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<td>National Directorate for the Promotion of Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECA</td>
<td>Economic Commission for Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENSAN</td>
<td>National Strategy for Food Security and Nutrition</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNS</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>International Fund for Agriculture Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFC</td>
<td>International Financial Corporation</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWRM</td>
<td>Integrated Water Resources Management</td>
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<tr>
<td>LDCF</td>
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</tr>
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<td>MASA</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security / Ministério da Agricultura e Segurança Alimentar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEF</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICOA</td>
<td>Ministry for Coordination of Environmental Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISAU</td>
<td>Ministry of Health / Ministério da Saúde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITADER</td>
<td>Ministry of Land, Environment, and Rural Development / Ministério da Terra, Ambiente e Desenvolvimento Rural</td>
</tr>
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<td>NORAD</td>
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<tr>
<td>NPAAD</td>
<td>New Partnership for Africa’s Agriculture Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODA</td>
<td>Official Development Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAMRDC</td>
<td>Multisectoral Action Plan for the Reduction of Chronic Malnutrition in Mozambique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARP</td>
<td>Poverty Reduction Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDSA</td>
<td>Strategic Plan for Agricultural Development / Plano estratégico para o desenvolvimento do sector agrário</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNISA</td>
<td>National Investment Plan for the Agricultural Sector / Plano Nacional de Investimento do Sector Agrário</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPCR</td>
<td>Pilot Program on Climate Resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQG</td>
<td>Five Year Plan 2015-2020 / Plano Quinquenal do Governo 2015-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA</td>
<td>Food Subsidy Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAM</td>
<td>Rural Mutual Assistance Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>Regional Agricultural Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDD</td>
<td>Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Land Degradation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ReSAKSS</td>
<td>Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SADC</td>
<td>Southern African Development Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART</td>
<td>Specific, measurable, agreed upon, realistic and time-related (indicators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDAEs</td>
<td>District Service for Economic Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETSAN</td>
<td>Technical Secretary for Food and Nutrition Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUN</td>
<td>Scaling-Up Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuPER</td>
<td>Sustainable, Productive, Equitable and Resilient (agriculture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAC</td>
<td>National Peasants Union / União Nacional de Camponeses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFCCC</td>
<td>United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations International Children’s Emergency Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>World Food Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>Water, sanitation and hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHA</td>
<td>World Health Assembly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction

Background

This Policy Analysis is part of series of country-specific studies on Food and Nutrition Security (FNS) and Climate Change Resilience (CCR) policies in the Southern African region that CARE International is currently conducting. **CARE Mozambique Country Strategy 2014 – 2020** (see Annex I) aims to empower and support women and girls in the exercise of their rights, specially their right to food and nutrition security. The Country Strategy is aligned with **CARE Southern Africa FNS-CCR Impact Growth Strategy**— aiming at improving FNS and CCR for 10 million women small-scale farmers, entrepreneurs, workers, consumers & their families in the region by 2020 – as well as **CARE International 2020 Program Strategy and CARE International FNS-CCR**

**CARE Mozambique Advocacy Strategy 2017-2020** (see Annex II) aims to provide overall focus to CARE advocacy activities in the country to support the achievement of its country goals (reflected as well as contributing to wider change in the region and beyond). The Advocacy Strategy was developed as a reference framework and building on previous policy analysis and advocacy discussions undertaken by the Country Office in the last years. It has also received input from CARE Mozambique staff and key partners in the country through an anonymous online survey and an Advocacy Workshop in November 2016. The focus of this analysis is the implementation status of FNS-CCR in Mozambique, with a strong emphasis on how these policies impact in the small scale and women farmers.

The analysis covers both national specific policies and those policies and commitments that the Government of Mozambique has signed as part of global collective efforts. The analysis aims to become a baseline to better understand the policy gaps and implementation challenges in in FNS and CCR towards women and smallholders in Mozambique. The main purpose of this analysis is to become useful source and instrument in the implementation of CARE Mozambique Advocacy Strategy, and also for the Government of Mozambique, donors and civil society organizations, to better identify the challenges for a more effective investment in gender transformative, climate resilient and nutrition smart agriculture.

What is policy?

By policy, in this analysis, we understand a course or principle of action adopted or proposed by an organization—in this case, by the government of Mozambique. Hence, this analysis covers not only the higher-level policy documents, but also any relevant documents containing government’s principles of action, such as strategies, action and investment plans, programs, guidelines and other policy initiatives, as well as their implementation arrangements, including budgets and evaluation and monitoring systems. Government policies are not only reflected in the set of documents containing them, but also in the way they are implemented in practice.

Methodology of the analysis

The analysis is, ultimately, the result of the collective work of different stakeholders. The process of elaborating the analysis started by the initiative of CARE, who conducted an exhaustive desk review, covering more than 180 sources (see Annex 4), including policy documents as well as reports, surveys, evaluations and other available documents assessing the actual implementation of the policies). Recent studies by CARE, and specially **Mozambique Agriculture Policy Analysis** (Action Aid and CARE,2016) and **Tracing Sustainable Agriculture in Mozambique** (CARE and IIED, 2016), were of paramount importance in the preparation of this Analysis.

CARE Mozambique in coordination with Action Aid has produced a set of indicators to assess and compare how agricultural policies, strategies and plans target the most vulnerable smallholder farmers, which was used as a guidance in this analysis. (See Annex 3)
Executive summary

Context and background

Mozambique remains as one of the poorest countries in the world. The country is highly dependent on foreign aid.

The number of people undernourished in Mozambique has been constantly declining during the last 25 years. Still, it is estimated that 25% of Mozambicans are undernourished; on average, farmers only produce enough food to feed their families adequately for less than eight months of the year.

The political commitment of the Government of Mozambique on gender equality and the empowerment of women is strong, but progress in reducing the gender remains uneven.

Agriculture policies

Mozambique enjoys a straightforward, solid and harmonic policy framework: The overall development policy of the country (PQG) sets the main broad priorities for the sector; a sector-wide strategic plan (PEDSA), fully aligned with PQG and with the CAADP priorities, details the sector objectives and broad targets, while an investment plan (PNISA), translates these objectives into specific programs, indicators and budgets. Finally, a set of complementary policies, deal with cross-cutting issues, including a stand-alone strategy for gender in agriculture and also a strategy for rural development. This consistent and well-articulated policy framework may be soon be substantially modified by a new draft law on agriculture and FNS, now under discussion.

The main aim of Mozambique’s agriculture policy is to transform the agricultural sector from predominantly subsistence to a more competitive agriculture, via augmenting yields and increasing the land area under cultivation. The policy framework does not address the implication of this approach in terms of deforestation and other environmental impacts.

Although the policy includes some provisions specifically aimed at the small-scale farmers, particularly in terms of promoting conservation agriculture, most of the proposed actions are focused on a more agro-industrial approach.

Although PEDSA recognizes the critically important role of women in agriculture and proposed specific measures to promote gender equality, in PNISA the challenges related to gender inequality are not adequately captured so, in fact, the policy promises are not really translated into programs and budgetary commitments.

In Mozambique, the implementation of the policies is highly decentralized to the local level, but poor working conditions and low qualification of the agriculture staff, and complex institutional arrangements, affect the agriculture and FS policy making and implementation.

Mozambique is fulfilling the CAADP commitment of allocating 10% of the national budget to agriculture, and (contrary to what usually happens in some other African countries) most of the budgeted funds are spent. Donor partners are also providing substantial support to the sector. However, the resources available are still insufficient compare to the needs, so the investments are not having a significant large-scale impact: many small-scale farmers are getting very little support. This is probably also because most of the programs (such as irrigation, access to finance, or inputs subsidies) are not designed to address the needs of the small-scale farmers, and also because the annual budgetary priorities at local and provincial levels, although set following a bottom-up approach, tend to be influenced by local elites and partisan interests.

Contrary to most other African countries, where inputs supply programs and price subsidies usually get most of the State agricultural funds, in Mozambique extension and research is the first budgetary priority. Despite this, funds are still insufficient and
only one out of ten small-scale farmers can access the service. Mozambique has been a pioneer in promoting participatory extension approaches such as Farm Field School but still, the overall system is not functioning as it should due to the nature of the staff working conditions, the promotion of techniques not always suiting the local conditions and poor coordination between the extension and research systems. Research in Mozambique is still mainly predominantly on-station, so even if valuable practices or varieties are developed, they are not scaled up.

For years Mozambique, has been proactively attracting large-scale foreign investment to the agriculture and forestry sector, making the country the 8th in the world in terms of transnational land acquisitions, and the 2nd in Africa. The land is transferred via long-term lease arrangements signed with the government, often endorsed by bribed local leaders who manipulate the prior consent of the local communities. Poor small-scale farmers, and particularly women, are usually not consulted in these processes. These investments have delivered little in terms of job creation or social benefits (despite the law making provisions for regular compensation for the payment of fees by the investors to the communities). Many cases of negative impacts have also been reported, including limiting the community access to water and other natural resources.

During the biofuels rush in the mid-2000s, the government put forward a progressive strategy with strong provisions to limit the potential negative risk of these investments in the food security of the country, but it has not been properly enforced.

Mozambique is input subsidy program is very small, and it is not designed to target poor small-scale farmers. The same applies to the irrigation policy, which is not tackling the small-scale farmers’ needs either: Most irrigation schemes predominately benefit large-scale farmers and companies involved in cash crops production for the export market.

Despite the fact that PEDSA highlights the need for more accessible credit, there are no activities in the strategy which specifically focus on the most vulnerable groups and many of the donors' funded projects to improve access to finance in agriculture focus on the medium and large farmers, not in the small ones.

**Climate change policies and the small-scale farmers**

The government of Mozambique is strongly committed to the CC Agenda. The NAPA, National Climate Change Strategy and the Climate Smart Agriculture Action Plan recognize the importance of agriculture adaptation to cope with the adverse impacts of CC. The Government has also created and strengthened institutions to deal with CC and the authorities in vulnerable districts are producing their local adaptation plans. Mozambique has been one of the first countries in the world to develop a specific gender and climate change strategy.

The country is also one of the main recipients of international climate funding for adaptation, including the large Pilot Program on Climate Resilience. Country funds for climate change, on the contrary, are very limited.

Civil society is actively engaged in the CC policy making processes. A participatory vulnerability assessment, covering districts all over the country, was conducted in preparation to the NAPA.

Smallholders are at the center of Mozambique’s agriculture climate adaptation policies, and there are currently multiple initiatives in the agriculture sector in Mozambique that are intended to build the resilience of smallholder farmers. There has also been noticeable progress in recent years in improving the access to weather forecast information for the farmers.

Conservation agriculture is gaining support in Mozambique and is actively promoted by the public extension system and by the private sector advisory services, which are trying to provide appropriate packages that are adapted to the local agro-ecological context. However,
these processes are still hampered by smallholder farmers’ poor access to inputs and markets and actions at field level are often not well coordinated. Inadequate supply and inefficient distribution is significantly limiting smallholders’ access to drought tolerant seeds.

**Nutrition policies**

In Mozambique, the fight against chronic malnutrition is high on the national development agenda: The Multi-Sectorial Plan for the Reduction of Chronic Malnutrition sets a package of well-defined evidence-based interventions. However, nutrition is not a strong theme within the agriculture policies, whose focus is mainly on augmenting production, not on improving food diversity or promoting healthy diets.

Cross-sector coordination for nutrition within the government has achieved only limited success. SETSAN, the nutrition agency, needs more autonomy to carry out its functions more effectively.

Civil society is engaged in the nutrition-specific policy making, mainly via the SUN Civil Society Network. Farmers’ organizations, on the contrary, have a limited say in the nutrition policies.

Mozambique is only allocating 0.6% of its own budget for nutrition; most of the nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensible programs are funded by different donors, each of whom focus their interventions in a particular geographical area. Although donors coordinate their actions at the level of planning, each of them follow different aid delivery methods in the areas where they operate.

Thanks to these donor-funded programs, there is some limited progress in nutrition-specific topics such as food fortification, food supplementation and school feeding.

Poor water and sanitation remain an important contributor to chronic undernutrition in the country, undermining some of the gains from the nutrition-specific interventions. The WASH policy for rural areas is weak, the sector is severely underfunded and the investments poorly maintained.

The Food Subsidy Program, which is the country’s main social protection intervention with a nutrition focus, is considered a major success and has significantly contributed to reduce children’s wasting.

**Key messages**

- Most agricultural activity in Mozambique is done by small-scale food producers that are by far the most vulnerable to food and nutrition insecurity, especially women small-scale food producers.

- While the existing policy framework supports initiatives to scale up sustainable agriculture to improve food and nutrition security, implementation is hampered by other priorities and by insufficient and unpredictable resources that greatly affect service delivery.

- Key identified challenges for the effective implementation of effective policy frameworks include:
  - Poor inter-ministerial collaboration as well as between agriculture sub-sectors
  - Unclear and complex institutional arrangements
  - Limited capacity of public institutions involved in the sector
  - The concerns of the small-scale farmers are not well incorporated into the final policies.

Source: CARE Mozambique Advocacy Strategy 2017-2020 (draft)
**Context and background**

**Economic context**

Mozambique is recognized as one of the most successful countries in Africa for its startling post-war reconstruction and economic recovery since the 1992 Peace Agreement. The country has enjoyed more than 20 years of strong overall economic growth since the end of its civil war, averaging over 7% per year. Government service delivery (e.g. health and education) has improved and infrastructure has been rebuilt, although the country’s road density is still the lowest in Southern Africa.

Mozambique is currently suffering an economic slowdown due various reasons including the fall in commodity prices. This is having significant impact on the country’s finances, making it harder for people to enjoy basic economic rights. The uneasy fiscal position is likely to remain under stress until the end of this decade, but despite these unfavourable prospects, the WB projects that growth will continue. The discovery of vast gas deposits off-shore and prospects for extensive coal mining may continue to contribute to an increasing flow of foreign investment and expand national revenues (EU, 2016).

Poverty is greatest in rural areas and it affects women and girls and particularly women-headed households disproportionately.

The country’s social indicators are amongst the worst in Africa. The adult literacy rate is 56%, and average life expectancy at birth is ~50 years. The social progress index for access to improved sources of water and sanitation ranks Mozambique 128th and 119th, respectively, out of 135 countries (WB, 2016).

HIV prevalence rates have declined nationally. Around 11% of the population aged between 15 and 49 years is infected and around 1.6 million of people are living with HIV (UNAIDS, 2012).

**Social context**

Mozambique’s rapid economic expansion over the past decades has had little impact on poverty reduction. The 2016 Human Development Index put the country at the bottom of the ranking (181 out of 188 countries and territories).

Over 80% of the population lives on less than $2 a day and approximately 60% of the population is in severely poor (UN, 2009).

In 2015, Mozambique ranked 127 out of 188 countries on the World Bank’s overall Ease of Doing Business index. On the World Economic Forum’s Global Competitiveness Index, it ranked 133 out of 144 countries.

**Social and economic indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (million)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural population</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population under 15 years</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual population growth</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI</td>
<td>180/188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP (US$ billion)</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP annual growth</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty (less 1,90 US$/day)</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life expectancy (years)</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult literacy rate</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 mortality x 1,000</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: UNDP, WB and SaDAKKS

**Political context**

Filipe Nyusi was sworn in as Mozambique’s new head of state on January 2015 after the victory of the FRELIMO party during the 2014 elections. The party also secured a strong majority in the parliament, though in sharp decline compared to the previous election in 2009 when it garnered 75% of the vote. Renamo, the former rebel-group-turned-opposition party, more than doubled its seats in the parliament. Recent events point to a deteriorating peace in Mozambique with Renamo waging a low-level insurgency. Human rights violations have recently increased due to this rising tension and armed clashes between the government and the former rebel group (Amnesty International,
2017). Talks are under way with the support of international mediation but have not produced a cessation of hostility yet (WB, 2016).

Mozambique’s level of democracy is still fragile, and there are limitations to freedom of speech, limited access to information and co-option of civil society activists. Citizens’ political, and socio-economic participation is very low (Oxfam, 2016).

### The limited role of the Parliament

*The role of the parliament (in policy making) in Mozambique is minimal, limited to the approval of government annual plans and budgets as well as laws, mainly proposed by the government or civil society. This is not only related only to its weak technical capacity, but also and perhaps more importantly to its reduced constitutional powers.

**Also marginal is the role of political parties, including the ones with a seat in Parliament. Frelimo’s majority and lack of technical capacity to engage in meaningful policy discussions have seriously hampered the ability of opposition parties to scrutinize government policies. In addition, the leaders of the two main opposition parties do not take part in the parliament.**

---

Policy Influencing, Lobbying and Advocacy
Mozambique country study
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands
2015

Even though a relatively well-established legal framework is in place, corruption is widespread in Mozambique. Clientelism still dominates the political sphere, giving rise to poor governance and endemic grand as well as small-scale corruption (OCDE, 2016), particularly in public procurement and in the tax and customs administrations. Donor countries have shown dissatisfaction over the country’s anti-corruption efforts (GAN, 2016).

### Civil society and advocacy

Although Mozambican civil society has used its capacity of mobilizing citizens to make demands, to campaign on relevant topics, in practice most decisions are taken by the government without effective contribution from the civil society organizations (CSOs).

CSO involvement in policy-making processes has been limited to a small group of well established, urban based, professionalized organizations. Some CSOs that engage in policy influencing from the onset focused their interventions on the analysis of government policies. For other CSOs this role has evolved from participation in invited spaces due to their role in service delivery.

CSOs’ growing calls for government accountability have also created some friction. These have manifested in the form of interference of public institutions on activities of civil society organizations and reduction in their space to conduct some activities. (MFAN, 2015).

### Media

Television is the most popular medium in Mozambique. State-run radio and private FM stations operate alongside dozens of government and community radio and TV stations. Print media have little influence given the high levels of illiteracy (BBC, 2016).

Press freedom is legally protected but according to a 2015 report by US-based Freedom House, many journalists practice self-censorship.

### Overall development policy

The **five-year government program (PQG) 2015 to 2020** is the strategic document that guides any policymaking in Mozambique. It presents the vision of the government during its mandate and indicates the priorities within each sector.

The PQG indicators are not very ambitious, aiming for example to increase from 6% to 12% literacy in children completing third grade, and creating jobs for less than 10% of those entering the job market each year through a combination of public and private sector employment (USAID, 2015).
PQG 2015/20 priorities

- National unity, peace and sovereignty
- Development of human and social capital
- Employment, productivity, competitiveness
- Economic and social infrastructure
- Sustainable management of natural resources

Supporting Pillars

- Rule of law, good governance decentralization
- Sustainable macroeconomic framework
- Strengthening international cooperation

A long-term vision, **Agenda 2025**, was prepared in 2003 by a civil society group, known as the **Committee of Advisors**, through a participatory process supported by UNDP, the World Bank and other partners. Agenda 2025 set broad general goals, though without discussing a strategy and action plan to achieve them.

The national **Poverty Reduction Paper**, PARP 2011–2014, served as the key framework document for external assistance to Mozambique. The PARP was disconnected from the budgetary process and lacked a proper framework for monitoring (MFAF, 2014). The PARP was extended until the end of 2015, and was not replaced afterwards.

‘Mozambique’s current development model continues to be dependent on “mega projects”, which, alone, will not easily address all of the fundamental shortages in terms of infrastructure, energy, human resources and the financial system. In this regard the weakness of Mozambican SMEs and the slow development of the agriculture sector should also be addressed as a matter of priority as they require the definition and implementation of long term policies’.

Mozambique and the EU
EU, 2016

**Foreign aid**

Decades of donors’ assistance to Mozambique have contributed to high macroeconomic growth, the development of key national institutions and partial successes in the social sectors, but has failed to contribute to poverty reduction beyond the post-war peace dividend (NORAD, 2016). Many analysts contend that aid dependency has led government and civil society organizations to be more accountable to donors than to the parliament, civil society and Citizens (MFAN, 2015).

Mozambique’s aid dependency is gradually falling, even if now external assistance continues to account for approximately 15% and 30% of the budget. However, the Government of Mozambique has noted on several occasions its aim to reduce aid dependency.

At least 20% of the aid is in the form of budget support. The social sector received the largest share of total ODA -between 40% and 60% of the total, depending on the year (GHA, 2011). The EU (EC and member states) represents the largest source of ODA to Mozambique (approximately 75% of the total). Among the biggest donors to Mozambique are the World Bank, the USA, the EC, the UK, the Netherlands, Sweden and Norway.

Mozambique is a pilot country for the United Nations “Delivering as One” Initiative.

The 2016 events of large-scale secret loans by the government have seriously eroded the relation and trust between the government and donors (NORAD, 2016). 14 donors who provide direct support to the Mozambican budget decided to suspend that financial aid.

**Agriculture sector context**

“The increase in agricultural production achieved [in Mozambique] over the past decade is unlikely to be sustainable, as it has been largely driven by land expansion. Politically driven priorities have also discriminated against the majority of smallholder farmers, who continue to be poor and vulnerable”.

Rita Cammaer
Tracing sustainable agriculture in Mozambique
CARE and IIED, 2016

Mozambique has considerable agricultural potential thanks to its rich endowment of land, forest, water and sun. The major food crops cultivated in Mozambique are maize (51%) and cassava (37%) (Aabø, E. and Kring, T., 2012).
During the last 25 years, the agriculture sector in Mozambique has been constantly growing (NEPAD, 2014). The sector’s GDP growth rose from an average of 2.5% in 1990-1995 to 7.7% in 2003-2008 before declining back down to 7.4% in 2008-2013. Mozambique is therefore above the target of 6% agricultural growth set by the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP).

This agricultural growth has been driven largely by land expansion, with very little or no technical change (Mogues et al., 2012). In other words: it is not the result of an increase in crop yields or in labour productivity, but due to a significant increase in the amount of cultivated areas, without any major technological improvements. Expansion of cultivated agricultural land was witnessed all over the country but was greatest in the central region. (WB, 2014).

It is the cash crops mainly cultivated by medium and large-scale farmers rather than the food crops of smallholders that accounts for the great bulk of this agricultural growth. The production and productivity levels of smallholders are growing at a much slower pace than the ones of large and medium scale farmers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agriculture indicators</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution of agriculture to GDP</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to exports</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>USDA</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to employment</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers who are small-scale</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture land under irrigation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers accessing improved seeds</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The smallholder farmers

The agricultural sector in Mozambique is dominated by smallholder farmers using family labour (World Bank, 2015). The total number of smallholders in the country can be estimated in almost 5 million families.

Most smallholders in Mozambique practice subsistence agriculture, with very low levels of productivity and production that limits their capacities to cope with stresses and shocks. The most fundamental challenge facing smallholder farmers in Mozambique is that of poor yields linked to the low fertility of its mostly sandy soils and reliance on rainfall, combined with farming practices that further restrict productivity, such as reductions in fallowing and use of poor varieties that are increasingly susceptible to diseases and weather variability (CARE Mozambique, 2014).

Mozambique imports more agricultural products than it exports, which creates an agricultural trade deficit. While the country is generally self-sufficient regarding cassava, beans and vegetables, consumption greatly exceeds production for rice, wheat, vegetable oils, and meat (WB, 2011). Maize and cassava, the main food staples, are grown by 80% of all Mozambican smallholders and cover over a third of cultivated land. Other important staples are wheat and rice (FAO, 2016).

High speed deforestation

According to FAO, since 1990, Mozambique has lost 10% of its forests (an average of 218,000 hectares per year), mainly due to agricultural expansion. 50% of the country is still forested, and the country holds some of the best-preserved forestlands in the world.

The diversification of production is extremely low: only 6% of rural families produce more than two agricultural crops. Livestock ownership is limited with only 19% (SESTAN, 2006). Only 4.1% of the smallholder farmers are using chemical fertilizers and 4.2% are using pesticides (WB, 2011). Improved maize
seeds are used only by 10% of the farmers (WB, 2011). Only about 2% of farmers use tractors in Mozambique (Francisco, A., et al., 2010). Around 44% of the smallholder farmers use storage strategies that contribute to the deterioration of the products, such as keeping production in sacks (UN Standing Committee on Nutrition, 2013).

Very few banking facilities are present in rural areas as the cost of providing traditional financial services to low density areas is extremely high. The little financing that does exist is directed to the large-scale farmers, traders and processors. (WB, 2006). Thus, very few small farmers have access to credit and those that do incur high interest rates in both real and nominal terms.

**Gender context**

**Background**

Mozambique has a long political tradition for emphasising gender equality and women’s empowerment, dating back to the post-independence period and extensive contacts with western donors. Despite advances in the policy-framework and female representation, however, ‘structural constraints and a strong patriarchal culture continue to preserve the dominant position of men, and inhibit most women from gaining enhanced economic self-reliance and social independence’. (CMI, 2010). Mozambique ranks 125 out of 146 countries in the UN gender development index.

Only 5% of women in the workforce have a primary education or higher, compared to 15% of men. The adult literacy rate for women is only 36%, compare to 67% for men (UNESCO, 2014). This educational gap impacts women’s employment prospects and puts them at greater risk of living in poverty (UNICEF, 2011). Less than 10% of women in Mozambique have a bank account (ICC, 2014).

The high levels of violence against women in Mozambique and its acceptance as a socio-cultural and traditional norm by many remain a major constraint to the implementation of gender equality commitments in the country (UN Women, 2012). 55% of women have been subjected to physical/sexual violence by an intimate partner or a non-partner during their lifetime (United Nations Gender Statistics, 2015). 38% of women from 15 to 18 are pregnant or are mothers already (CARE, 2014).

“behind a Mozambican woman, there’s an entire household taking decisions for her”.

Navarro, C. and Pellizzoli, R., 2012

Women represent about 65% of the total agricultural labour force. Agriculture employs 90% of the female workforce and 70% of the male workforce. The overrepresentation of women in agriculture is predominately because many men died during the civil war while others migrated to work in other sectors in major cities and South Africa or other neighbouring countries.

In Mozambique, women are largely responsible for a wide range of labour-intensive tasks and time-consuming activities including, weeding, harvesting, feeding the animals, processing and preparing food, working for wages in rural enterprises, collecting fuel and water, maintaining the home and looking after the family especially the children, elderly and ill family members.

**Surveying the gender gap**

In a baseline survey conducted in Inhambane Province in June 2014, CARE found that only 10% of survey participants were members of any type of formal or informal group. Therefore, important information on legal frameworks related to agriculture, services, and opportunities is not reaching the most vulnerable women in rural areas.

For example, despite significant efforts in recent years to increase knowledge of the Land Law and to sensitize women to register to obtain an identity card, the majority of women surveyed in this same baseline in Inhambane remained unaware of their right to land and natural resources.
Women tend to be excluded from cash crops production, which is often seen as more lucrative. Research done in the tobacco growing area of Maua District in 2012 showed that tobacco is a ‘man’s crop’ as profits belong to male producers.

Cultural and social barriers restrict them from owning land (only 25% of the land owners holding official user rights are women), participating to consultations, benefiting from natural resources extraction activities as well as having access to extension services, credit, information, training and productive assets (technology and agricultural inputs). Moreover, their participation in decision-making related to productive and economic aspects is low because of the role that they play at the social and traditional level (CARE/AA, 2016).

The status of female-headed households (i.e. those who do not have a husband or partner in their lives) is particularly problematic (CARE Mozambique, 2014). Female-headed households often face social exclusion and may be viewed with suspicion, whether they are divorced, separated, or widowed. Though less likely to face stigma than widows or divorced women, unmarried women may have less control over their resources and their children’s upbringing despite having to face most challenges alone.

**International gender commitments**

Mozambique is a signatory to all international gender-related agreements including the 1979 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, the 1995 Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action that seeks to address inequalities between men and women in the sharing of power and decision making at all levels; the 1997 SADC Declaration on Gender and Development which sets a minimum target of 30% representation by women in leadership positions; the 2003 African Women’s Protocol and the 2008 SADC Protocol on Gender and Development, which state that, by 2015, at least 50% of decision-making positions in the public and private sectors should be held by women and call on States to ensure access to productive resources including property and land for women and men in an equitable manner.

**Policies and institutional set-up**

The political commitment of the Government of Mozambique on gender equality and the empowerment of women is strong. The Constitution states that the State will promote, support and improve women’s development and encourage their increasing role in society, in all spheres of the country’s political, economic, social and cultural activity.

Within the legal framework, the country has made considerable efforts to draft, revise and implement legislation in line with gender equality, including the 2004 Family Law (that favors joint heads of the family and recognizes unmarried couples and equal rights between men and women); the 2009 Law on Domestic Violence against women; and the revision of the Commercial Code, which sets out women’s total independence to carry out economic business (Ministry of Women, 2014). In 2012, the Council of Ministers adopted a Multi-sectorial Mechanism for Integrated Service for Women Victims of Violence, which seeks to operationalize international commitments ratified or undertaken by Mozambique and which consolidate the experiences learned over time.

Other key policy documents related to gender are the National Action Plan for the Advancement of Women and the Action Plan on Gender and HIV-AIDS.

**The Mozambican experience reveals (…) the failure of ‘mainstreaming’ gender policies and interventions, which have effectively pulverized responsibility and made gender issues a non-committal cross-cutting issue for government and donors alike**.

Inge Tdventen
Gender Equality and Development in Mozambique
World Bank, 2012

The Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Action was created in 2004. The National Council for the Advancement of Women, also created in 2004, gathers together ministries, society organizations,
trade unions, academies and religious groups, and members of parliamentary cabinet.

**Food security and nutrition context**

The number of people undernourished in Mozambique has been constantly declining during the last 25 years, from 7.8 million in 1990 to 6.9 million in 2015 (FAO, 2016). This reduction is particularly significant if we consider that during the said period the country’s population augmented significantly. In fact, the percentage of people undernourished declined from 56.1% in 1990 to 25.3% in 2015, which means a 55% reduction. This made Mozambique one of the 12 countries in Sub-Saharan Africa that fulfilled the MDG target of halving nutrition between 1990 and 2015.

However, the food security and nutrition status of the country is still fragile. In 2013 the country ranked 64 out of 78 countries on the Global Hunger Index and was classified by IFPRI as ‘alarming’. 43% of children under age 5 are affected by stunting, 20% suffer from more severe chronic malnutrition, and 8% from wasting (Demographic Health Survey, 2011). However, as said, progress is noticeable: Prevalence of stunting has been constantly declining since 2001. Wide regional disparities can be noticed. Chronic malnutrition is highest in rural areas (46%), with the highest national levels in the northern districts of Cabo Delgado (55%) and Nampula (52%).

Cereals and starchy roots represent 75% of the dietary energy supply of Mozambicans (FAOSTAT, 2011). This very poor level of dietary diversification has not improved for the last 40 years and is currently the lowest in the SAR region (FAO, 2011).

Low levels of productivity and production as well as high levels of vulnerability among smallholders contribute to high rates of food insecurity. On average, farmers only produce enough food to feed their families adequately.
for less than 8 months of the year. The poorest families only produce enough food for half the year (Cuanguara B. 2010). Due to their lack of resilience, families are forced to use risky coping strategies to survive that undermine their ability to recover, such as eating the next season’s seeds, selling productive assets and undertaking labour migration.

Due to their lack of resilience, families are forced to use risky coping strategies to survive that undermine their ability to recover, such as eating the next season’s seeds, selling productive assets and undertaking labour migration.

Climate change and other shocks

Mozambique been ranked third among African countries most exposed to risks from climate-related disasters, and the cost of inaction on climate change was estimated at a staggering US$450 million per year (Climate Investment Funds, 2012). 25% of the population is at risk from natural hazards and drought routinely affects a large number of people. Droughts occur primarily in the southern and central regions with seasonal rainfall varying by as much as 60% (CARE/AA, 2016).

Based on observed trends and future scenarios, climate change will increase current weather variability, leading to more intense droughts, unpredictable rains, floods and uncontrolled fires. By 2040-2060, maximum temperatures are expected to increase by 2.5-3.0 degrees Celsius in the interior of the country. Climate change and natural disasters will also likely put greater pressure on the agricultural sector which could contribute to a slowdown of its overall performance. This slowdown could have severe consequences for the already precarious levels of food and increase poverty within the country (CARE/AA, 2016).

2016 El Niño food security crisis

In 2016, Mozambique was hit by the worst drought in 35 years, which has made an already difficult situation even worse. An unusually strong El Niño caused rains and harvests to fail for the second time, and prices in local markets have skyrocketed. Over two million people have been affected by food insecurity in the South and the West of the country.

2017 Tropical storm DINEO

About 551,000 Mozambicans are affected by the impacts of Tropical Storm DINEO which hit the south of the country in mid-February of 2017.
Agriculture and food security policy framework

International commitments

Mozambique has adopted the UN 2015 (SDGs), committing to eradicate hunger by 2030.

The Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP) was initiated in 2003 in Maputo, as a continent-wide African Union initiative. Mozambique, as well as the other countries signing the CAADP compact, adopted the targets of pursuing an average of 6% annual agricultural sector growth at country level and allocating 10% of the national budget to agricultural development. Mozambique signed the CAADP Compact in 2011. These commitments were reinvigorated in 2014 in the Malabo Declaration, that introduced a further set of targets for African Agriculture for 2025 which Mozambique has also signed.

As a member of the Southern African Development Community (SADC), Mozambique is also signatory to the Regional Agricultural Policy (RAP), aimed at harmonizing the growth and development of agriculture and promotion marketing and trade among SADC member States.

Mozambique has not explicitly yet indicated if it will subscribe to the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Land Tenure, which were endorsed by the Committee on World Food Security in 2012. The guidelines define several principles including the need to ensure that investments in agriculture lands are responsible. The tenure aspect of the Guidelines is particularly challenging in the context of Mozambique, since the legal framework on land does not allow a land market as such (only the state can own land, and land cannot be sold or bought).

Main policies

Contrary to some other Southern African countries, where there are in place parallel agriculture sector policies with similar scope albeit setting different (and even contradictory) priorities, Mozambique enjoys a straightforward, solid and harmonic policy architecture: The overall development policy of the country (PQG) already sets the main broad priorities for the sector; a sector-wide strategic plan (PEDSA), fully aligned with PQG and with the CAADP priorities, details the sector objectives and broad targets, while an investment plan (PNISA) translates these objectives into specific programs, indicators and budgets. Finally, a set of complementary strategies, deal with cross-cutting issues (gender and agriculture, rural development, food & nutrition security (FNS), land).

This consistent and well-articulated policy framework maybe be soon substantially modified by a new draft law on agriculture and...
PQG indicates the government plans to “promote increased productivity in the family sector” but it is not clear how this would be done. The understanding of food security in the PQG is very narrow, limited to the notion of ensuring that each family produces enough for itself, without tackling the accessibility and affordability aspects.

PEDSA

The Strategic Plan for the Development of the Agricultural Sector (PEDSA) 2011-2020, is a very comprehensive document, providing the specific content on agricultural development within the broader context of the PQG while following the vision set by Agenda 2025 and following the priorities set out in the CAADP (Cunguara, B. et al., 2013).

PEDSA aims to transform the agricultural sector from predominantly subsistence to a more competitive agriculture, integrating the vision of key stakeholders in the sector, fighting the factors that undermine investor confidence, while also encouraging self-sufficiency.

PEDSA is extremely ambitious: It sets a growth target of 7%, to be supported through a doubling of yields and an increase of land area under cultivation - which raises serious concerns on the environmental implications of the Plan and its implementation. In fact, the Plan does not explain what the potential effects of this expansion will be in terms losing of natural resources, and how to mitigate those.

PEDSA outlines five objectives, and under each of these strategic objectives there is a set of measurable targets.

The Plan also recognizes that the sector’s dependence on fertilizer imports is unsustainable, and encourages in-country production. It also intends to improve in the sustainable use of land, water and forests (Cammaer, 2016).

PEDSA objectives

| Increase agricultural productivity, production and competitiveness |
| Improved services and infrastructure to increase access to markets |
| Promote the sustainable use of resources such land, water, forest, and wildlife |
| Create policy and legal frameworks that are conducive to agricultural investment |
| Strengthen agricultural institutions |

PNISA

The National Investment Plan for the Agricultural Sector (PNISA) is the investment plan that has been developed to operationalize the actions to achieve the CAADP and PEDSA objectives. It was designed by technical teams established after the signing of the Mozambique CAADP compact in 2011.

PNISA objectives

| Agricultural growth of 7% annually over the period 2010-2019 |
| Reduction in the prevalence of chronic malnutrition in children under 5 to below 20% by 2020 |
| Reduce by half the proportion of the population that suffers from hunger by 2015 |

To achieve these three goals, PNISA outlines 5 areas (production and productivity, market access, food & nutrition security, natural resources and institutional reform) that encompass 21 programs and 62 sub-programs, each of them budgeted.

According to some critics, one of the main problems of the PNISA is it tends to focus on everything. The risk of this approach is that the document becomes no more than a list of good intentions. The lack of clear priorities also impedes the effective allocation of resources (Mosca, J., 2014).

The agriculture policy analysis conducted by CARE and ActionAid in 2015 concluded that, beyond the component of conservation agriculture (which focuses on food production and subsistence agriculture and places special emphasis on women and the arid and semiarid areas of the southern region) most other components of PNISA, including the extension services and technology transfer initiatives, do not seem to target the most vulnerable
smallholder farmers specifically, nor do they focus on nutrition, traditional or indigenous crops. The geographical priorities are not based on needs of smallholder farmers and vulnerable groups, but on potential for agricultural growth (CARE/AA, 2016).

**Gender Strategy of the Agricultural Sector**

This strategy was developed by MASA to guarantee that the sectoral and sub-sectoral plans and programs factored in the needs of women in all activities. This focus on women and specifically female farmers was designed to promote the overall well-being and social status of women in the society.

**Rural Development Strategy**

The *Rural Development Strategy (EDR)* was developed to ensure all sectoral policies, strategies and plans retained a pro-rural approach. The main goal of the EDR is to have a three-fold increase from 2005 levels of human development in rural areas by 2025. This target is set to be achieved through the promotion of a rural economy that is more competitive, sustainable, environment friendly and socially attractive.

**EDR objectives**

| **Increased competitiveness, productivity and rural accumulation patterns** |
| **Productive and sustainable management of natural resources and environment** |
| **Expanded human capital, innovations and technologies** |
| **Diversified and effective social capital, infrastructures and institutions** |
| **Good governance and market planning** |

**National Strategy for FS and Nutrition**

The *National Strategy for Food Security and Nutrition (ENSAN)* was approved in 1998, and is operationalized through the National *Plan for Food Security and Nutrition (PASAN)*.

**Draft Law on Agriculture and FNS**

This new draft law, which is currently awaiting government approval, aims to increase agricultural production and achieve food self-sufficiency in the long-run, via training the farmers, increasing investment in rural infrastructure, prioritizing the production of food crops for local markets and family farming, promoting agricultural research and extension; increasing awareness on safe and nutritious food; restricting agricultural imports and discouraging exports if they are done at the expense of domestic food production. The proposed law also calls for setting aside food reserves and guaranteeing minimum prices for basic food.

The draft law has been criticised by civil society for its complexity, bringing together under a single umbrella the whole of the agriculture sector plus food security and nutrition. There are also concerns on how the law could build on the existing institutional arrangements or if it would require the establishment of new agencies and bodies. Finally, the draft law seems to put much of the food security emphasis on food availability (production) rather than on aspects of affordability and accessibility (CARE/AA, 2016).

The provisions on restricting agricultural imports and guaranteeing minimum prices for basic food have been criticised by the private sector, for being at odds with the Constitutional provisions on rights to freedom of initiative (MM&A Advogados Associados, 2014). The legal provisions related to raising barriers to agricultural imports may also lead to increases in the cost of food and have a negative impact on the poorest and most vulnerable groups; while most likely benefiting larger producers at the expense of smallholder farmers. Additionally, by raising food prices, the measure could have pernicious effects on the welfare and food security of net buyers (Anderson, K., 2014). By introducing barriers on imports and exports, the law might create potential conflicts with Mozambique’s international obligations under SADC and WTO.
Institutional setup

The main institution responsible for delivering public services, formulating and monitoring policy execution in the agricultural sector is the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MASA). The mission of MASA is ‘to contribute to food security and poverty reduction through supporting the family sector, the private sector, government agencies and NGOs towards increasing agricultural, agro-industrial and market productivity and achieving sustainable exploitation of natural resources’. MASA into divided in directorates, including the National Directorate of Agricultural Services and the National Directorate of Agricultural Extension (DNEA).

In addition, MASA has some subordinate institutions, such as the Agricultural Research Institute (IIAM), and the Technical Secretariat for Food and Nutrition Security (SETSAN).

MASA also supervises the Agricultural Development Fund (FDA). FDA revenues come from various fees and fines of agriculture and forestry.

High staff turnover and rotation at MASA mean that technical staff members often lack the knowledge to effectively perform their activities (ReSAKSS, 2014). Poor working conditions also contribute to low staff performance. Positions are allocated based on trust and not necessarily on skills. Salaries are low and there is a lack of adequate incentives, training and long term prospects in career development (CARE/AA, 2016).

Provincial Governments’ Directorates of Agriculture (DPAs) deal with the agricultural sector in each of the eleven provinces. The DPAs oversee the promotion of agricultural, forest and livestock production, supporting farmers’ associations, supervising rural extension activities as well as ensuring the good management of agricultural resources and the respect of agricultural legislation. They are also responsible for the formulation of provincial agricultural plans and strategies. At district level, agricultural issues are managed by the District Service for Economic Activities (SDAEs). (CARE/AA, 2016).

The Ministry of the Sea, Inland Waters and Fisheries is responsible for management of fishing resources.

The National Directorate for the Promotion of Rural Development (DNPDR), which belongs to the Ministry of State Administration and Public Service, works to improve the living conditions of the rural population by promoting local economic development through the sustainable exploitation of the available natural resources.

Complex institutional arrangements affect agriculture and food security policy making and implementation. The central apparatus of MASA has not been adapted to the new scenario of devolved responsibilities to the provincial and district levels. (ReSAKKS, 2014)

There are also instances of overlaps: For example, both MASA’s Directorate of Agricultural Services and SETSAN oversee food and nutrition security (FNS) issues.

Inter-institutional coordination

PEDSA emphasizes the need for multi-sector coordination to achieve agricultural development and FNS in-country. The need to strengthen the collaboration between sectors is highlighted throughout the policy.

PNISA initiated the creation of the Agricultural Sector Coordinating Committee (CCSA). The CCSA is chaired by MASA and meets twice a year, to ensure an effective dialogue between public institutions, donors, private sector and CSOs involved in the implementation of the agricultural policies (NEPAD, 2014).

In practice, inter-ministerial coordination has yet to improve.

The draft law on Agriculture and Food and Nutrition Security foresees the creation of a National Council for Rural Development, Food Security and Nutrition, which is expected to coordinate
and finance governmental initiatives aimed at reaching the goals of the law, but it is not clear at this stage if it will replace the CCSA or, otherwise, how both bodies will interrelate.

**Budgetary commitments & expenditure**

**Budget requirements**

The total financial resources required for PNISA implementation over the period 2013-2017 are about US$4 billion. In 2014 NEPAD estimated that 78% of these funds were not filled yet.

31% of the PNISA budget is focused on irrigation, 29% on research and extension services, 21% on other agricultural activities, 10% on fisheries and rural roads and 9% to cover input subsidies.

A study by IFPRI estimates that public expenditure in agriculture will need to grow at a rate of between 17.5 to 20.9% per annum to reach PEDSA’s target of 7% annual agricultural growth per year in 2022. According to this same study, in the PNISA budget US$2000 are needed to lift one person above the poverty line. IFPRI suggests that if some of the existing funds allocated by PNISA to irrigation would be redirected to extension and research services, the impact on poverty alleviation would be maximized and only US$1000 would be needed to lift one person out of poverty. (Mogues, T. and Benin, S., 2012)

**Budgeting process**

Various challenges constrain the smooth functioning of the process influencing the final resource allocations in the agriculture sector in Mozambique. The annual activity plans are prepared by MASA as a consolidation of ‘wish lists’ by the different spending sub-national units. Sometimes resources are allocated in order to gain political support (CARE/AA, 2016).

Due to Mozambique’s substantial dependence on foreign aid, the preparation of the agricultural action plan also includes consultations with the main multilateral donors, sometimes forcing the government to ‘please’ the different donors’ agendas (Cammaer, 2016).

The annual activity plans are not revised by MASA after the allocation of funds, so they can become obsolete. (Mogues, T. and Benin, S., 2012).

**Budget allocation**

Analyzing public expenditure in agriculture in Mozambique is challenging: There are discrepancies and inconsistencies in the data depending on the source and accounting system used (state budget, internal accounting systems of MASA, specific projects’ budget, etc.) and some expenditure is not captured in national statistics (ReSAKSS-SA, 2007).

MASA is actually responsible for a fraction of the total budget which is allocated to the sector: During the period 2009 to 2014, 37% of the agriculture budget was allocated to MASA, while 11% was directly allocated to the districts and the Ministry of Fisheries got another 6%.

The rest went to other State bodies beyond agriculture, such as National Institute of Social Action (responsible for social protection programs, including food aid); the Regional Water Administration (responsible for irrigation) or the activities implemented by the Ministry for Regional Development Economy Support and Rehabilitation Fund (MAFAP, 2014).
Since 2001, budget allocations to agriculture (again, if including agriculture budget beyond MASA) have hovered at around 10% of the total budget, peaking in 2014, when they were above 13%. With a more restricted definition of what agriculture expenditure is (i.e. confining it to MASA’s budget), the actual sector expenditure every year would be well below 5% of the total budget.

Budget disbursement

Every year, actual spending in the sector is less than what was initially budgeted, although the difference is usually relatively small (around 25% underspent), compare to other Southern African countries, where the difference can be as high as 50%.

Budget structure

Most public agricultural expenditure is on salaries and other transfers, including institutional overheads. Spending on support to farmers and provision of other agricultural services accounts for only about one-quarter of expenditures (NEPAD, 2014).

In most Southern African countries, input supply programs and price subsidies are the top headings in the agricultural budget’s I support to farmers. In Mozambique, however, the situation is very different: Extension (including technology transfer training and technical assistance), together with research, made around 28% of the agriculture and food security budget expenditure (at least during the period 2009 to 2013, when this breakdown of data was available). Allocations to access to finance by the farmers were 14.5% (again, a rarity in the region, where often these type of programs are almost non-existent), while access to inputs only got 5%.

Despite this comparatively high investment on extension and research, the coverage of these services and the number of qualified extension staff and researchers remains rather limited. This is because, even if the percentage allocated is high, the actual amount is very limited, because the overall budget of the country is in fact, very small. In other headings

Agriculture and FS budget (2009/2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support to producers</th>
<th>84%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extension, training, technical assistance</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to credit to farmers</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture research</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-farm irrigation</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to machinery and equipment</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to inputs (FISP)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other subsidies/ payments to farmers</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other off-farm infrastructure</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary and plant protection</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing support</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-farm services for farmers</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage and public stockholding</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-farm irrigation</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to processors/input suppliers</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support to consumers</strong></td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash transfers (food subsidy program)</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School feeding programs</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food aid</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
where the budget percentage is very narrow (such as access to inputs, irrigation, storage...) the State investment is, in practice insufficient to have a noticeable impact.

Calculations based on data from e-SISTAFE. (MAFAP, 2014)

Investments: Scale of the impact
Given the budget constraints, agricultural investments of the Government of Mozambique can only target a very limited proportion of the 5 million farmers of the country, so selecting interventions with high impact and less cost should be a priority.

The ratio between how much is assigned to a certain type of investment, and how many farmers are benefiting by each investment differs enormously from one investment to another:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of investment</th>
<th>% of budget (2009/13)</th>
<th>% farmers covered</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inputs (FISP)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>10:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>1:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Foreign aid
For decades, the agriculture sector in Mozambique has been heavily dependent upon foreign aid. Its major agricultural sector strategies have been implemented with significant support from the donor community, and most of these have been designed in consultation with the donors.

Until the halt of direct budget support in 2016, donors made commitments of at least US$ 950 million in support of the PNISA investment plan out of which, around 20% is in the form of direct budget support (NEPAD, 2015). USAID, World Bank, IFAD, JICA, the EU, Belgium, DFID, Sweden, Denmark and Spain were the main contributors to the sector.

Policy monitoring and evaluation
PEDSA foresees the production of Joint Sector Review Assessment Reports to assess the performance and results of the agriculture sector and assist government departments to adjust sector specific policies and priorities. This review shall cover both government and CSO-funded activities and has to be conducted involving a wide range of stakeholders including government institutions, research centers and CSOs. The first Joint Sector Review Assessment Report was developed in 2014.

PNISA highlights the importance of developing a strong monitoring and evaluation framework as well as to guarantee the transparency in the use of the funds, but in practice key indicators for monitoring and evaluation of PNISA activities are undefined (NEPAD, 2014).

Transparency and civil society participation in policy making
While efforts are underway in Mozambique to incorporate CSOs and the private sector onto the policy making process, in practice it is almost solely dominated by the state (NEPAD, 2014).

PEDSA was developed following a participatory approach that involved representatives of producers, service providers, cooperation partners, researchers, and civil society actors. This was not the case with PNISA, where not even UNAC, which is the major farmer organisation in Mozambique was involved in the drafting process (ReSAKSS, 2014). There has also been a lack of public consultation in the preparation of the draft Law on Agriculture and Food and Nutrition Security.

MASA regularly organises consultation workshops and meetings with external groups.
such as partner organisations and other stakeholders in the food and agriculture sector. However, there is very little follow up on recommendations made in these consultations and final policies, strategies and plans rarely incorporate the stakeholders’ recommendations (CARE/AA, 2016). The participation of smallholder farmers’ organizations appears to be inconsistent (NEPAD, 2014).

The annual planning process in Mozambique is, in theory, bottom up. District proposals are prepared after a consultation process with the Local Councils, (which, as per the 2003 Law on Local State Organs should be a consultation body representing the plurality of the local communities in every district) who provide local content in terms of concerns and priorities. All district plans are presented to the province, where they feed into the national sectoral plan. The overall national plan is then discussed and approved by the Parliament (Cammaer, 2016). But in practice the system is not as representative and transparent as it should be. The Local Councils are often dominated by local elites such as party members, religious leaders as well as members of CSOs closely linked to the party in power (Pereira, J., 2012).

**Place of the small-scale farmers in the policy priorities**

PEDSA fails to clearly define and identify smallholder farmers as a target group. It builds on the assumption that by boosting agribusiness investments, developing markets and promoting export in the agricultural sector, positive impacts will eventually trickle down to the local communities. Additionally, the strategy fails to recognize local knowledge and existing good practice that could be effectively applied leading to the scale up of sustained production. The policy seems to be predominantly based on a top down approach, in which external actors are tasked with introducing new techniques, developing knowledge and changing the current practices of local farmers (CARE/AA, 2016).

The focus on productivity and competitiveness has not been accompanied by a discussion on highly nutritious food crops. Moreover, while increasing food production is at the centre of the strategy, issues linked to the diversification of this production are missing. In 2013, the UN Standing Committee on Nutrition undertook an analysis to assess to which extent different policies in Mozambique were sensitive to FNS. PEDSA got the lowest score among the seven policies analysed with 9 points out of 17. Only one of the 23 indicators designed by PEDSA are directly linked to FNS.

PNISA, like PEDSA, does not include goals or activities for smallholder farmers. It defines similar targets for small, medium and large-scale farmers and does not clearly prioritize food production over cash crops. PNISA does not outline the challenges encountered by the family sector and fails to recognise smallholder farmers’ competitive disadvantage within broader markets (Mosca, J., 2014).

**The role of INGOs in policy making**

*INGOs, such as CARE, Save the Children, and World Vision play key roles in the implementation of agricultural policy.*

*Usually working in focus provinces, INGOs provide extension services in parallel with the government’s own agricultural extension service. They help to develop smallholder farmer associations, and strengthen agricultural value chains by giving farmers better links with agribusinesses.*

*As NEPAD recognised in the 2014 Joint Sector Review Assessment, ‘Although they are not so prominent in policy processes, these organizations are important participants in the implementation of policy, so they are not totally excluded from the design of those policies’ (NEPAD, 2014).*

**Gender mainstreaming in the policies**

PEDSA insists on the importance of social and gender equality in its general objective and gender is one of the key cross-cutting issues within this policy. PEDSA also discusses the important role played by women in the
agricultural sector in Mozambique and highlights the many challenges and barriers they face. This key policy document also includes activities directly focusing on women including the promotion of women’s participation and access to agricultural inputs and knowledge. PNISA, on the contrary, does not consider gender issues. It only discusses the role played by women in programs directly linked to nutrition or land and doesn’t highlight the key contribution of women to agricultural production. Challenges related to gender inequality are not adequately captured and dealt with in PNISA.

Farmers’ organizations

Mozambique has a strong tradition of farmers’ associations and coops, that dates back to the country’s socialist phase after independence and that revived afterwards in the frame of the global food sovereignty movement. The role of the social movements in agriculture is also reflected in the main policy documents, such as the PQG or the Poverty Reduction Paper which calls for the support to the establishment of associations and cooperatives as a means to help the smallholders to reach the markets.

The National Peasants Union (União Nacional de Camponeses, UNAC) was founded in 1987. An active member of La Vía Campesina, UNAC promotes the recognition of farmers’ crucial role in Mozambique’s food security and food sovereignty. UNAC, which brings together 58 unions and 1,243 farmer associations and cooperatives, works to improve the social, economic and cultural rights of small-scale farmers by strengthening farmer organizations and developing strategies for food sovereignty and increasing the participation of women in policy advocacy. Land tenure is of particular concern to UNAC due to the problem of land grabs.

The Rural Mutual Assistance Organization (Organização Rural de Ajuda Mútua, ORAM) is working on the issue of access to land and other natural resources. It also has national coverage, and was instrumental in the approval of the land law.

Other movements have a more business advocacy orientation, than the broader and more political aims of UNAC and ORAM. This includes the Mozambican Agrarian Producers Association (Associação de Produtores Agrários de Moçambique, AGRARIUS), the Mozambican Young Farmers’ Association (Associação dos Jovens Agricultores de Moçambique, AJAM), and sub-sector organizations like the Mozambican Poultry Association (Associação Moçambicana de Avicultores, AMA) or the Mozambican Fruit growers Association (Associação dos Fruticultores de Moçambique, FRUTISUL).

The cooperative movement is also strong in Mozambique, and several business-oriented agriculture cooperatives have been established in the country since the approval, in 2006, of the 2006 Law on Agriculture Cooperatives. They are present in virtually every production sector (including the export-oriented production, as well as the local market) and in all the provinces. First level coops are grouped in larger cooperatives’ associations and unions, such as the General Cooperatives Union (União Geral das Cooperativas, UGC), or the Association for the Promotion of Modern Cooperativism (Associação Moçambicana para Promoção do Cooperativismo Moderno, AMPCM).

Agriculture policy knowledge platforms

In Mozambique, the government mainly relies on international research and education organizations for evidence to guide policy choices in agriculture. These include development partners such as Michigan State University, which has an almost 20-year history of providing policy research and capacity building in the agricultural sector in Mozambique, and the CGIAR international agricultural research centers. The capacity for agricultural policy research in domestic institutions is primarily within the country—Eduardo Mondlane University and within some smaller domestic policy research institutes and consultancy enterprises (CEPAD, 2014).
Summary and main conclusions

- Mozambique has a well-articulated policy framework. The strategic plan (PEDSA) is aligned with the CAADP priorities and the investment plan (PNISA), includes specific programs, indicators and budgets.

- The main aim of the agriculture policy is to augment yields and increase the land area under cultivation, despite the negative environmental implications.

- Although the policy includes some provisions aimed at the small-scale farmers, such as promoting conservation agriculture, the focus is on promoting large agribusiness.

- PEDSA proposes measures to promote gender equality, but they are not reflected in PNISA.

- Low capacity of the agriculture staff and complex institutional arrangements, affect the agriculture and FS policy making and implementation.

- Mozambique is fulfilling the CAADP commitment of allocating 10% of the national budget to agriculture. Donor partners are also providing substantial support to the sector.

- However, the resources available are still insufficient compared to the needs, so the investments are generally not having a large-scale impact.

- In contrast to most other African countries, where inputs supply programs and price subsidies usually get most of the State agricultural funds, in Mozambique extension and research is the first budgetary priority.

- The annual budgetary priorities at local and provincial levels are set following a bottom-up approach, but they tend to be influenced by local elites and partisan interests.

- In Mozambique, there is a well-established network of farmers’ organizations and cooperatives’ unions advocating for food sovereignty and the rights of the small-scale farmers.
Agriculture and food security policy implementation

Access to land

All land in Mozambique is, in principle, owned by the State. Individuals and communities have legally recognized use rights over the land under their occupation.

According to the traditional norms, men have control over property, assets and decisions and women have very limited and unsecured land rights. Inheritance practices often mean that widows lose not only a spouse and any production/income he generated, but also family assets and land. (CARE Mozambique, 2014).


To help protect the community’s land from expropriation, the Land Law establishes that the expropriation of land could only take place for reasons of public necessity, utility or interest and has to be preceded by payment of fair indemnification and/or compensation (CARE Mozambique, 2013). The Land Law states that consultation with communities should be undertaken prior to appropriation of any land in order to ensure that rights gained through occupancy are not ignored by investors (CARE/AA, 2016).

In 2015, the government launched a 5-year campaign directed at providing better security of land tenure to national citizens and rural communities through the issuing of 5 million land titles, including collective land certificates for 4000 rural communities (LandAc, 2015).

In Mozambique, agricultural investors can acquire land use rights for a period of 50 years (renewable) by making formal requests to the State (CARE Mozambique, 2013). Most smallholder farmers have traditional but undocumented ownership so they face unsecure land rights and cannot legally challenge the investors’ land claims. (CARE Mozambique, 2013).

In 2006 the government created the Agriculture Promotion Centre (CEPAGRI), an agency to promote large-scale foreign investment in the agricultural sector. Since then, a large amount of land has been given to larger-scale farming.

The Land Matrix organization, which tracks land grabbing investments all over the world, has recorded up to 84 large land acquisitions in Mozambique, totalling 2,448,000 hectares, making the country the 8th in the world in terms of transnational land acquisitions, and the 2nd in Africa, only after South Sudan. The top investors countries are South Africa, UK, India, Portugal, China, India and Norway.

Although consultation with local communities is part of the statutory process for land allocation foreseen in the Land Law, this process has been widely criticized for being superficial, conducted without sufficient preparation or representation on the part of the community (CARE Mozambique, 2013a). In many cases, only the local elites have been involved in this consultation process. In some communities, leaders have personally approved investment projects despite strong community objections.

Exclusion of women in consultations

Women are often excluded from the consultation processes and the community forums (CARE Mozambique, 2013a). In the Nipiode area of the Zambezia Valley for example, women interviewed who were clearly against the eucalyptus plantations on community land confirmed that they had no voice in the process of public consultation.

As a result, community leaders agreed to transfer the land rights to the company Ntacua Corporation despite the general belief amongst women that eucalyptus production offered no benefits to the community (JA and UNAC, 2011).
Within Mozambique local leaders enjoy enormous authority and members of the community are culturally not allowed to question or criticize their decision-making. According to a survey, 81% of respondents interviewed in the Central Region felt that chiefs defended the interests of the investment projects at the expense of the needs of their own communities. In some communities, reluctant members opposing leaders' decisions on community land use have been threatened and beaten (JA and UNAC, 2011). Where negotiations take place, agreements are rarely respected and often following consultations, agreed land areas are enlarged during the registration and implementation process.

Per various studies, some of the private investments not only had very limited effects on social development, employment and poverty reduction in Mozambique but also had severe negative consequences on the most vulnerable groups such as smallholder farmers and women (CARE/AA, 2016).

The employment creation of large-scale investment projects falls far short of expectations. While mega-projects accounted for around 72% of total private investments over the period 1992-2010, they only generated 5% of total expected employment (OECD, 2013). According to the CPI forecasts recently registered, mega-projects generate only 1.7 jobs per US$1 million invested, compared to 77 jobs for other registered projects (OECD, 2013).

50% of respondents to a survey on the impact of large investments in the Southern region confirmed that the existing investment projects had prevented the communities from accessing water sources. Many communities had to walk longer to be able to reach water resources because of these private investments.

Some investment projects have been associated with major environmental concerns including the discharge of pollutants and the contamination of rivers due to the large-scale use of agrochemicals (JA and UNAC, 2011). In 2016, the government announced that it would close CEPAGRI, giving no reason for the closure, and indicating that its functions would be subsumed under a different agency in MASA.

However, there has been speculation that the closure of the agency would mean a policy turn and the recognition that the policy of promoting large agribusinesses has largely failed to deliver the planned results.
The Beira Agricultural Growth Corridor (initiative is a partnership between the Government of Mozambique, private investors, farmer organizations and international agencies. It was launched in 2010 and aims at promoting increased investments in commercial agriculture and agribusiness within the Beira Corridor (Tete, Sofala and Manica Provinces).

Contract farming

Contract farming is proactively promoted by the government in Mozambique. A significant proportion of the production of cotton and tobacco is achieved through grower schemes in which smallholder farmers are contracted to produce the crops for large-scale commercial farms (NEPAD, 2014).

According to a 2012 study, “it tends to focus on the production of cash crops and can have pernicious effects for smallholder farmers’ food security as it diverts them from food crop production. The study also highlighted that contract farming in Mozambique usually provides an income in cash only for a limited period that allows for consumption smoothing but not for the start-up of an accumulation process (Navarro, C. and Pellizzoli, R., 2012).

Biofuel promotion

Following the biofuel rush witnessed in the country since the mid-2000s, the government of Mozambique adopted in 2009 a National Biofuel Strategy, approved after a consultative process that involved the development and dissemination of a comprehensive assessment on the potential for biofuel production in country. While the assessment indicated that biofuel production had the potential to increase revenue and generate jobs it also outlined some major socio-economic risks related to food security and local land rights protection (Nhantumbo, I. and Salomão, A., 2010). The Strategy states that biofuel production should not be done at the expense of food production. The policy specifically excludes the use of food crops for producing the biofuel (CIP and AWEPA, 2011) and calls for biofuel production to be done only on marginal and unused lands to avoid competition with production of food crops. The strategy suggests the utilization of 450,000ha of biofuel production should create 150,000 jobs (100,000 on farms and 50,000 in refining) (CIP and AWEPA, 2011).

Payments for environmental resources

The Forestry and Wildlife Law provides a legal basis for the payment of benefits to local communities resulting from commercial exploitation of any forest or fauna resources in their area. Under the law, 20% of all annual fees arising from the issuance of timber-cutting quotas to commercial operators must be returned to the community living in the area where the exploitation has been licensed.

The payment of these fees is made by district governments directly to the Community Management Committees (CGC). These bodies are composed of members of the community, and have a mandate to defend the rights of the community regarding the use and conservation of natural resources (CARE Mozambique, 2013a). The 20% annual fees are expected to finance projects that will directly improve the well-being of the inhabitants in those communities. From 2005 to 2012, approximately 954 communities received a total of US$4.4 million in fees.

A 2014 research study that was based on case studies in four districts of Nampula concluded that the compensation fees from forest and fauna exploitation had little economic and social impacts. The amounts received by the communities were insignificant when compared to the timber prices and the profits realized by the private companies, and many of the infrastructure investments built in compensation for forest exploitation investments were of very low quality, including classrooms on the verge of collapse. Additionally, decisions on how to use the funds received have often been made with little community consultation or transparency by a small number of community leaders. (Serra, C. et al., 2014).
Despite these legal provisions, ‘few biofuel projects have addressed the concerns raised by the different stakeholders and often have directly competed with food crop production for available land. Projects to date have not created the promised local employment, have causes many land disputes and forced resettlements and have also led to environmental and biodiversity degradation’ (Nhantumbo, I. and Salomão, A. (2010).

Access to inputs

PEDSA outlines priority actions to increase fertilizer use in 2015 and the country developed a Fertilizer Strategy. Mozambique’s Farm Input Subsidy Program (FISP) was launched in 2009 and is still running. It aims at increasing maize production and reduce import dependency. FISP targets farmers cultivating between 0.5–5 ha of maize or rice, who are interested in modernization and commercialization, have access to extension services and input and output markets, and could pay the balance of the subsidy. The government holds a lottery that randomly selects 25,000 beneficiaries from a larger list of qualifying beneficiaries, selected by extension officers, local leaders and input suppliers (World Bank 2014b).

The support package consisted of 73% of the cost of 12.5 kg of hybrid or open pollinated seed and 100 kg of fertilizers (World Bank 2014b). Extension officers distribute the vouchers to the winning farmers; and they redeem the vouchers at private suppliers; the suppliers cash the voucher value from participating international donor organizations, and the state-owned Mozambique Fertilizer Company gives the fertilizer on credit to the suppliers (ACB 2016). In the 2014 to 2015 season the physical voucher started to be replaced by an e-voucher. From 2007 to 2013 the Mozambican government spent about US$ 150 million on the subsidized inputs under FISP (roughly US$ 25 million per year).

Compare to other Southern African countries, such as Malawi or Tanzania, were the input subsidies programs have been targeting hundreds of thousands of farmers and consuming the lion’s share of the national agriculture biggest, Mozambique’s FISP is a rather small scheme, in terms of total number of beneficiary farmers (only 0.5% of the farmers are covered), and in terms of impact in the budget (as we saw, 5%). The government has been considering upscaling a fertilizer subsidy scheme to national level, due to lack of finance resources this idea has not been implemented yet (FAO, 2016).

The FISP seems to have contributed to augment maize yields. However, its contribution to reduce poverty is less obvious. Given the beneficiaries’ selection criteria, it is clear that the primary beneficiary of the program is not the poor small-scale farmers. Furthermore, the way the potential beneficiaries are qualified to take part in the lottery (with local leaders and input suppliers having a say in making the lists) seems very un-transparent. The value for money of the program is not very impressive: 5% of the agriculture budget has been allocated annual to a program that benefits 0.5% of the farmers.

Extension services

Extension is a central theme in Mozambique’s agricultural policies, highly prioritized both in PNISA and PEDSA. The PEDSA envisages an increase in extension services through both public and non-public channels, including, the private sector and NGOs, so that public

---

**Seed legislation**

In 2013 the government approved a new Seed Law, aimed at developing the seeds; granting accreditation of private sector agents in the seed breeding and providing protection of new varieties of plants. In 2014 MASA launched the National Platform of Dialogue of Seed Sector to enhance the business environment in the sector (FAO, 2016).

The country has not yet put in place quality declared seed systems that could help small scale farmers to get guarantees of the quality of the seeds they use without the burden of formal accreditation.
extension workers can be mainly allocated to districts with highest potential for growth. As we saw, extension is also the largest heading in the agricultural annual budgets, getting, on average, 19.5% of the sector funding. The public extension services have been progressively expanded covering a growing number of districts and employing an increasing number of extension workers. Despite this expansion of the service, the percentage of farmers accessing it is still only 11% (MASA, 2013).

The traditional training and visit model to promoting new technologies was abolished in Mozambique more than one decade ago, and now the DNEA (the MASA’s directorate for public extension) uses methodologies involving de-concentration, participation and partnership (DNEA, 2007). The use of approaches such as conservation agriculture (CA) and the establishment of Farmer Field Schools (FFS) have significantly increased over the past few years. The FFS approach was first promoted by FAO, as well as by CARE and other NGOs, and now is becoming increasingly mainstreaming in the public extension system. The MASA has recently started a new project, supported by FAO, to further promote the FFS approach in four provinces to benefit 80,000 farmers through the establishment of 3,200 FFSs and through the training of 1,500 facilitators and 200 extension workers (Cammaer, 2016).

However, in many cases the techniques promoted by MASA, are not always suited to the local context. The promotion of certified improved seeds, mechanization and irrigation, which are all priorities for the Mozambican Government, can only work for a selected number of private farmers, but are still often widely promoted amongst small-scale producers (Cammaer, 2016).

Extension workers often live in precarious conditions with no access to decent housing. They have no transportation means except bicycles, which makes it very difficult for them to access the poorest farmers scattered across very large areas not serviced by main roads. They have very little career development opportunities and incentives to perform their roles optimally. Another staffing challenge relates to the low educational level, and the poor access to training (Francisco, A., et. al., 2010).

The poor coordination between the DNA and the IIAM (the MASA agency for research) exacerbates many of these problems.

A further problem is that the approaches and techniques promoted by NGOs are not always consistent, so there is a clear need for a better coordination between the different service providers (CARE/AA, 2016). This is exacerbated by lack of coordination between agricultural research and extension services (CARE Mozambique, 2014).

Research

PEDSA proposes various activities related to research, including training and recruiting researchers, giving priority to research on post-harvest losses and the development of mechanisms which establish research priorities based on demand while still taking account the needs of vulnerable populations including women (CARE/AA, 2016).

However, in practice, research specific to food crop and smallholder farmers is minimal. The number of full-time agricultural researchers in Mozambique has increased by almost 12% annually between 2000 and 2008 (Flaherty, K, 2011), but less than half of the IIAM research staff had reached the post-graduate level and, despite the decentralization process, they are mainly based in Maputo, not in the rural areas. (CARE/AA, 2016).
Moreover, high staff turnover and weak documentation of good practices leads to a weak institutional memory on mechanisms and activities implemented over time for research and extension coordination (MASA, 2013).

As said, the coordination between the DNEA IIAM is very weak, so extension and research follow often different paths. Staff of both institutions lack incentives to undertake coordination activities.

Research is predominantly on-station; and so even if valuable practices or varieties are developed, the extremely poor link with extension services (government, private or non-profit) means that these seldom get out to farmers at any meaningful scale (CARE Mozambique, 2014). As an alternative to this model, at local level, Government, NGO’s and local partners are working together using FFSs to identify combinations of local crops that are tolerant to drought, provide more food, and build up soil fertility and organic matter with minimal financial and labour inputs (Silici et al., 2015).

Irrigation

Current irrigation schemes predominately benefit large-scale farmers and companies involved in cash crops production for the export market: While off-farm large extension systems (which usually target large cash crops areas) are getting, on average, 7.5% of the agriculture budget, in-farm schemes, which suit better the needs of the small farmers, are also receiving 1% of the funding. Sugar cane accounts for most (60%) of the total irrigated culture.

Between 2002 and 2008 the percentage of smallholder farmers using irrigation schemes went from 10.9% to 8.8% (Cunguara, B., et al., 2013). The scarce irrigation infrastructure used by smallholders is mostly outdated. Only between 34 and 40% of the total area equipped for irrigation is actually being irrigated.

Mozambique adopted in 2010 the National Strategy for Irrigation, followed by establishing the National Irrigation Institute. The lack of good collaboration between the Institute and the extension services to farmers is probably one of the key reasons for why irrigation schemes throughout the country are so poorly utilized.

In 2015, the government submitted to the Parliament a request for approval of an updated regulatory framework for irrigation associations, defining mandates and accountabilities for the operation, maintenance and management of public irrigation infrastructure. The new regulations are designed to increase sustainability of investment in irrigation systems, but the approval is pending.

Post-harvest management

PEDSA recognizes the impact of high post-harvest losses and sets many targets in relation to conservation and storage, processing and access to market (CARE/AA, 2016). PEDSA foresees the construction of improved granaries and the rehabilitation and maintenance of public silos. In practice, these good intentions are not translating into actions, mainly due to lack of funds: As we saw when analyzing the agricultural budget, in the last years only 1.5% of the funds for agriculture have been allocated for storage and public stockholding.

Access to markets

PEDSA also recognizes the impact of weak market participation of farmers combined with their lack of negotiation power over prices. To improve the access to markets, the government regularly organizes (in most districts) the feiras, popular markets with the dual objective of seed distribution and as a venue for smallholders to sell their produce. In most cases, there are two such markets per year, at the start of the season, when improved seeds are offered, and at the end of the season, to sell the produce. Extra market days are also organized, for horticultural crops, to avoid them from getting spoilt. This seems to be a simple, not expensive, yet efficient, way to support the smallholder farmers.
Access to finance

In 2013 the Government approved the Financial Sector Development Strategy 2013-2022 with the main objective ‘to further development of the financial sector to become sound, diverse, expansive, and provider of adequate products and services to the majority of households and businesses, at competitive prices’ (Mambo, G, 2016).

Despite PEDSA highlighting the need for more accessible credit, there are no activities in the strategy which specifically focus on promoting access to credit to the most vulnerable groups including traditional smallholders and women. In fact, many of the donors’ funded projects to improve access to finance in agriculture seems to focus on the medium and large farmers, not the small ones.

The Development Credit Authority (DCA) is guaranteed by funds made available by USAID and SIDA, and it is designed to strengthen the guaranteed lending institutions’ ability to finance loans to medium-sized farm agribusiness. USAID has three DCA programs with two banks (USAID, 2014).

Summary and main conclusions

- Land grabbing is a recurring phenomenon in Mozambique. Commercial investors often negotiate land use rights with local leaders who bargain away traditional tenure arrangements. Poor small-holder farmers, and particularly women, are not consulted.

- These large investments are delivering little in terms of job creation or social benefits (despite the law foreseeing compensation fees by the investors to the communities).

- Only one out of ten small-holder farmers can access the extension service. The nature of the staff working conditions, and poor coordination between the extension and research systems, affect the efficiency of the system.

- Mozambique has been a pioneer in promoting participatory extension approaches such as Farmer Field School.

- Most of the other government programs, including the input subsidies, irrigation and access to finance, are not designed to tackle the needs of the small-holder farmers’ needs.
Agriculture and food security policy implementation through the lens of the SuPER approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy area</th>
<th>Sustainable</th>
<th>Productive</th>
<th>Equitable</th>
<th>Resilient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to land</td>
<td>★★★★</td>
<td>★★</td>
<td>★★★★</td>
<td>★★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to inputs</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension services</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to finance</td>
<td>★★</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>★★★★</td>
<td>★★★★</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARE’s SuPER approach to agriculture promotes (1) sustainable agricultural systems grounded in healthy ecosystems; stable, accountable and enduring institutions, and sustainable financing; (2) productive, (including profitable, and nutrition-sensitive) intensification interventions that are ‘climate smart’ and increase returns on investment for farmers; (3) equitable outcomes in smallholder agriculture by enabling access to equal rights, opportunities, resources and rewards; taking into account the needs/constraints of women; and (4) supporting access to affordable nutritious food for all and helping individuals, families, communities and systems to become resilient.

The Green color in the table above means a positive assessment, while red means a negative assessment. The number of ✔ and ✗ qualify how positive or negative it is.

Mozambique’s access to land policies, and particularly granting land rights to agro-investors, is not a sustainable: it promotes the expansion of the farmland, putting in danger forests and other ecosystems; it returns very little investment to the local communities, if any at all, so it is not productive for them. Often the land deals are agreed without the consent of the communities, so they are not equitable, and they tend to promote cash crops for exportation, no stable food or nutritious product, so they are not resilient.

Mozambique’s access to inputs program (FISP) is not designed to promote sustainable agriculture models. It is, to some extent, productive, because it has augmented production and profitable intensification, but is not inclusive because the focus is not women and/or small holder farmers. It may help the targeted farmers to be more resilient to shocks.

Extension services in Mozambique promote (although not always) sustainable models of production, are generally productive (because they promote profitable and often climate smart models) and are implemented based on participatory methods such as FFS, so they are equitable. Resilience is usually an important aspect of the extension packages.

Agriculture research in Mozambique is largely based on outdated methods and approaches, where augmenting yields (rather than seeking to increase resilience and sustainability) is the main priority. The research is disconnected from the extension services and not scaled up to the farmers, so it is not very productive. It is mainly conducted on research stations, more than in the field, so it does not follow participatory approaches and is not really equitable.

Irrigation in Mozambique is mainly oriented to export-oriented cash-crops, not to promote nutritious food, so it does not promote equitable or productive models. It enhances resilience but the sustainability of the policy is uncertain.

Access to agriculture finance in Mozambique is mainly benefiting medium and large size farmers, not the small ones (so it is not equitable), and Climate Smart Agriculture, sustainability or nutrition aspects are not prioritized in the lending services (they are therefore not resilient, productive or sustainable).
Climate change resilience policies and the small-scale farmers

International commitments

Mozambique ratified the Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in 2003 and the Kyoto Protocol in 2005. The Paris Agreement was signed by Mozambique, but the ratification is pending.

The Government of Mozambique drafted a First National Communication on climate change (CC) in 2003, emphasizing coastal protection, agriculture and water resources (MFAF, 2014). This was followed by the submission of a National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA) in 2008, with a continuation of these three themes and addition of early warning systems as a fourth. (MER, 2015).

Main national policies

The government of Mozambique is strongly committed to the CC Agenda. Since the ratification of the UNFCCC, the country has made strong efforts towards integrating CC concerns in national development planning, including in the Agenda 2025 and the PQG. These policies explicitly recognize that extreme weather events are one of the greatest threats to development and socioeconomic performance of the country.

The overall objective of Mozambique’s NAPA is strengthening the national capacity to cope with the adverse impacts of CC.

NAPA priority areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening of the early warning system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening the capacities of agricultural producers to cope with climate change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the knowledge and strengthen the management of river waters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote actions to limit erosion and to develop sustainable fishery activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2012 Mozambique launched its National Climate Change Strategy for 2013-2025. The Strategy provides the overall policy framework to guide climate resilient planning and development at sector and sub-national level. It builds on analytical work conducted by the Institute of Disaster Management, and on previous policy frameworks, including the NAPA.

National CC Strategy objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>To become resilient to impacts of climate change, while minimizing climate risks to people and property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td>To identify and implement opportunities to reduce GHG emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity and resources</td>
<td>To build institutional and human capacity and explore opportunities to access technology and financial resources to implement this strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Strategy recognizes that ‘conservation of agricultural land, as well as the promotion of resilient crops, is crucial’, and calls for a Agricultural interventions tailored to each agro-climatic zone and their predicted vulnerabilities.

The Climate Smart Agriculture Action Plan was produced by MASA to support and promote climate resilient agriculture in small-holder farming, with a focus on extension services, knowledge management, coordination, and monitoring and evaluation aspects. The plan foresees approval of incentives for scaling up climate resilient agriculture, as well as strengthening extension provision and improving knowledge management for uptake of climate smart approaches by the farmers.

Main environmental policies

The National Environment Policy (1995), the 1997 Environment Frame Law were created to systematically integrate environmental aspects in development. In 2013, the government approved the Mozambique Green Economy Action Plan which outlines interventions for Mozambique to embrace a greener economy.
The PEDSA, which was approved before the CSA Action Plan is not fully consistent with the CSA paradigm, and still requires to be updated accordingly.

Local climate adaptation plans and budgets have already been prepared and adopted in at least 20 vulnerable districts with more expected to follow (WB, 2014 1).

Institutional setup

Lack of coordination and cooperation between the various governmental actors with responsibilities on CC was, for many years, a major weakness in Mozambique. To improve this coordination, a Climate Change Coordination Unit (CCCU) was established in 2014, with support from the World Bank, which is funding capacity building activities to support its management and coordination functions. The CCCU is host at the National Sustainable Development Council, and functions as a cross-governmental body for coordination of CC activities.

The Mozambique Academy of Science hosts the Climate Change Knowledge Management Centre, whose mission is to synthetize and disseminate existing and new climate knowledge, and to feed policy and development planning more systematically. The Centre is a public body and works in close coordination with the CCU.

The Ministry for Coordination of Environmental Affairs (MICOA) used to be, until 2015, the line agency dealing with CC, but it was dismantled that year, after allegations of corruption and poor performance. MICOSA units were merged with agencies from other ministries, to form a new Ministry of Lands, Environment and Rural Development (MITADER) (MER, 2015).

MASA has a small CC team, which works within the National Directorate for Agrarian Extension. This may explain why, while CSA agriculture is, overall, becoming well integrated in the extension system, other agricultural programs (such as the FISP) are not really taking CSA approaches into consideration. A stand-alone CC unit could probably better help MASA to integrate CC concerns across all the ministry’s activities. Some other ministries have established their own environment units or departments, which in principle are run under the oversight of MITADER.

Climate change funds

A Climate Change Public Expenditure and Institutional Review was conducted in 2015, as a support tool for the Government to properly plan CC funding. According to this review, during the period 2009 to 2012, around 0.8% to 1% of the total Mozambique budget was devoted to CC. The large majority of the CC budget is externally funded.

The Government designated FUNAB (now MITADER) to oversee all funding of CC interventions, as its national entity to mobilize and coordinate climate funds. MITADER is now in the process of accreditation to access global climate funds (Climate Change Unit, 2015).

Among all Sub-Sahara African countries, Mozambique is third in terms of the climate finance that has been approved.

The largest CC program in Mozambique right now is the Pilot Program on Climate Resilience (PPCR), with US$ 86 million funding. It is part of the Climate Investment Fund (CIF) portfolio specifically aimed at adaptation. PPCR funding consists of grants and near-zero interest credits from World Bank and the AfDB. Mozambique is one of only three African countries receiving PPCR funding (Niger and Zambia are the other two).
The country is using the PPCR support for infrastructure upgrades; improved resource management; enhanced climate services and development of local and national capacities for climate resilient planning and action (MER, 2015). PPCR programs have played a critical role in implementing the National Climate Change Strategy, particularly in the most vulnerable river basis such as Limpopo and Zambezia.

Another large program, now finished, was the €47 million Mainstreaming of Climate Change project, co-funded by EU’s Global Climate Change Alliance (GCCA) and DANIDA, implemented from 2011 to 2015. Various projects funded by the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) implemented by UNDP and UNEP are also run in the country (including a domestic cook stove substitution project), as well as several other projects from the bilateral cooperation, such as the Adapting to climate change in Mozambique project, funded by GIZ (MER, 2015).

Transparency and participation in policy making

CSOs have been actively engaged in the CC policy making process in Mozambique: The formulation of the NAPA was made through an inter-institutional CC working group which included representatives from the private sector, NGOs, academia, and CSOs (Climate Change Unit, 2015). Consultation meetings were conducted in several districts in preparation of the NAPA, in a process that involved also a participative evaluation of 31 districts to determine which ones should be chose for implementation.

MITADER is now prioritizing the development of participatory local adaptation plans as part of the first phase of strategy implementation, and has engaged extensively in provincial, district, local level and civil society consultations.

Place of small-holder farmers in the policy framework

Smallholders are at the center of Mozambique’s climate adaptation policies.

The NAPA, which was produced after on-the-ground consultations across the country, reflects very well the adaptation needs of the small farmers and gives attention to local knowledge to cope with climate vulnerability.

The strategic agriculture actions identified in the National Climate Change Strategy are also well-adapted to the small farmer’s needs (e.g.
diversifying and introducing crops that are more resistant to climate variation; improving agricultural productivity by making available technologies and inputs suitable for CC).

The Climate Smart Agriculture Action Plan envisages demand-side incentives the smallholder farmers, such as prizes and certificates to reward increasing farmers’ own production through improved farm practices, or supporting others in their community to adopt them. Once a critical number of farmers have adopted CSA practices it is envisaged that the need for these incentive payments will diminish.

**REDD+**

‘Mozambique, being one of few African countries with a considerable proportion of its area still covered with natural forests, initiated a national REDD+ process in 2008. In a collaboration agreement between the Brazilian Amazonas Sustainable Foundation (FAS) and Ministry for Coordination of Environmental Affairs a National Strategy was prepared and submitted in 2012. (...) This strategy focuses on afforestation and conservation agriculture, and funding is received from the Norwegian and Finnish governments’.


Impact of the policy implementation on the small-scale farmers

There are currently multiple initiatives in the agriculture sector in Mozambique that are intended to build the resilience of smallholder farmers, but these are not well coordinated. There are often overlaps in coverage and poor communication between projects. The result is that lessons are not shared and learned, and synergies are not exploited. There is no structured way that information, analysis and lessons are shared between the multiple actors seeking to build climate resilience into smallholder agricultural systems (WB, 2014,).

**Participatory vulnerability assessments**

As already mentioned, in the context of the preparation of the NAPA, the government conducted a country-wide participative evaluation, covering selected districts across the country, to identify and prioritize adaptation measures to reduce these vulnerabilities. More than one thousand people was interviewed, including community members, local leaders and CSOs.

Access to weather forecast information

There is a noticeable progress in Mozambique in recent years in terms of improving the access to weather forecast information. The National Institute of Meteorology has established regional meteorological centers to improve and deliver weather forecasts and early warning systems at regional level.

With the support of PPCR funds, the hydrometeorological and flood modelling work is jointly being conducted by the Ministry of Public Works and Water Resources and the Ministry of Transport and Communication. More weather forecast centers are now better equipped and technical capacity building has been on going to ensure
that the software and hardware installed in different sites perform more efficiently and therefore weather information services are improved (Climate Change Unit, 2015). Most of this has been possible largely thanks to the World Bank-funded Transforming Hydrological and Meteorological Services Project.

CC extension and research

As already mentioned, in Mozambique, advisory services are trying to keep up in providing appropriate packages that are adapted to the local agro-ecological circumstances and, of increasing importance, climate variability (Cammaer, 2016). Sustainable agricultural approaches, such as CA, are increasingly being promoted through FFS. This provides the necessary flexibility to adapt the initiatives outlined in national policies and strategies to local circumstances and needs. The government-supported FFS are increasingly incorporating new approaches and practices targeted to cope with CC.

Outside of Mozambique CARE has been working with smallholder farmers and has established Farmer Field and Business Schools (FFBS), integrating skills development on marketing, gender and nutrition, and Climate Field Schools, which integrates aspects of climate scenario planning (Cammaer, 2016).

In Mozambique, much of the formal agricultural research is still driven by the priorities of researchers rather than farmers. As a result, it is not adding the value that it could to initiatives attempting to address CC impacts on farming (WB, 2014, 1).

Promotion of drought tolerant crops

Mozambique was one of the targeted countries by the Tolerant Maize for Africa project, funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and implemented by the International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT). The project has developed a total of 160 varieties during the course of seven years (2007-13) (DTMA, 2014).

CIMMYT estimates that in 2013, 102,000 households were benefiting from drought tolerant seeds in Mozambique. A 2016 survey, also by CIMMYT, found that ineffective seed distribution contributed significantly to limiting smallholder access to improved varieties. Additionally, low seed production from the few approved seed companies in the country has worsened the situation due to soaring costs, putting the drought-tolerant varieties beyond the reach of millions of smallholders (CIMMYT, 2017).

Agroforestry

Mozambique was part of the Zambezi Basin Agroforestry project, covering five countries in Southern Africa. After having tested the technologies on-station, participatory research with farmers was initiated. This saw the project scaled up, with knowledge and planting materials more widely disseminated. Since 2013 Mozambique has also been a beneficiary of the Large Evergreen Agriculture Network for Africa, aimed at building research and development capacity and supporting tree seed production by smallholder farmers.

Integrated pest management

Most integrated pest management initiatives in Mozambique are addressed through basic research projects and are concentrated in the central and northern provinces. Ongoing research is trying to develop potential training and education strategies to enhance farmers’ knowledge and overcome constraints to adoption (Silici et al., 2015/Cammaer, 2016).

Conservation agriculture practices

PEDSA sees CA as one of the key strategies to use in arid and semi-arid areas of the country extensively affected by CC. PNISA also recognizes that ‘there is need to develop sustainable production systems capable of doubling output; this requires attacks on all fronts, ecology, soils, agronomy, breeding, farm management, pest management, etc. all in a systematic way which increases the productivity of complex farming systems’. 
Since approval of the PNISA, considerable progress has been made at project level. Thousands of farmers are now adopting CA practices that include zero tillage, and improved soil and moisture management (WB, 2014, 1). As discussed, the Government and several NGOs, including CARE, are promoting CA through technological packages combining technical assistance for existing or new crops and improved varieties of food and cash crops, training of both farmers and advisory staff, and promotion of research and experimentation (Silici et al., 2015/Cammaer, 2016).

However although progress in achieving CA is being made, it is still hampered by smallholder farmers’ poor access to inputs and markets. The involvement and interest of the private sector in marginal areas is limited, although there are a few encouraging reports of successful and locally developed value chains, such as cashew nut (Cammaer, 2016).

Gender mainstreaming

‘Although the existing environmental legislation is conducive for the mainstreaming of climate adaptation, its contribution for mainstreaming a gender perspective into CC adaptation has not been realized’.

Gender and Climate change: Mozambique Case Study Natasha Ribeiro and Aniceto Chautique 2010

CC has disproportionate effects on women and girls in Mozambique, since they are more dependent on natural resources for household and agricultural tasks. Women are responsible for crop production, availability of food and water for the household. As already mentioned, women’s rights and control over natural resources is less than men’s, and they are often underrepresented in decision-making bodies (MER, 2015).

In 2010, the Government of Mozambique approved the Gender, Environment and Climate Change Strategy with the aim of ensuring equality between women and men, and boys and girls, to access and control natural resources, technologies for climate change adaptation and mitigation’. The Gender, Environment and Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan was also adopted in 2010.

This made Mozambique one of the first countries in the world to create such a policy and program for implementation. An ongoing initiative is reviewing implementation progress and updating the plan in line with the National Climate Change Strategy (WB, 2014 1).

Policy monitoring and evaluation

The CCCU has developed the National Monitoring and Evaluation Climate Change Framework, a monitoring and evaluation system for the National Climate Change Strategy, which enables reporting Mozambique’s Council of Ministers on an annual basis (Climate Investment Funds (2012). UMC is currently leading the work on establishment of the baseline figures on CC across government sectors.

The CCCU has also designed a results’ framework to asses on an annual basis each PPCR project is, describing the level of implementation through a scorecard process.

MASA plans that the adoption rates of climate resilient farm practices will be monitored by results indicators designed to track the changes in the number of households using improved, climate resilient farming techniques, and the average maize yields from farms where these techniques are used, but the model is still to be developed.
**Summary and main conclusions**

- The government of Mozambique is strongly committed to tackling CC and has created and strengthened institutions to deal with the climate response.

- Civil society is actively engaged in the CC policy making processes

- Mozambique has been one of the first countries in the world to develop a specific gender and climate change strategy.

- Mozambique is one of the main recipients of international climate funding for adaptation. Country funds for climate change, on the contrary, are very limited.

- There are multiple initiatives in the agriculture sector in Mozambique that are intended to build the resilience of smallholder farmers; conservation agriculture is promoted by the extension system.

- These processes, however, are still hampered by smallholder farmers’ poor access to inputs and markets; actions at field level are often not well coordinated.

- Inadequate supply and inefficient distribution is significantly limiting smallholders’ access to drought tolerant seeds.
Nutrition Policies

International commitments

Mozambique endorsed the **Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)**, committing to eliminate hunger and malnutrition by 2030. The country is party to the **World Health Assembly (WHA)** Global Nutrition Targets (GNTs), which are to be fulfilled by 2025, and has also signed the 1990 **Innocenti Declaration**, which set child survival targets related to breastfeeding.

Mozambique joined the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Movement in 2010. SUN is a global movement that unites national leaders, civil society, bilateral and multilateral organizations, donors, businesses and researchers in a collective effort to improve nutrition and bring more coherence to the nutrition sector.

The country has also signed the **Cooperation Framework to Support the New Alliance for Food Security Nutrition**, committing to mainstream nutrition in all food security and agriculture-related programs.

By adopting the **CADAAP**, Mozambique also committed to address issues related to food security and nutrition and its linkage with agriculture. The **Malabo Declaration** includes also nutrition-related targets.

Nutrition-specific policies

In Mozambique, there has been significant progress in the governance of nutrition issues, through raising the profile of nutrition nationally and putting into place a national framework for action.

The PQG 2015-2019 includes the reduction of stunting as an indicator in the human and social development pillar.

The **Multisectoral Action Plan for the Reduction of Chronic Malnutrition in Mozambique 2012-2020** (PAMRDC) is the main policy document governing nutrition, but it is almost exclusively focused on nutrition-specific interventions.

In the PAMRDC, the Government sets a package of evidence-based interventions that should contribute to reducing chronic under nutrition among under five children from 44% in 2008 to 30% in 2015 and 20% in 2020.

The PAMRDC stresses the need for a multi-sectoral approach to nutrition with a strong focus on decentralization to ensure that nutrition is on the agenda at district and provincial levels and it seeks also to put into practice the necessary co-ordination of nutrition-related activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAMRDC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic objectives and activities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adolescents</strong>: Monitor anemia; reduction early pregnancy (10-19 years); nutritional education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pregnant and lactating women</strong>: Reduced deficiencies in micronutrients and anemia; monitor infections; increase weight gain during pregnancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children below 2 years</strong>: 6 months Exclusive breastfeeding; food supplementation; reduced deficiencies of micronutrients and anemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household-oriented activities</strong>: promotion of locally produced food by the poorest families; better processing and storage of food; access to support services and social protection; food fortification and salt iodification; basic sanitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Resources</strong> capacity in nutrition strengthened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengthen national capacity</strong> for advocacy, coordination, management and progressive implementation of the Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food and nutrition control system strengthened</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agriculture policies and nutrition

Despite these commitments, nutrition is not a strong theme within the agriculture policies in Mozambique: Increasing agricultural wages or yields prevail over nutritional concerns.

**PEDSA** and **PNISA** are clearly focused on productivity, missing the nutrition aspect. In
PEDSA, production diversification is not a priority topic. There is no reference to the need for supporting the improvement of processing and storage to maintaining the nutritional value and safety of the food. PEDSA does not include, neither, specific actions related to improvement of diet nutritional practices (UN System/Standing Committee on Nutrition, 2013).

**Linking agriculture and nutrition**

*The food system [in Mozambique] has high potential to reduce both poverty and food nutrition insecurity. Agricultural productivity appears as one of the important aspects among others, including the productivity of products with high nutritional value.*

*However, the availability of food is not enough to ensure food and nutritional security of families. There is a need to begin to think about the food system along the chain. Conservation, fortification, reduced costs and prices, and diversification of products contribute to a diet more oriented towards food and nutrition security’*

J. Massingue, C. Donovan and J. Garrett
Food availability and quality of diets in Mozambique, 2013

**Institutional set-up**

The Technical Secretary for Food and Nutrition Security (SETSAN) role in ensuring proper planning/co-ordination, budgeting and execution, including monitoring and evaluation and reporting is still not fully functional due to insufficient strategic and managerial capacities at various levels (EU, 2016). In fact, SETSAN lacks the autonomy needed to carry out its functions effectively: It is difficult for SETSAN to ask other ministries to submit reports and be accountable, as the unit is perceived as one of MASA’s subordinate institutions and not as an independent institution. It has been argued that SETSAN would benefit from being an independent institution directly attached to the president or prime minister’s cabinet. (UN Standing Committee on Nutrition, 2013). In fact, the upgrade of SETSAN’s to the status of an Institute for the Promotion of Food Security and Nutrition (IPSAN) is currently being discussed.

SETSAN has been decentralized into the 11 provinces of Mozambique, through provincial technical working groups. Except Maputo and Inhambane, each province has, since 2015, Government-approved activity plans. There is still the need to reinforce the implementation of the plans, through prioritization and proper sequencing of activities in locally established plans (EU, 2016).

SETSAN oversees the Working Group of the PAMRDC. The Working Group is composed of relevant ministries, CSOs and donors and is responsible for the promotion, planning and monitoring of the nutrition plans of the various ministries and for strengthening coordination and accountability (UN Standing Committee on Nutrition, 2013).

The Ministry of Health (MISAU) with its Nutrition Department is the lead body for the delivery of most of the nutrition-specific activities and services. The Ministry of Public Works, Housing and Water Resources is responsible for water resources control and management. The Institute of Social Action (INAS) focuses on consumer protection through food provision and cash transfers to facilitate access to food to the population. Cross-sector coordination for nutrition within the government has achieved only limited success. Each relevant sector ministry and agency has a nutrition focal person who attends planning meetings and promotes nutrition-sensitive programs within his or her own ministry. However, the point person is not usually senior enough to exert influence over sector budgeting in his or her ministry, so coordination is only functional in planning, and not in implementation (Mogues, T and Billings, L. 2015).

**Budgetary commitments**

**National resources**

In Mozambique, the resources that have been allocated from the state budget to strengthen the response to the nutrition commitments are
not adequate (UN, 2015). In fact, only 0.6% of the PNISA budget allocation is foreseen for nutrition activities, creating a total disconnection between the political discourse and what actually is being implemented (Government of Mozambique, 2010).

**The cost of undernutrition**

*The National Multi-Sectoral Plan of Action for the Reduction of Chronic Malnutrition estimates that a reduction in productivity of 2% to 3% of GDP in Mozambique is attributable to chronic undernutrition. This estimate is supported by the 2006 World Bank document “Repositioning Nutrition as Central to Development” that also estimated a risk of losing 2-3% of GDP by not addressing undernutrition.*

**Foreign aid**

There has been a considerable increase in donor attention and a greater flow of resources into Mozambique in support of nutrition in the last years. For the period 2015-2020 the development partners are committed to mobilize approximately US$ 320 million in support of nutrition, most notably from DFID, IrishAid, DANIDA, Netherlands, Spanish Cooperation, the WB, USAID and the UN agencies.

Most of these programmes include a large variety of activities, including not only nutrition-specific actions, but also diversification of production, food fortification and behavior change for dietary diversity.

The donor community in Mozambique appears to have achieved a relatively high level of coordination by forming a **Nutrition Partners’ Forum**. Each province has been “adopted” by a different donor to fund chronic malnutrition reduction activities in alignment with the PAMRDC. Since this coordination is primarily of spatial, it does not prevented donors from each pursuing their own preferred and varying spending modalities, such as allocation of funds through NGOs (such as USAID in Nampula and Zambezia provinces) versus budget support to provincial governments (like DANIDA in Tete and Gaza) (Mogues, T and Billings, L. 2015).

**Nutrition Partners Forum**

*The Nutrition Partners Forum is a coordination mechanism which meets monthly to plan activities and share information, and holds strategic policy dialogue twice a year with the Government. This forum, hosted by SUN donor conveners – is presently lead by IrishAid and USAID (EU, 2016).*

**Transparency and participation in policy making**

Civil society has been engaged in the design of the nutrition-specific policy framework: The government conducted consultations in preparation of the PAMRDC for the Reduction of Chronic Undernutrition, and various NGOs are part of the Working Group of the PAMRDC.

The **SUN Civil Society Network** (SUN-CSN), whose secretariat is currently based at the premises of the Nutrition and Food Security Association (ANSA) supports the advocacy work of civil society to encourage grassroots contributions and promoting right to food (EU, 2016).

However, what seems to be totally missing in Mozambique, is the possibility for the farmers’ organizations to be part of the nutrition policy
dialogue -which is not a surprise, given the little attention to nutrition-sensitive actions in the agriculture policy.

**Monitoring and evaluation**

Impact monitoring and evaluation of the nutrition interventions in Mozambique, is, overall, very weak, especially for government programs (IFPRI, 206). Nutrition surveillance through the health system does not provide sufficient information for program improvement, and the national data bases do not provide timely and disaggregated data to support policy development (UN, 2015).

**Policy implementation**

The fight against chronic malnutrition is high on the national development agenda, but progress has been slow.

**Food-based nutrition education and communication**

### Integration of nutrition into extension

One decade ago, Mozambique witnessed a pioneering example of the integration of nutrition into extension and advisory services: in 2003-2005, pairs of agriculture extension agents and nutrition agents working together sought to increase the production of Orange Fleshed Sweet Potato (OFSP).

These integrated teams taught agricultural concepts to farmer groups, mainly pertaining to production methods, storage, and commercialization, as well as nutrition. 90% of households reached through this intervention adopted OFSP, and children in those households consumed more vitamin A than children in the control group (GFRAS, 2013).

MISAU and various NGOs are undertaking activities related to nutrition education, involving different models, mainly based on the positive influence that mothers have for behavior change in communities designated (mother groups), but the impact of these activities is rather limited.

Probably the only agricultural public program with a strong focus on nutrition is the extension system, and especially when applying participatory and flexible approaches such as the FFS.

**Food diversification**

### Determinants of diversification

A seminal Master Thesis made in 2014 revealed that in Mozambique prices are the strongest determinants of crop diversification. Hence, policies that expand information and market access to isolated farms have the potential to change cropping behaviors.

Households in villages located over 50 kilometers from a paved road are likely to grow fewer total crops than those close to a paved road. This result is inconsistent with the traditional hypothesis that households more isolated from the market tend to have higher levels of diversity to be self-sufficient. The cause of this is because these more isolated farms lack access to information about different crops (Turner, 2014).

Although poorly diversified diets lie at the root of persistently high malnutrition in Mozambique, the ongoing initiatives to promote dietary diversification are still insufficient (UN System/Standing Committee on Nutrition, 2013). In the agricultural programs, there is no prioritization of crops that have a higher nutritional value.

The focus of the agriculture policy is on cash crops and on starchy staple foods, and includes no initiatives to promote dietary diversification. FISP, for instance is strictly focused in maize, while, as already mentioned, 60% of the irrigation investments have been in the sugarcane plantations.

**Food fortification**

Food fortification, including universal salt iodisation, is one of the key interventions in the PAMRDC plan (EU, 2016). The Global
Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN) has been working with the National Committee for Food Fortification in Mozambique (CONFAM) and implementation has made some progress, including the drafting of legislation for mandatory fortification including salt iodisation (still awaiting approval), and proactive engagement with the food processing sector.

Food supplementation

MISAU, through its Nutritional Rehabilitation Program, provides nutritional supplements to those with acute malnutrition. For the treatment of serious acute malnutrition, almost all districts use Plumpy Nut as therapeutically supplement.

The government also recently adopted the Nutritional Rehabilitation Program for the treatment of moderate and severe acute malnutrition (USAID, 2014 1).

School feeding

The School Feeding Program of the Ministry of Education is being implemented with the support of WFP. The program provides a meal with nutritious food, covering the daily recommended needs to ensure that girls do not leave school therefore preventing pregnancies and early marriages (Government of Mozambique, 2010).

Water, Sanitation and Hygiene

Poor water/sanitation remains an important contributor to chronic undernutrition in Mozambique. Only 55% of all households had access to clean drinking water in 2013, with only 48% of rural households having access compared to 85% of urban households (EU, 2016). There is a strong link between WASH and nutrition. Nutrition goes hand in hand with hygiene and hygienic conditions of food preparation (CARE 2014 b).

The 1995 National Water Policy and the national Water Development Program allowed transfer of operational responsibilities for water supply to private companies. The policy focuses on urban areas, with weak attention on rural areas.

The World Bank estimates that up to 35% of rural systems are not working at any one time due to a limited capacity. Sustainability is, in fact, the biggest weakness in Mozambique’s donor-financed water and sanitation sector interventions. A recent study for JICA suggests that many projects constructed as recently as two years ago, are already broken (USAID, no date).

Social protection policies and nutrition

In 2007 the Social Protection Law was adopted which has set the legal and institutional framework with broad social components (social, health, education and social inclusion). This was followed with a new regulatory framework in 2009 and more precise definition of the components were included in the 2010 National Strategy for Basic Social Security (ENSBB). The ENSBB was expanded in 2011 into a comprehensive social safety net that formed the Strategic Operational Plan for Basic Social Security programs. This process has been accompanied with scaling up spending significantly; it has risen from around US$ 13 million in 2008 to US$ 57 million in 2013 (ILO, 2015). UNICEF estimates that INAS programs are covering 15% of the poor households in Mozambique (UNICEF, 2015).

Out of the various social protection schemes implemented in Mozambique as part of this comprehensive policy, the Food Subsidy Program (Programa Subsidio de Alimentos, PSA) is specifically designed to target food insecurity and malnutrition.

In fact, PSA is one of oldest Sub-Saharan Africa’s governmental non-contributory cash transfers: It was launched in the 1990s. PSA is
a large unconditional cash transfer program, co-funded by the government and donors (DFID, Netherlands), although government ownership of the PSA does not seem to be a problem (DIE, 2016).

The program targets extremely poor households in which no adult can work (households headed by the elderly or by persons with disabilities). The PSA is, in fact, in line with government’s commitment to ensure a basic minimum standard of living for the most marginalized groups in society (Overseas Development Institute, 2013).

The regular monthly transfer is intended to be used to buy food. In 2008 the subsidy scale was increased to US$ 3.6, and the additional benefit for dependents increased to US$ 1.80 per dependent up to four (FAO, 2016). Still, no subsequent updates took place.

It was supposed to pay 30% of minimum wage. However, not only was the minimum wage not updated in the following years but, more importantly, there was a high rate of inflation, thus significantly reducing the transfer size, which became too low (DIE, 2016).

Despite this, PSA is considered a major success and amongst the best cash transfer program, in Sub-Saharan Africa outside South Africa (DIE, 2016). A 2010 independent evaluation indicated that the it had a large, positive effect on food expenditure and the number of meals consumed (Veras Soares and Teixeira, 2010). The program has also contributed to significantly reduce under 5 years old wasting (DIE, 2016).

### Summary and main conclusions

- Fight against chronic malnutrition is high on the national development agenda: The PAMRDC sets a package of well-defined evidence-based interventions.

- However, nutrition is not a strong theme within the agriculture policies, whose focus is mainly on augmenting production, not on improving food diversity and promoting better diets.

- Cross-sector coordination for nutrition requires improvements. SETSAN needs more autonomy to carry out its functions more effectively.

- Civil society is engaged in the nutrition-specific policy making, mainly via the SUN Civil Society Network. Farmers’ organizations, on the contrary, have a limited say in the nutrition policies.

- Mozambique is only allocating 0.6% of its own budget for nutrition.

- Most of the nutrition programs are funded by the donors, each of them following their own aid delivery methods in the areas where they operate.

- Thanks to these donor-funded programs, there is limited progress in nutrition-specific topics such as food fortification, food supplementation and school feeding.

- The WASH policy for rural areas is weak and the investments poorly maintained.

- The Food Subsidy Program, which is the country’s main social protection intervention with a nutrition focus, is a major success and has reduced children’s wasting.
## FNS global policy framework:
Mozambique performance and ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global and regional FNS policies</th>
<th>Performance (source, year)</th>
<th>Adoption/ownership Government and CSOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Past commitments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG #1 (1990) By 2015...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halve poverty</td>
<td>33% reduction (ReSAKSS, 2015)</td>
<td>Adopted, owned and fulfilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halve proportion of people with hunger</td>
<td>55% reduction (FAO, 2015)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Food Summit (1996) By 2015...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halve number of people with hunger</td>
<td>10% reduction (FAO, 2015)</td>
<td>Not adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maputo Declaration/NEPAP/CAADP (2003)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAIP technical review conducted</td>
<td>Yes (2014)</td>
<td>Limited follow-up/engagement by CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6% annual agriculture GDP growth</td>
<td>12.18% (ReSAKSS, 2015)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% budget for agriculture</td>
<td>12% (ReSAKSS, 2015)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SADC Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan.</strong> By 2015...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase cereal yield to 2 Tons/hectare</td>
<td>1 Tons/hectare (WB, 2012)</td>
<td>Little ownership by Gov and CSOs, and no consistent follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily per capita dietary 2,700 kcal</td>
<td>2,180 (GNR, 2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halve proportion of people with hunger</td>
<td>55% reduction (FAO, 2015)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On-going commitments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG #2 (2015) By 2030...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End hunger and malnutrition</td>
<td>Too early to assess</td>
<td>High ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Health Assembly Global Nutrition Targets (2012). By 2025...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% reduction stunted children</td>
<td>Off course (GNR, 2016)</td>
<td>Both Government and CSO owned the targets, mainly thanks to the SUN Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% reduction anemia women</td>
<td>Off course (GNR, 2014)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% increase breastfeeding rate</td>
<td>On course (GNR, 2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% reduction childhood wasting</td>
<td>On course (GNR, 2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scaling Up Nutrition -SUN.</strong> By 2020...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringing people together</td>
<td>78% (SUN, 2016)</td>
<td>High Gov and CSOs ownership but limited funds' allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherent policy and legal framework</td>
<td>63% (SUN, 2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Results Framework</td>
<td>57% (SUN, 2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial tracking / mobilization</td>
<td>39% (SUN, 2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comitting to Child Survival</strong> By 2035...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce under 5 mortality to 20/1,000</td>
<td>87/1000 (WHO, 2013)</td>
<td>More commitment needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nutrition for Growth (N4G) London Summit.</strong> By 2023...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% reduction stunted children</td>
<td>Off course (GNR, 2016)</td>
<td>No ownership by Gov on fund allocations. Very limited advocacy by CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30/child nutrition budget increase</td>
<td>Off course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% annual increase nutrition budget</td>
<td>Off course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Malabo Declaration (2014).</strong> By 2025...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% agriculture productivity increase</td>
<td>On course</td>
<td>Ownership still limited. Some indicators not tracked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% post-harvest loses decrease</td>
<td>Not tracked; clearly off course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% reduction stunted children</td>
<td>Off course (GNR, 2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% underweight reduction</td>
<td>On course (GNR, 2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% contrib. of agr. to poverty reduction</td>
<td>Not tracked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6% Annual agricultural GDP growth</td>
<td>12.18% (ReSAKSS, 2015)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 PPP agriculture VCs established</td>
<td>Not tracked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% households resilient to shocks</td>
<td>Not tracked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nairobi COP 11 Decision (2005)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce NAPA</td>
<td>Produced (2008)</td>
<td>Strong ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cancun Adaptation Framework (2010)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation to be addressed as priority</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Strong ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paris Agreement (2016)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote greater resilience</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Strong ownership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Main conclusions

1. The main goal of the agriculture policies in Zimbabwe is to augment yields and production, with a strong emphasis in promoting large agribusiness investments. These large-scale investments, often allied with local leaders, are causing negative economic, social and environmental impacts in the communities, affecting mainly the women and poor farmers.

2. In Mozambique, there is a well-established network of farmers’ organizations advocating for farmers’ rights, and there are spaces open for participation of the civil society in the agriculture policy making.

3. Mozambique is fulfilling the CAADP commitment of allocating 10% of the budget to agriculture. The donors are also providing substantial support to the sector.

4. The country has been a pioneer in promoting participatory approaches in the advisory services for the farmers, and conservation agriculture is officially promoted by the extension services. However, other programs, such as agricultural research, input subsidies, or irrigation, are not designed to tackle the needs of the small-scale farmers’.

5. The government of Mozambique is strongly committed to climate change and has created and strengthened institutions to deal with the climate response. The civil society is actively engaged in the climate policy making processes, and Mozambique has been one of the first countries in the world to develop a specific gender and climate change strategy.

6. Mozambique is one of the main recipients of international climate funding for adaptation. Country funds for climate change, on the contrary, are very limited, and there are multiple initiatives in the agriculture sector in that are intended to build the resilience of smallholder farmers. These processes, however, are still hampered by smallholder farmers’ poor access to inputs and markets, and actions at field level are often not well coordinated.

7. Fight against chronic malnutrition is high on the national development agenda, but most of the policies and programs are focus on nutrition-specific interventions. Nutrition is not a strong theme within the agriculture policies, whose focus is mainly on augmenting production. Cross-sector coordination for nutrition requires improvements.

8. Mozambique’s is only allocating 0,6% of its own budget for nutrition, but thanks to donor-funded programs, there is limited progress in nutrition-specific topics, like food fortification or school feeding. The Food Subsidy Program is a major success. A nutrition-sensible WASH policy is missing.
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CARE International in Mozambique Program Strategy 2014-2020
Program Objectives

Based on the analysis of poverty and vulnerabilities in Mozambique - and on CARE’s own organizational history and capacity both locally and globally - the organization will focus on three program objectives toward achievement of its two strategic impact goals. These three interdependent and complementary objectives form a coherent program that is sufficiently flexible to anticipate and respond to new developments across the humanitarian-to-development spectrum. Initiatives and activities under each objective will be undertaken in full collaboration with stakeholders and partners at all levels.

As strategic partnerships are cultivated and as events transpire and lessons emerge, CARE will adjust its initiatives as necessary and/or design new ones, all the while maintaining focus on and long-term commitment to its primary impact groups and strategic impact goals, contributing to greater food and nutrition security.

Objective 1: Enhanced productivity, adaptive capacity and resilience of women and girls dependent on land and natural resources.

To achieve this objective, specific initiatives will be undertaken with and by partners to achieve:

- Increased adoption of more sustainable, productive, equitable and resilient (SuPER) natural resource-based livelihood strategies
- More pro-poor, pro-women market-oriented approaches
- Greater diversification of the livelihood base, with emphasis on more dignified work for women
- Strengthened land and natural resource rights for women
- Expanded access to key inputs and services: e.g., community-based financial services; early childhood development services; water, sanitation and hygiene in both long term and emergency programs; emergency shelter; and social protection schemes

-All interventions under this objective are nutrition sensitive.

Objective 2: Women and girls are empowered to exercise their rights and influence decisions in the private and public spheres.

CARE will collaborate with its partners to propel important changes such as:

- Women and girls empowered to claim and exercise their rights
- Increased women’s and girls’ leadership in governance and in political spaces
- Greater access to non-formal education opportunities
- Increased mobilization against traditional practices harmful to women and girls
- Exemplary male leadership on gender transformative development Improved intra-household gender relations and more equitable control for women over household productive assets.

Objective 3: CARE and civil society partners are empowered to promote transformative, rights-based development at scale.

In support of the third program objective, specific initiatives will be undertaken to achieve the following:

- Improved organizational and institutional capacity of civil society partners
- Improved knowledge management on the part of civil society partners
- Strengthened individual organizational advocacy capacity for the rights and interests of women and girls
- Strengthened collective advocacy and networking capacity for the rights and interests of women and girls.
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CARE Mozambique Advocacy Strategy 2017-2020
Summary

Advocacy strategy rationale

Influencing policy and its implementation is a key strategy to multiply the impact of CARE’s programs and is mission critical for achieving the organization national and regional goals. Through advocacy, CARE can influence the enabling environment for small-scale food producers and women as well as policies that support the scale up of SuPER food and agriculture systems. CARE will hold governments accountable to close the implementation gap on numerous policy and investment commitments the government of Mozambique has made at national, regional and global levels that can dramatically reduce food and nutrition insecurity and vulnerability.

Goals and Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Objective 1: Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government policies, plans and budgets at district, province and national levels are implemented in ways that enable the scaling up of gender-transformative, climate-resilient and nutrition approaches to increase the food and nutrition security of vulnerable groups, with a focus on women and girls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 2: CR agriculture</th>
<th>By 2020, the government address critical and gendered barriers to access to &amp; adoption of climate-resilient agriculture practices and approaches.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 3: Nutrition</td>
<td>By 2020, MASA, MISAU and the Ministry of Education at the local level have developed and integrated nutrition-sensitive and nutrition-specific intervention approaches, with a focus on women and girls.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advocacy Targets

Advocacy will target and influence district, province and national processes on agriculture development, climate investment and nutrition, ensuring that government commitments and action at national, regional, pan-Africa and global level translate in improved food and nutrition security, with a focus on women and girls.

Key national policies, strategies and plans which CARE seeks to leverage and influence include: PQG, PEDSA, PNISA and PAMRDC.

CARE will support government authorities with the effective implementation of national policy frameworks including its alignment with regional and global commitments, especially: 2003 Maputo & 2014 Malabo Declarations; UNFCCC Nationally Determined Contributions, particularly related to agriculture and adaptation; 2030 SDGs; and SUN Commitments and WHA Nutrition targets.

Advocacy Approaches: Evidence, Allies and Partners, and Capacity

CARE will leverage the following:

- **Evidence** drawn from programs, research, and partnerships.

- **Partnerships and alliances** with INGOs, research institutions, policy organizations, local CSOs, women’s, and farmers’ organizations; and existing networks and platforms, like the SUN Movement.

- **Capacity building** to enable greater country office engagement with governments and civil society.
Advocacy Results

Objective 1: Governance

Result 1.1. MASA and the MIGECAS ensure the fulfilment of the 30% quota of women participation in decision-making processes and budget discussions on gender, nutrition and food security at district, province and national level, including at leadership positions so that women are also able to influence the agenda, discussions and decisions.

Result 1.2. The Parliament (Assambleia da República), MASA, MIGECAS and MF collaborate to ensure effective and transparent planning and allocation of financial resources that prioritize women small-scale food producers and make available information on budget allocations disaggregated by gender as per the different phases of public information established by the Information Law.

Result 1.3. MASA, MEF, Council of Ministers and 2nd Commission (Plan and Budget) and 5th Agriculture Economy and Environment) of the Assembly of the Republic, ensure alignment of agriculture policies, plans and budgets at all levels with the agriculture calendar for proper financial planning and to ensure current situation of underspent is addressed.

Objective 2: CR agriculture

Result 2.1 Each district has, at least 1 MASA technician who supports women extension workers in the area for the adoption of climate-resilient agriculture practices by women small-scale food producers.

Result 2.2 Public extension approaches priorities the introduction and utilization of leguminous and dark green leaves crops adapted to climate change with high nutritional value for pregnant women and children under 2 and improved access to such extension services for women small-scale food producers during key stages (when preparing land; seed acquisition; planting and post-harvest) at least 3 times each cycle through the updating of the agricultural extension curriculum with an increase of women extension workers (focus on Inhambane e Nampula)

Result 2.3. SDAEs work with the private sector to improve access of extension services (seeds, irrigation and technology) for small-scale food producers, with a focus on women.

Result 2.4. MITADER (national level) and SDAE (provincial level) ensure that customary land rights are effectively protected with effective and transparent community consultation for any matters related to land allocation and registry in the Land Registry of customary land rights of vulnerable communities, including women small-scale producers.

Objective 3: Nutrition

Result 3.1. The 20% school curricula of local content includes nutrition, sexual and reproductive health education so that girls between 10 and 15 years attending school in rural areas know their rights on this area.

Result 3.2. The Ministry of Health, through their provincial directorates and district services from Nampula and Inhambane, assume responsibility for resource allocation and implementation of the approved PAMRDC (Multisectoral Action Plan to Reduce Chronic Malnutrition).

Result 3.3. The Ministry of Health in collaboration with MEF, through its Provincial Directorates and District Services, facilitates and guarantees the integration of PAMRDC in the district plans and budgets actions for its effective implementation.
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Indicators for assessing and comparing how agricultural policies, strategies and plans target the most vulnerable smallholder farmers

1. An explicit definition of smallholder farmers, taking into account their heterogeneity and vulnerability
2. A clear goal targeting smallholder farmers.
3. Clear identification of the government and other actors’ roles to meet smallholder needs.
4. The promotion of inter-sectorial coordination and collaboration.
5. The promotion of intra-sectorial coordination and collaboration.
6. Clear system of monitoring and evaluation with some indicators on smallholder farmers.
7. Considers local specificities (local knowledge, attitudes and practices).
8. Considers the different agro-ecological regions.
9. Is sensitive to gender issues and promotes the empowerment of women through special focus on women smallholders.
10. Promotes sustainable agricultural practices, with a particular focus on climate resilience.
11. Promotes access of agricultural technologies to smallholder farmers through quality extension services.
12. Encourages research focused on developing new knowledge, practices and technologies adapted to vulnerable smallholder needs.
13. Promotes access to credit and financing for smallholder farmers.
14. Encourages conservation/storage, processing and the access to markets for smallholder food production.

Source: CARE & ActionAid, 2015
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