

February 21, 2013

**Comments from Germany and Spain on Approval by Mail: Mozambique: Climate Resilience: Transforming Hydro-Meteorological Services (IBRD)**

Dear Mozambique team,

thank you very much for your project proposals which we support. Please find attached our comments.

kind regards  
Annette

Dr. Annette Windmeisser  
Klimapolitik und Klimafinanzierung  
Bundesministerium für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung

Division for Climate Policy and Climate Financing  
senior political advisor  
Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development

**Joint German and Spanish Comments on proposed project: Mozambique**

**Climate Resilience: Transforming Hydro-Meteorological Services Project (Add. Grant)**

**Summary**

Mozambique faces significant development challenges that are compounded by climate change and natural disasters. Most of its climate vulnerability is linked to water. These conditions contribute greatly to income and food security issues. Recently the country went and still is going through severe floods in the south, center and north that have resulted in loss of life as well economic costs. Hardest hit so far has been the Limpopo Basin, with weak links to neighboring countries and limited access to relevant information. Against this background, the proposed project is highly relevant to the country and well aligned with its key strategies, touches upon the key issues in the field of hydrological and meteorological services, and offers plausible solutions.

We have no objections and welcome the proposal for an additional grant. When commenting on the original project proposal of January 16<sup>th</sup> we made a number of suggestions. We basically picked up on those when reviewing the present proposal at hand. We would very much like to see our recommendations (see our comments to the

original proposal, as well as **bold** highlights below) incorporated during project implementation.

### **Individual Comments on the Proposed Project**

The present proposal is building on the one we recently commented on, which has resulted in the extension of certain key aspects including a greater involvement of neighboring countries, inclusion of more vulnerable communities and populations, as well as more ambitious capacity building action. It also enhances the access to more relevant, timely and accurate water and weather information for more users, thereby including locations that have shown to be vulnerable during the recent floods. In this context, we would like to **point out that it might be useful to initiate a proactive cross-border water flow regulation in such basins as the Limpopo, where there are many dams operating, the water flow of which is not coordinated, which has contributed significantly to the magnitude of the recent catastrophe. We therefore recommend exploring options to include these considerations during project implementation.**

The results framework has been improved significantly in the revised proposal, e.g. by including linkages to PPCR core indicators, as well as by refining targets and baselines. In this context, we would like to note that indicator 4 of the original proposal “% of hydro-climatic stations operational and reporting” appears to be missing.

In the following our comments to your response regarding our comments to the original proposal:

#### **1. Results framework; Monitoring & Evaluation**

**Our original comment:** *“We recommend clarifying in the results framework in which way the activities and project indicators are linked with other global core outcome indicators, in particular with the indicators “B1 Extent to which vulnerable households, communities businesses and public sector services use improved PPCR supported tools, instruments, strategies and activities to respond to climate variability and climate change” and “B5 Quality of and extent to which climate responsive instruments/ investment models are developed and tested”. B1 is listed under component C, but not marked as a core indicator. We encourage formulating more indicators measuring success beyond the output level, pointing out e.g. the desired use or outcome of the trainings, use of the newly generated hydro-met information by target groups, etc.” ... “There is only one indicator considering gender issues. While this is entirely appropriate for Components A and B, there is certainly potential and we strongly recommend including further indicators on gender issues in Component C and at the Programme Development Objective Level.”*

**MDB's and MOZ's response:** *“The team agrees and have updated the results framework in line with the newly revised PPCR Results Framework (Jan 14, 2103), including new core indicators. During Appraisal, baselines and targets have been refined as well as breakdown of beneficiaries (e.g., gender) including Component C. During detailed design of Comp C pilots, accurate data on target groups will be acquired which will inform quality monitoring and ability to scale up. Two key considerations have guided RF design: ability to show attribution to development outcomes and realism in reporting on progress and success on a regular basis (which is reflected in Bank’s bi-annual Implementation Support Missions).”*

**Our comment to response:** We are pleased that the activities and project indicators have been modified and are now more clearly linked to the PPCR core indicators. Nevertheless, **we consider it important to include all of the five core indicators, in particular “B5 Quality of and extent to which climate responsive instruments/ investment models are developed and tested”**, as mentioned in our comment.

We appreciate that there will be a breakdown of beneficiaries into male and female, including for Component C. At this time, however, this is only visible in the indicator *“Direct female project beneficiaries (% of total direct project beneficiaries)”*. **We trust that the gender breakdown of beneficiaries will be done for the whole of Component C.**

## **2. Sustainability**

- a) **Our original comment:** *“We feel that communities could play a greater role in sustaining the investments, giving the appropriate value to hydrological and meteorological stations, and sharing some of the costs and activities which would benefit directly their activities and lives. We therefore recommend that the programme, on a pilot basis, consider engaging local communities and in particular local disaster risk committees to a greater degree in operating and using hydro-meteorological networks and services, e.g. through capacity building initiatives and/or community-managed data collection and dissemination platforms. This would also be of great benefit for identifying and testing the most needed services, and for learning from best practices on the effectiveness of services being provided.”*

Your response: *“The team appreciates the comment and the engagement of local communities in protecting and maintain the stations is incorporated (p.13). Integrating the flow of information with the work of INGC’s local structures and the ARA’s basin stakeholder committees is also part of project design, whilst respecting the political mandates of respective institutions for the management of the networks.”*

Our comment to response: We are pleased that the local communities’ engagement in protecting and maintaining the stations has been incorporated into the proposal. However, it remains somewhat unclear to us how this is reflected on page 13. Also, we would have preferred the programme to consider engaging the local communities in a more active way in terms of operating and using the hydro-

meteorological networks and services, e.g. through capacity building initiatives.

**We consider the local disaster risk committees particularly important in this context and trust that their potential will be considered during project implementation.**

- b) Our original comment:** *“There are concerns regarding the long-term sustainability of the systems to be established or upgraded, in terms of maintenance as well as in terms of human resources and funding.”*

**Your Response:** *“Agreed. In both Activity A.3 and B.4, the upgrading of physical infrastructure will be tailored based on O&M costs, technological appropriateness, ability to protect infrastructures/equipment and involve local community in maintenance/protection.”*

**Our comment to response:** We note that our original comment appears to be missing from the summary. Our comment to this issue was in fact the following: *“We therefore recommended addressing the long-term sustainability of the systems more explicitly and in greater detail. A financial strategy and associated budget for the “transformed” systems needs to be established and its implementation needs to be initiated; which should outline government support, revenue generated, shortfalls and a clear indication of support required from development partners and time horizons for such support. The financial strategy needs to consider cost recovery, revenue streams and the amount financed by the ministries (i.e. users of the service). Operation, management and expansion of the system should not rely on the support of development partners indefinitely. In addition, the proposal should address the retention of staff once trained more than it currently does, as there is a considerable risk of trained staff leaving the government for working with the private sector or being promoted away from the activity for which they were trained.”* We trust that these concerns regarding the long-term sustainability of the systems will be addressed during project implementation.

### **3. Comments on Cross-Cutting Issues**

#### **a) Participation**

Regarding early warning systems, we consider it very important to encourage and facilitate the participation of local people. In this context, we appreciate that lessons learned are being drawn from support provided by Germany in the Buzi river basin.

## **b) Gender**

Our original comment: *“We recommend conducting further analysis to identify whether information needs and potential uses of information products have a gendered dimension, and acting on the findings in an appropriate manner. Furthermore, we note that issues regarding the gender-balanced staffing for the operations of the systems within INAM, DNA and the ARAs (Components A and B) are not being addressed. We therefore recommend that a capacity building programme to explicitly target women be considered, to assist in balancing the gender gap that generally exists in the water sector.”*

Your Response: *“The team concurs with the importance of recognising the gendered dimensions of using and delivering hydro-met information. Project design has emphasised that tailoring information to users is critical for its success (in line with strategic communication value chain), and as such gender is an important factor. Also, the pilot interventions seek to increase access and transparency of hydro-met data that support decision making across a number of sectors (and as such will benefit both women and men).*

*The team agrees would like to draw attention to the following:*

- In the annual surveys of tailoring information to users that DNA, ARAs and INAM will undertake (Activities A.6 and B.7) will include consideration to gender.*
- The Bank’s team is undertaking a detailed survey during 2013 as part of a wider socio-economic analysis of hydro-met services. This household surveys puts great emphasis of the demographic aspects of users (age, gender etc) which in turn will gather data for the implementing agencies on how best to communicate with beneficiaries (including those in the pilot interventions).*
- The project activities include staffing assessment (e.g. A.1 and B.1) which aims to maximise opportunities for skills development.*

*Component C contains 4 core pilots and the PAD has been updated accordingly.*

*The detailed design and consultations of each pilot intervention will be done by the implementing agencies to provide more opportunities to empower, and build ownership and inter-agency cooperation with partners (such as INGC, IDPEE, IIAM/MINAG, private sector and NGOs).*

*This is planned for the first year of implementation. The scope and scale of the pilots will be adapted to the timeframe and available resources. Evaluations of pilot impact and potential for revision/scale up are included in all pilots (see Results Framework, and p.36-38). In the detailed design of the pilots, the implementing agencies will use the well-established routines and structures for consultation of the River Basin Stakeholder Committees (organised by the ARAs), fisheries association (organised by IDPPE) and the disaster risk management (organised by INGC).”*

**Our comment to response:** Gender considerations appear to have been taken into account more thoroughly in the project design – except for the results framework, see comment above. **In addition to the efforts that have made to adjust the project design, we still see potential for a capacity building programme that would explicitly target women,** as mentioned in our c