, J. Uaiene, R.N. & Headey, D. Growth without change: The elusiveness of agricultural and economic transformation in Mozambique. Paper presented at “Dialogue on Promoting Agricultural Growth in Mozambique”. 2011-06-21
- Embassy of Sweden, Maputo. Decision on contribution. 2008-10-29
- Embassy of Sweden, Maputo. Specific agreement between the government of Sweden and the government of Mozambique on support to capacity building for SAKSS. 2008-12-08
- Gemo, H. 2011. Avaliando a Implementação e Efectividade do Sistema de Informação para Gestão no Ministério da Agricultura. MINAG/DE. 2011-02
- Gemo, H. 2011. Moving towards the implementation of the CAADP framework in the agricultural sector: The case of Mozambique. 2011-02
- ICRISAT. Progress report on MozSAKSS. 2011-09
- IWMI. Detailed progress report IWMI-led components: January-June 2011
- MacNeil, M. MozSAKSS project communications strategy (no date)
- Mazvimavi, K., Minde, I. Manussa S. & Murendo, C. A review of the agricultural input and output markets in Mozambique (draft). Paper presented at “Dialogue on Promoting Agricultural Growth in Mozambique”. 2011-06-21
- MINAG. Pacto do CAADP em Mocambique (borrador). 2011-06-27
- MINAG. PEDSA 2011-2020. 2011-05
- MINAG/DE. First meeting of the consultative and advisory group: Activity report. 2009-09
- MINAG/DE. Monitoring Agricultural Sector Performance, Growth and Poverty Trends in Mozambique. 2011-08-19
- MINAG/ICRISAT/IFPRI/IWMI. Capacity strengthening through strategic analysis and knowledge support for agricultural development in Mozambique, A joint proposal. 2008-07-07
- MozSAKSS. Direct Effects: Results Framework for MozSAKSS. 2011-06
- MozSAKSS. Inception period completion report. 2009-12
- MozSAKSS. Minutes of review: Annual technical meeting. 2011-06-08
- MozSAKSS. Summary work plan. 2010-03
- MozSAKSS. Work plan update for 2011. 2011-07
- MozSAKSS. Annual Report 2010
- NEPAD. Report of the planning meeting for establishing and strengthening strategic analysis knowledge support systems and mutual accountability platforms. Dar es Salaam. 2011-07-21
- Pauw, K., Thurlow, J. & Uaiene, R.N. Agricultural Growth and Poverty Reduction in Mozambique: Technical Analysis in Support of the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program. Paper presented at “Dialogue on Promoting Agricultural Growth in Mozambique”. 2011-06-21
- Sida. Assessment memo, MozSAKSS. 2008-10-4
- Taimo, N.V. MozSAKSS program retreat report. 2010-08
- Uaiene, R.N., Arndt C. & Masters, W.A. Determinant of agricultural technology adoption in Mozambique. Discussion papers No. 67E. MINAG/DE. 2009-01

Annex 3 – Programme and persons met

Dates	Institution	Persons met
Preparation period	Sida	Anna Liljelund
17/09	IWMI/ReSAKSS Pretoria	Emmanuel Musaba Precious Zikhali
19/09	Arrival Maputo	
19/09	Swedish Embassy	Annlouise Olofsson
20/09	USAID	John McMahon
20/09	IFPRI	James Garrett
20/09	IFPRI	Rafael Uaene
20/09	IWMI	Helder Gemo
21/09	MSU	Cynthia Donovan
22/09	World Vision - CAADP pillar 3	Francisco Matuca
22/09	ADRA – CAADP pillar 4	Miriam Chilundo
22/09	European Commission	Albert Losseau
22/09	ICRISAT	Kizito Mazvimazi (telecom)
23/09	ADPP Moz – CAADP pillar 1	Francisco Mabjaia
23/09	Direcção da Economia	Victorino Xavier (Director) Eulalia Macome (Dept of Policy Analysis)
23/09	MINAGPROAGRI II	Fernando Songane
23/09	Direcção da Economia	Lucia Luiciano (Deputy Director) Acubar Batista (Dept of Planning) Angela Faria (Dept of Information Systems)
25/09	IWMI	Helder Gemo
26/09	ICRISAT	Issac Minde (Telecom)
27/09	UEM – Faculty of Agronomy and Forestry	Emilio Tostão
27/09	World Bank	AgRED
28/09	Austrian cooperation	Erasmus Saraiva
28/09	Direcção da Economia (CAADP Focal Point)	Adriano Chamusso
28/09	Canadian International Development Aid	Hercilia Hamela
29/09	IWMI	Pius Chilonda
29/09	IIAM	Feedback workshop with MINAG-DE/IFPRI/IWMI/ICRISAT
29/09	IFPRI	James Garrett
30/09	Swedish Embassy	Debriefing
30/09	World Bank	Patrick Verissimo
30/09	IFPRI	Todd Benson
02/10	Arrive Pretoria	
03/10	NEPAD/CAADP	Martin Bwalya Simon Kisira

ⁱ A total of 13.6 million SEK has been disbursed thus far. It is unclear at the time of this review if additional funds (approximately 7 million SEK has not yet been disbursed) will be required.

ⁱⁱ Even though Sida and USAID have each funded discrete activities (with USAID primarily supporting specific outputs related to the CAADP process), this evaluation does not differentiate between these sets of activities as both largely address the same core objectives and processes.

ⁱⁱⁱ This committee was sometimes referred to as an "advisory committee".

^{iv} *CGIAR Joint Declaration*, December 8, 2009.

^v All interviews concurred in recognition of this underlying problem in the design of MozSAKSS.

^{vi} Other projects supporting statistic capacity include the following: MSU is assisting DE with agrarian statistics and with the Centre for Socio-Economic Studies; FAO is assisting DE on a Statistics Master Plan, jointly with IWMI; the European Commission has a institutional capacity building project with two components: academic training of staff (BSc and masters) and technical assistance on planning, monitoring and evaluation.

^{vii} See *Thematic Study of Support to Statistical Capacity Building*, Evaluation of the Paris Declaration, DFID.

^{viii} NEPAD, *Report of the Planning Meeting to Establish SAKSS and Mutual Accountability Platforms* (draft) June, 2011, p.6.

^{ix} NEPAD, *Report of the Planning Meeting to Establish SAKSS and Mutual Accountability Platforms* (draft) June, 2011, p.1.

^x For example, a recent publication summarising CGIAR experience over the past forty years states "Since the effectiveness of research collaboration depends on the capacity of individual colleagues, the CGIAR has made a considerable effort over the years to strengthen the capacity of national partners through formal and informal training and other learning activities that, together, absorb roughly 20% of CGIAR expenditures." (The CGIAR at Forty and Beyond, CGIAR Fund Office, Washington, D.C., page 10).

^{xi} Based on Jones, Harry (2011) *A Guide to Monitoring and Evaluating Policy Influence*, ODI Background Note, February 2011.

^{xii} Some or all of these activities may need to be undertaken as consultancy inputs outside of an actual extension depending on the availability of remaining programme funds and the willingness of IFPRI to extend their engagements.

^{xiii} It is important to coordinate any training plan with other donor-financed programmes.



EXTERNAL REVIEW OF THE MOZ-SAKSS PROGRAMME IN MOZAMBIQUE



This review assesses the results of the programme “Capacity Strengthening through Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support for Agricultural Development in Mozambique” (MozSAKSS), which was intended to develop the capacity of Mozambican stakeholders, the Ministry of Agriculture’s Directorate of Economics (DE) in particular, to engage in evidence-based agricultural policy formation. The programme has been plagued by a lack of trust and communication among the partners. DE has not provided clear leadership of MozSAKSS due to misperceptions and unclear lines of accountability between the DE and the agricultural research centres providing support. In the future Mozambique will need MozSAKSS more than ever as governmental demands for policy analyses increase, and as the donor community expects a more proactive governmental role in leading strategic analyses of agricultural investments. The review recommends rethinking how MozSAKSS should be organised, with a more narrowly focused role in policy analysis and in monitoring and evaluation.

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm

Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64

Postgiro: 1 56 34-9. VAT. No. SE 202100-478901

E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

