



Sustainable Land & Water Resources Management Project (SLWRMP)

Country / Region: **Mozambique** | Project Id: **XPCRMZ020A** | Fund Name: **PPCR** |

Comment Type	Commenter Name	Commenter Profile	Comment	Date
Comment 1	Jane Higgins	United Kingdom	<p>The UK approves the allocation of PPCR funding to the project under Mozambique’s SPCR entitled “Sustainable Land & Water Resources Management Project”. However, we would like to highlight some issues which we think need to be addressed explicitly during project implementation, and raise some questions for the Government of Mozambique and the AfDB – these can be found in the attachment. Many thanks Jane Jane Higgins Policy Analyst - Low Carbon Development and Adaptation Teams Climate and Environment Department Department for International Development UK Comments on Mozambique: Sustainable Land & Water Resources Management The UK approves the allocation of PPCR funding to the project under Mozambique’s SPCR entitled “Sustainable Land & Water Resources Management Project”. However, we would like to highlight some issues which we think need to be addressed explicitly during project implementation, and raise some questions for the Government of Mozambique and the AfDB: Project milestones: clarification requested as to why the last disbursement is scheduled a year after completion (completion Dec 2017 and disbursement Dec 2018). Why are the targets in the results framework 2016 rather than the year of completion in 2017? Results: The project summary states the project will have 20,000 direct beneficiaries (50% women) and 20,000 indirect beneficiaries. Can these figures be captured in the results framework? Currently there appears to be a gap in the results chain between the impact of „poverty reduction and livelihood diversification“ and the outcomes which measure increased improvements to yields, forest restoration and infrastructure built, but do not include any indicators on resilience or well being of the target population. The outcome „Improved resilience through diversification of livelihoods“ does not appear to have a direct indicator to capture it. If the results framework were to incorporate direct and indirect beneficiaries (see above) this might address this gap. This would also be in line with the new draft overall PPCR results framework which includes this sort of indicator. Results: Not all of the Key Performance Indicators listed on page 17 appear to be included in the Results Framework. For example „increased level of income of the beneficiary communities“ and „increased number of communities and beneficiaries implementing climate change adaptation actions in the target districts“ don’t appear to be included. Co-benefits: There appear to be some good co-benefits from the project on mitigation and forestry (as well as health and jobs); could these also be captured in the results framework? Consultation and Government ownership: The project appears to be particularly strong on consulting with target communities and across Government (as well as the donor community). It’s not clear however if civil society organisations were substantively involved in consultations. Capacity building: The emphasis on this element is welcomed and appears strong. It is not clear though if PMU staff are permanent civil servants or project staff only? In the results framework it would be better if outcomes rather than activities on capacity building could be captured, e.g. including demonstration of improved capacity and ownership rather than attendance at training courses. Gender: The emphasis on targeting women as beneficiaries and gender disaggregation of results is welcomed. Administration costs: could the categories be further explained; what do the services and operating costs (15% and 6% of the total respectively) consist of? Overall a relatively high proportion of the total budget appears to be on administrative and office costs, could the project team provide assurances that these costs are justified? Given that these costs are additional to the main component of Technical Assistance in the SPCR (Mozambique Climate Change and Technical Assistance project) Sustainability: This aspect appears to be well considered which is welcomed. However it would be good to expand more on what exactly the plans are for transferring lessons from these pilots to new districts, given the importance of this aspect to the rationale for the project. Risk: This section is very light. For</p>	Aug 23, 2012



Comment 2 Frank Fass-Metz Germany

implementation a more thorough risk matrix with an assessment of impact and probability and associated mitigating actions would be welcomed.

We welcome the proposed project, and would like to commend all involved parties for submitting a well prepared proposal. There are no major objections from our point of view. We would like to suggest, however, that our recommendations (see bold highlights below) be incorporated during project implementation. Individual Comments on the Proposed Project The proposed project represents a fairly standard sustainable agriculture/land and water management approach. While this might be the right approach in this particular part of Gaza province, the document is not very explicit about what the climate challenges are that this approach is trying to address. The climate scenarios are depicted in relatively broad and general terms. It is therefore difficult to assess from the document whether the approach taken is an adequate response to the questions and challenges climate change poses in this region. We therefore request elaborating more clearly how the Project will addresses specific climate challenges. In relation to financial resources allocated for investment, the area covered by agriculture water infrastructure development is relatively small. This raises questions especially about the high financial rate of return (FIRR). Drip irrigation can produce a high financial internal rate of return with high value crops. In the document it is not clear enough how these rates are possible with maize, rice and vegetables. Also the issues of institutional arrangements for irrigation investments to work, i.e. maintenance, land and water rights etc. have not been spelled out. We therefore recommend being more explicit about the conditions for the approach to work, and spell out more clearly how the high financial rate of return (FIRR) is going to be achieved. Comments on Cross-Cutting Issues Learning The proposal makes only very brief mention of "knowledge building" but does not spell out how and with whom in Mozambique this is to be achieved. Also, when looking at the overall architecture of the proposal, the issue of learning seems insufficiently addressed in our view. The proposal does state that "the project will systematically document new lessons and experience for future use". It remains very vague, however, in outlining how and by whom this will be achieved. The issue of how lessons learned in the SLWRMP will feed back into the overall knowledge management of the SPCR for the benefit of other countries and actors is not being discussed altogether. We therefore recommend that the proposal provide more detail on how learning will be supported, both within Mozambique's SPCR and as input of Mozambique's SPCR to the PPCR as a whole, and how and in which roles Mozambican university and research institutions will be engaged. Synergies with German Climate Change Related Engagement in the Country / Region The province chosen is neighbouring the provinces that an adaptation project supported by Germany will be implemented in. We strongly encourage communication and exchange of experiences during implementation as a number of issues addressed are similar yet the ways in which they are being addressed are different, and recommend that both Projects actively seek communication about implementation experiences.

Aug 27, 2012