

August 23, 2012

**Comments from United Kingdom on the Approval by Mail: Mozambique:
Sustainable Land & Water Resources Management Project (SLWRMP) (AfDB)**

Dear Patricia

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