

Project Evaluation Series

**Terminal evaluation of the project
“Strengthening capacities of agricultural
producers to cope with climate change
for increased food security through the
farmer field school approach”**

**Project code: GCP/MOZ/112/LDF
GEF ID: 5433**

Management response

Terminal evaluation of the project “Strengthening capacities of agricultural producers to cope with climate change for increased food security through the farmer field school approach” – Management response					02/2023
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	Further funding required (Y or N)
<p>Recommendation 1.</p> <p>In designing future projects of similar size and complexity levels, a more realistic inception period (minimum 6 months) should be considered, allowing for adequate implementation planning and for timely preparation of all conditions necessary for effective and efficient execution, including the recruitment of all members of the project management team and the definition of partnership agreements with all key partners.</p> <p><i>Responsibility: FAO/GEF.</i></p> <p><i>Deadline: In the future, when designing new projects.</i></p>	Accepted	Some years after this project started to be implemented, the country office started including a more realistic inception period (minimum 6 months) in projects with similar size and complexity levels. This practice will continue to be implemented in the future, allowing for adequate implementation planning and for timely preparation of all conditions necessary for effective and efficient execution.	FAO and GEF Unit	Ongoing	No
<p>Recommendation 2.</p> <p>Future projects should include, as an activity, the definition of an exit strategy or sustainability plan that is strategic and realistic. To ensure better conditions for the sustainability of the results achieved and the dynamics created by the projects, it is essential that a structured exit strategy, with defined responsibilities, priorities and timetables, including the role of government entities, is defined in a timely and participatory manner with the main partners who have responsibilities.</p> <p><i>Responsibility: FAO (project formulators, project task forces and Budget Holders), and FAO GEF GCU.</i></p> <p><i>Deadline: In the future, when designing new projects.</i></p>	Accepted	It is a common practice in FAO to include exit strategy or sustainability plan in the project document and consider this plan during project implementation. However, conditions may change, and the strategy or sustainability plan may become unrealistic. So, it will be useful to have a structured exit strategy, designed in a timely and participatory manner with the main partners who have responsibilities. This strategy should include responsibilities, priorities and timetables, including the role of government entities.	FAO (project formulators, project task forces and Budget Holders), and FAO GEF GCU. Deadline: In the future, when designing new projects.	In the future, when designing new projects.	No

Terminal evaluation of the project “Strengthening capacities of agricultural producers to cope with climate change for increased food security through the farmer field school approach” – Management response					02/2023
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			Further funding required (Y or N)
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	
<p>Recommendation 3.</p> <p>Also, in relation to project design, it is important to consider political cycles and potential changes in strategy, vision or leadership as risks to project implementation and results. These aspects should be duly integrated in the assumptions and hypotheses of the Theory of Change, whenever relevant. Possible measures to mitigate or respond to these changes should also be defined at the design stage of the intervention.</p> <p><i>Responsibility: FAO (project formulators, project task forces and Budget Holders), and FAO GEF GCU.</i></p> <p><i>Deadline: In the future, when designing new projects.</i></p>	Partially accepted	<p>FAO cannot hold complete responsibility on the political cycles and potential changes in strategy. For instance, Farmer Field Schools (FFSs) is proven to be a highly efficient and effective rural extension methodology and yet the Government intended to replace this methodology with a new approach that does not assure adequate accompaniment and technical support to the most vulnerable farmers, who do not yet have a market-oriented productive vision. Sometime ago this was completely unexpected.</p> <p>With the current lesson learned, the country office will start to consider this risk. However, it will always be difficult to predict all the changes that might occur for which FAO do not have control over it.</p> <p>In addition, FAO is promoting policy dialogue among others also on extension services and within MADER there are different streams amongst directors and the scenario may evolve and change again.</p>	FAO (project formulators, project task forces and Budget Holders), and FAO GEF GCU.	In the future, when designing new projects.	No
<p>Recommendation 4.</p> <p>For more effective project implementation, but also so that management can be more consistent with the principles of Results Based Management (RBM), the M&E system should include a more</p>	Accepted	Recent projects already include M&E systems with a more comprehensive level of data disaggregation to facilitate a better understanding of potential deviations or limitations, and to allow for a timely	FAO (project formulators, project task forces and Budget	Ongoing	No

Terminal evaluation of the project “Strengthening capacities of agricultural producers to cope with climate change for increased food security through the farmer field school approach” – Management response					02/2023
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			Further funding required (Y or N)
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	
comprehensive level of disaggregation of data (by gender, district, province, stakeholder). At the reporting level it should also be ensured that data on project indicators are always presented in a disaggregated way to facilitate a better understanding of potential deviations or limitations, and to allow for the timely activation of corrective measures (if necessary). <i>Responsibility: FAO (project formulators, project task forces and Budget Holders), and FAO GEF GCU.</i> <i>Deadline: In the future, when designing new projects.</i>		activation of corrective measures (if necessary). Moreover, following a restructuring process, the country office established recently the MEAL (Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning) unit and efforts are being made to establish a real time monitoring system in order to increase efficiency and efficacy of the MEAL system.	Holder(s), and FAO GEF GCU.		
Recommendation 5. To reinforce the outcomes achieved under component 3 of the GCP/MOZ/112/LDF Project, it is recommended to FAO Mozambique to maintain its support to the Government to finalize the revision of SPASD and NIPAS, ensuring that these documents integrate the issues of Climate Change Adaptation. <i>Responsibility: FAO Mozambique.</i> <i>Deadline: Immediately.</i>	Accepted	The revision of the Strategic Plan for the Development of the Agrarian Sector (PEDSA) and National Agriculture Investment Plan (PNISA) is in its final stage - awaiting final consultation and approval. FAO will continue supporting this process.	FAO Mozambique	Ongoing	No
Recommendation 6. FAO and MADER should initiate, as soon as possible, specific discussions on the future of the Farmer Field Schools (FFS) and their integration into future rural development policies and programmes, including the Sustenta Programme. The investment in the creation and training of FFSs is strategic for the	Rejected	FAO Mozambique is full convinced about the relevance of this recommendation. However, due to the current political scenario FAO cannot hold responsibility over it because it is out of the organization control.	N/A	N/A	N/A

Terminal evaluation of the project “Strengthening capacities of agricultural producers to cope with climate change for increased food security through the farmer field school approach” – Management response					02/2023
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			Further funding required (Y or N)
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	
<p>country’s rural development efforts and to ensure that the most vulnerable farmers, who do not yet have a market-oriented productive vision, have adequate accompaniment and technical support. Being a highly efficient and effective rural extension methodology, the FFSs should not be abandoned or left to self-management, otherwise risking closure due to lack of support, leaving thousands of farmers without technical support.</p> <p><i>Responsibility: FAO and MADER.</i> <i>Deadline: Immediately.</i></p>		<p>Police dialogue for a blended system (Sustenta and FFS, public and private) is ongoing at the technical level and FAO will continue advocating about the importance of FFS for the country’s rural development and to ensure that the most vulnerable farmers, who do not yet have a market-oriented productive vision, have adequate accompaniment and technical support. The Government may eventually accept FAO’s recommendation.</p>			
<p>Recommendation 7. FAO should review the adequacy of the procurement processes and procedures currently in place and applicable to projects of this nature. The successive delays caused by the complexity and length of procurement procedures, and their inadequacy to the context of the intervention, seriously damage FAO reputation with institutional partners and beneficiaries, and jeopardize the effectiveness of implementation in terms of the quality and comprehensiveness of results, therefore these procedures should be subject to a deep analysis.</p> <p><i>Responsibility: FAO.</i> <i>Deadline: Immediately.</i></p>	Partially accepted	<p>Delays in procurement are not always related to adequacy of the procurement processes and procedures currently in place and applicable to projects of this nature. There are also external factors, out of control of FAO that contribute significantly to these delays. For instance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. There are few or inexistent number of companies available in the country to supply goods and/or services procured by FAO. Thus, often FAO has to procure goods abroad and this takes time. Moreover, a large number of national suppliers are dealers, which means that they import goods when requested. In some cases business ethics of 	FAO	Immediately	No

Terminal evaluation of the project “Strengthening capacities of agricultural producers to cope with climate change for increased food security through the farmer field school approach” – Management response					02/2023
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			Further funding required (Y or N)
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	
		<p>awarded dealers demonstrated to be questionable causing great delays in the procurement process and sometimes ending in exclusion from future tenders. There are other cases where the few number of available companies that apply provide inaccurate/incomplete information, which may also contribute to delays.</p> <p>ii. In 2019, Mozambique was hit by the cyclone IDAI - a major sudden onset humanitarian crises - and the country was not prepared to this emergency intervention. Thus, attention was diverted to respond to this emergency situation, including prioritizing procurement of goods and services to assure that people affected by the cyclone had access to basic inputs after the shock. The emergency situation also increased demand in the national and international market and suppliers often prioritized delivery of emergency goods.</p> <p>iii. The COVID-19 pandemic also contributed to delays in procurement due to restrictions in the national and international trade.</p>			

Terminal evaluation of the project “Strengthening capacities of agricultural producers to cope with climate change for increased food security through the farmer field school approach” – Management response					02/2023
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			Further funding required (Y or N)
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Responsible unit	Time frame	
<p>Recommendation 8.</p> <p>To build on the results of the GCP/MOZ/112/LDF Project, initiatives focused on the development of value chains, promotion of market access for farmers benefiting from FFSs and support to access information systems should be included. The gains in productivity and increased production generated by the project could be capitalized to facilitate the achievement of long-term impacts if there is a structured focus on the development of agricultural and livestock value chains benefiting from the project, as well as the promotion of market access. To take better advantage of the results related to the installation of the agrometeo stations, it would be important to support farmers' access to information systems by building digital skills where internet access already is available. This would allow farmers to access more knowledge or weather data that can be relevant to improve their performance as producers.</p> <p><i>Responsibility: FAO.</i></p> <p><i>Deadline: In the future, when designing new projects.</i></p>	Accepted	Recent projects already include initiatives focusing on the development of value chains, promotion of market access for farmers benefiting from FFSs and support to access information systems. FAO is currently discussing proposals for future projects to increase access to meteorological data and information. The country office will continue to make efforts to capitalize and facilitate the achievement of long-term impacts of this project.	FAO	Ongoing	No

Office of Evaluation
E-mail: evaluation@fao.org
Web address: www.fao.org/evaluation

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Rome, Italy



Some rights reserved. This work is available under a CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO licence.