

Project Evaluation Series

16/2023

**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 in
Mozambique”**

Project code: GCP/MOZ/112/LDF

GEF ID: 5433

Follow-up report

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Rome, 2024

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 in Mozambique” – Follow-up report				09/2024	
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken	MAR Score	Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions
<p>Recommendation 1.</p> <p>In designing future projects of similar size and complexity levels, a more realistic inception period (minimum six 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	<p>Some years after this project started to be implemented, the Country Office started including a more realistic inception period (minimum six months) in projects of 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.</p>	<p>This practice continues to be implemented by the Country Office and allows for adequate implementation planning and for timely preparation of conditions necessary for effective and efficient execution. This excludes emergency projects which require fast track procedures.</p>	Excellent	<p>Projects are less impacted by implementation planning and timely preparation of conditions necessary for effective and efficient execution.</p>
<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>	Accepted	<p>It is a common practice in FAO to include an 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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>The Country Office continues to include the definition of an exit strategy or sustainability plan that is strategic and realistic. Change in context continues to be a risk that must be managed along the project’s lifetime. The fact that the government relies on extra budgetary funds is also an external risk for sustainability that must be managed.</p>	Good	<p>The exit plan has ensured a successful transition at the time of project phaseout. Some activities, that for some reason are not completed during the implementation period, are mostly left to the partner to complete. So far, this clear definition of roles has been</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 in Mozambique” – Follow-up report

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 in Mozambique” – Follow-up report					09/2024
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken	MAR Score	Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions
<p><i>Responsibility: FAO (project formulators, project task forces and budget holders), and FAO–Global Environment Facility (GEF) Coordination Unit (GCU)</i></p> <p><i>Deadline: In the future, when designing new projects</i></p>					contributing for sustainability of project results.
<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 for the political cycles and potential changes in strategy. For instance, the Farmer Field School (FFS) 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. Some time ago, this was completely unexpected. 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 that FAO does not have control over.</p> <p>In addition, FAO is promoting policy dialogue among others also on extension services, and within the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development there are different <i>streams</i> among directors and the scenario may evolve and change again.</p>	FAO continues to include changes in strategy, vision or leadership as risks to be managed during project implementation to achieve the desired results. However, since this is an external risk, FAO has no control over it.	Good	

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 in Mozambique” – Follow-up report				09/2024	
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken	MAR Score	Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions
<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 monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system should include a more 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).</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	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 timely activation of corrective measures (if necessary). Moreover, following a restructuring process, the Country Office recently established 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.	FAO has introduced a dedicated M&E unit to support the process. Additionally, the Regional Office for Africa (RAF) recently conducted an MEL training to harmonize competences of M&E personnel across the region with the view of improving MEL systems quality, readiness for evaluations and capacity to produce quality assured data on project and programme results at country, subregional and regional levels. In the future, RAF will organize trainings for programme personnel and will also provide technical guidance for M&E issues. This will allow the Country Office to continuously improve on this area.	Good	The establishment of the monitoring unit and proper implementation of the monitoring principles have provided the Organization with the opportunity to measure the effectiveness of programmes and projects, obtain the necessary information about its target audience that feeds into better decision-making, and promote organizational learning.
<p>Recommendation 5.</p> <p>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</p>	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.	The revision of PEDSA and PNISA was finalized and issues related to climate change and adaptation were integrated. PEDSA and PNISA are currently being implemented and will end in 2030.	Excellent	

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 in Mozambique” – Follow-up report

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 in Mozambique” – Follow-up report					09/2024
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken	MAR Score	Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions
<p>the Strategic Plan for Agricultural Sector Development (SPASD) and the National Investment Plan for the Agricultural Sector (NIPAS), ensuring that these documents integrate the issues of climate change adaptation.</p> <p><i>Responsibility: FAO Mozambique</i></p> <p><i>Deadline: Immediately</i></p>					
<p>Recommendation 6.</p> <p>FAO and the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development 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 FFS is strategic for the 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 FFS should not be abandoned or left to self-management, otherwise risking closure due to lack of</p>	Rejected	<p>FAO Mozambique is fully 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’s control.</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 for the importance of FFS for the country’s rural development 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>	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 in Mozambique” – Follow-up report					09/2024
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken	MAR Score	Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions
<p>support, leaving thousands of farmers without technical support.</p> <p><i>Responsibility: FAO and Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development</i></p> <p><i>Deadline: Immediately</i></p>					
<p>Recommendation 7.</p> <p>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></p> <p><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> <p>i. There are few or an 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 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</p>	<p>The country is still facing similar challenges in procurement. Continuous efforts are in place to minimize the impact of this on project implementation. This includes: 1) regular meetings at different levels, including project task force meetings; 2) revision of the Country Office organigram to include procurement under the programme unit; and 3) recruitment of an international procurement officer (currently on board).</p>	Advancing	

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 in Mozambique” – Follow-up report

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 in Mozambique” – Follow-up report					09/2024
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken	MAR Score	Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions
		<p>inaccurate or 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 for 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>The COVID-19 pandemic also contributed to delays in procurement due to restrictions in the national and international trade.</p>			
<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 FFS 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</p>	Accepted	<p>Recent projects already include initiatives focusing on the development of value chains, promotion of market access for farmers benefiting from FFS 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</p>	<p>Several projects were implemented and/or are currently being implemented, in the same target areas of the project GCP/MOZ/112/LDF, with focus on development of value chains, promotion of market access for farmers benefiting from FFS and support to access information systems.</p>	Excellent	

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 in Mozambique” – Follow-up report				09/2024	
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken	MAR Score	Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions
<p>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 agrometeorological 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>		<p>facilitate the achievement of long-term impacts of this project.</p>	<p>Some examples of ongoing projects are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Building Back Better and Resilience Building: an Integrated Territorial Approach in Sofala Province, Mozambique (UNJP/MOZ/130/UNH), a project worth USD 2.6 million, implemented in Sofala; ii. PROMOVE Agribiz (GCP/MOZ/127/EC), a European Union-funded project worth USD 53.4 million and implemented in Manica, Sofala, Zambézia and Nampula; and iii. Integrated Agricultural Development Programme (ProDAI) of the Beira Corridor (GCP/MOZ/132/ITA), a project funded by Italy worth USD 4.9 million and implemented in Manica. 		

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

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Rome, Italy