Management Response & Recommendations Action Plan

Evaluation Report Title: Evaluation of the Mozambique Community Land Use Fund

Response to Evaluation Report (overarching narrative)

The evaluation report will provide a useful input for the next phase of support to land tenure security in Mozambique. Many of the key recommendations (see below) are relevant to improving the design of the next phase of support and should ensure that the project is even more successful at achieving its key outcomes in the future. The understanding demonstrated of both Mozambique and the area of land reform by the evaluation team within the report is high.

The evaluation report, however, has been substantially delayed against its original deadline (i.e. over seven months late). Some of this delay is due to slow response times from the evaluation Reference Group and managing donor (i.e. DFID) but the main reason for the delay is due to the poor quality of the final analysis and report itself by the evaluation team, which has required a large number of re-drafts before it was of an acceptable quality for publication. This time delay has reduced dramatically stakeholder engagement in the process and will affect take-up of its recommendations.

It is unclear if the evaluation method of Outcome Harvesting that was used for the evaluation is a credible method that should be used more widely for this type of project due to the poor analysis of results. On the positive side it is clear that this method can produce useful qualitative data for projects that lack an evaluative baseline. However, even with the careful codification of qualitative data, question marks remain over its ability to provide generalizable findings.

Evaluation Report Title: Evaluation of the Mozambique Community Land Use Fund

Recommendations	Accepted or Rejected	If "Accepted", action plan for implementation or if "Rejected", reason for rejection
1. iTC/MCA has incentivised community land delimitation over association demarcation ***Recommendation****: Applying the iTC/MCA approach more broadly might allow the rhythm of delimitations to increase in the future, satisfying community aspirations to protect and prepare for investment. Integrating iTC/G6's demand-driven approach would assure greater community participation. Supporting communities may improve the success of internal & external investments resulting from tenure improvements. Demarcations may be of questionable value unless associations are well established already.*	**Accepted**	During the design of the new land programme the design team will seek have to obtain better economies of scale drawing from the lessons of the MCA model, while making sure the quality of the social preparation of G6 model ensures a suitable empowerment model for communities in Mozambique. The right balance is not a straightforward question but achievable thanks to some of the evidence provided by the evaluation report. However, there was a lack of analysis comparing both systems and the proposed (future-looking) theory of change for iTC did not provide this, as was expected from this evaluation.
2. MCA support has sped up the processing of applications ***Recommendations****: The iTC should encourage Government support for speeding up processing of tenure improvements in the future. Providing direct support to cooperating entities including SPGC and SDAE4 might also allow them to more quickly accommodate the demands put on them by the iTC programme, reducing backlogs.*	**Accepted**	There is however some underlying issues on the independence of the work of iTC - in what relates cadastral public service capacity. The fact that a project such as iTC has driven much of its tenure security outside of the control of the government makes obviously hard to assume/expect that local land administration can expedite much of iTC work/processes concluded by the project. Government local capacity is stretched as it is. In future iTC donor support should be combined with strong complementary support provided by G6, either through GESTERRA but also a new

		DFID/SDC support to land cadastres in target districts and municipalities, beyond 2015.
3. Local land administration capacity is lacking *Recommendations: Additional capacity is needed to provide small but cumulative investments in local government land administration, using IT to decentralise land information management. Maps and other basic tools could be made available to improve land administration capabilities and local land use planning.*	**Accepted**	See answer to recommendation two above.
4. Clustering interventions geographically can cut costs and increase the efficiency of iTC service provision *Recommendations: Continue to manage activities as clusters while disaggregating accounting and reporting so costs can easily be apportioned and problems quickly addressed.*	**Accepted**	There are has been discussions on the economies of scale of iTC operations. Clustering has been demonstrated as more cost effectively, but moreover it also makes more sense from a territorial planning perspective.
5. CGRNs have begun to manage community natural resources *Recommendations: Government, donors and NGOs must consolidate their initial investments in community institutions to empower them to meet challenges and to allow them to take advantage of opportunities as they emerge.*	**Rejected**	It is probably too soon to consider this capacity can be mature enough to attract effective economic investment at the lower level. However, a follow up from service providers well beyond their contract arrangements could be of great insight and mutual benefit (communities first, and iTC in terms of learning).
6. Large-scale sustainable and equitable investments have been slow to emerge *Recommendations: The programme should mobilise knowledge accumulated*	**Accepted**	There is regional experience and iTC is largely tapping on it, through peer review future partnerships, but the country contexts are quite different.

during the iTC programme to reduce risks to communities and investors. Models from Mozambique (TechnoServe) and South Africa (Vumelana Advisory Fund) may perhaps provide some guidance for meeting this challenge. Support to specialised service providers capable of guiding and advising communities on investment decisions is also needed.		
7. Arbitrary delimitation of communities continues *Recommendations: Continued consultations are needed with Provincial & National institutions to balance community capacity to manage natural resources with traditional community identities under the Land Law and other regulations. Consultations should be held to discuss modification of Article 35(d) of the Land Law, requiring approval by the Council where delimitations exceed 10,000 hectares.*	**Accepted**	Discussions on how to take on board these recommendations are ongoing.
8. Communities lack the capacity to deal with large-scale land acquisitions, concessions and growth corridors *Recommendations: The new iTC can analyse these programmes from the point of view of communities and assure them a meaningful role in programme design. Such policy studies would require consultation between legal and policy research staff and the communities themselves.*		The project donors are very much aware of land-grab risks when promoting land-investments in specific geographical areas in Mozambique – i.e. the Beira (BAGC) and Nampula (PROSAVANA) corridors, but also the strategic area of the Zambeze valley (ADVZ). The evaluation confirms the need to improve that specific relationship between iTC in those areas and with those stakeholders, and to make sure the steer and promotion of agricultural investments preclude land access in sustainable and transparent way. DFID has allocated an increased budget of about £6 million for the next 3 years to focus on the development corridor of Beira and support local government allocation of land in a transparent and accountable way.

9. Many communities do not collect their share of forestry taxes (and mining revenues) *Recommendations: Strengthening CGRN capabilities requires iTC to develop small grant programmes to analyse investment proposals both internal and external to allow CGRNSs to protect community interests. Their financial management and oversight should be strengthened (open, manage and audit bank accounts). The iTC should also develop a strategy to assist communities in obtaining a fair share of mining revenues.*	**Rejected**	It could confuse the role of iTC by stretching the range of services and products provided to communities to cover areas such as this, especially as it will not necessarily integrate better the economic development dimension of the project. iTC is levelling the playing field and accelerating the maturity of communities to manage and negotiate their systems and resources. Partnerships can be fostered, but not led by iTC - they will be led by the communities, at the right moment in time.
10. Community, government and NGO participation mechanisms are not well established *Recommendations: The programme should adopt new approaches to maximize community participation and thus to improve programme management. Among these, ideas developed by the network of donors and practitioners for "Outcome Mapping" may allow the future iTC to better deal with complex challenges. Periodic Outcome Harvesting should be used to determine how the programme can be adjusted to make it more responsive to community needs.*	**N/A**	The idea of using participatory methods in project monitoring is an interesting one and it will be considered by the new institution as part of the design phase. It is too early to know at the moment if this recommendation has been accepted or rejected.