mer

Netherlands Commission for
Environmental Assessment

Advice on Phase 1 Products Zambezi Multi–Sector Agenda/SEA/PEOTT

Memorandum by the NCEA

MOZAMBIQUE

14 November 2014

Advice of the Secretariat

To	Zambezi Valley Agency, UATA
Attn	Mr Roberto Mito, Ms Helena Ribeiro
From	The Netherlands Commission for Environmental Assessment, the NCEA
Date	14 November 2014
Subject	**Advice on Phase 1 Products Zambezi Multi-Sector Agenda/SEA/PEOTT**
	By: the Secretariat of the Netherlands Commission for Environmental Assessment – Mr Reinoud Post/Ms Ineke Steinhauer, with the NCEA expert input from Mr Roel Slootweg
	Advice 2014-18

Table of Contents

ANNEXES

1. Guião de produtos
2. NCEA's observations on Final Inception Report
3. Detailed observations on AAE
4. Detailed observations on Multi-Sector Plan
5. Detailed observations on Modelo Digital
6. Detailed observations on PEOT

1. Introduction

Under the Terms of Reference for the Netherlands Commission for Environmental Assessment (NCEA) concerning involvement in the Zambezi SEA/MultisectorAgenda/PEOTT/Digital Model (signed March 2014) the NCEA received a request from the UATA (the technical and administrative support unit of ZVDA and MICOA).
The request was made because the TPF consortium has made available the deliverables as part of phase 1 of the Zambezi Multi-sector Agenda/SEA/PEOTT, through posting these online (digital platform) on 29 September, 2014.

On 8 October, UATA gave background information on the state of affairs of the work done by TPF including some of their concerns, and requested the NCEA's opinion on the products made available in this phase. UATA explained that these products are crucial to define the subsequent phases and that therefore the NCEA's opinion, agreement and guidance would be important to UATA. No clear deadlines were given to the NCEA to send its comments to UATA, but given the fact that UATA and the TPF team would be visiting a series of districts in the second half of October, the NCEA proposed to give its comments early November.

2. NCEA involvement since kick-off

On 25 March 2014, the Kick off meeting for the Zambezi (MSP/SEA/PEOTT and MD) was attended by NCEA. Thereafter, UATA asked the NCEA support on quality checks of several versions of the Inception report, documented in two Advisory report of the NCEA secretariat (May Advice 2014-05 and June Advice 2014-06). The Inception Report was finalized early July and Mr Roberto Mito (ZVDA) briefly visited the NCEA in July to give an up-date on TPF progress. In August-September, Mrs Helena Ribeiro (UATA coordinator) informed the NCEA again on progress. Through Mrs Celia Jordao, Netherlands Embassy, the NCEA received TPF's latest progress report (nr. 6).

3. Overview of progress since Inception Report

In July, Mr Roberto Mito met with TPF to express his concerns about the development of the activities. TPF was asked to speed up project development and four issues of particular concern have been discussed, namely the need to:
- perform site visits as soon as possible to those districts which would be difficult to visit when the raining season starts;
- catch up the delay (more than 2 months) in handing in the deliverables which were to be made available by TPF;
- respect the deadlines in the Contract and,
- implement decisions taken, in a meeting that took place in Tete, between UATA and TPF.
For the capacity building activities, specific preparatory meetings between UATA and TPF were requested as well as full time permanency in the study area of a TPF team, led by a technical facilitator (coordinator of one of the 4 components).

Currently, UATA is analysing the products received in the framework of the Contrato CGC 13.1. (p. 37). According to that Contract, the following products corresponding to 'parcela nr. 3' needed to be ready:

- 3.3 Relatorio de diagnostico ambiental, Social e economico AAE/PM/PEOT
- 3.4 Inventario dos Instrumentos legais AAE/PM/PEOT
- 3.5 Cenario de referencia e visao futura + indicadores de Sustentabilidade para a zona de Intervencao
- 3.6 Matriz de consistencia atraves da sobreposicao dos cenarios sectoriais
- 3.7 Avaliacao de impactos estrategicos do cenario de referencia

TPF has posted the following documents online:

PM: Sumário Executivo
        Tomo 1– Quadro Estratégicco e Legal en Diagnóstico Ambiental
        Tomo 2 – Diagnóstico Social e Económico
        Tomo 3 – Síntese de Diagnóstico e Definicão Preliminar de Cenários
AAE: Relatório de Definicão de Ambito de AAE e Diagnóstico Ambiental
PEOT: Relatório de Caracterizão Territorial e Diagnóstico Provincial
MD: Aceitacão do Levantamento de Requisitos

Because these 7 documents do not precisely correspond to the products that had to be delivered according to the Contract, TPF has made a Guide indicating how to interpret the deliverables as part of phase 1. This has been done through a so-called Matriz de Correspondencia of which the NCEA received a copy on 27 October (Annex 1 to this Advice). The aim is to facilitate better understanding of the Expected Products as defined in the Contract and the content of each of the 7 products put on-line by TPF.

UATA also explained that Delivirable no. 3.6. 'Matrix de consistencia[…]' was not yet ready and was to be expected by 31 October (not yet received). In the Guide made by TPF, it was explained that this product would be part of their phase 2 activities according to their workplan.

4.   The NCEA's review approach

In the next chapters, the NCEA gives its preliminary findings. These are the joint observations on the documents by the NCEA technical secretaries Reinoud Post and Ineke Steinhauer. Because of the enormous volume of the 7 products to be reviewed, the NCEA invited Mr Roel Slootweg to assist in this task. Mr Slootweg is well informed on SEA practice in Mozambique and is also acquainted with the Zambezi Multi-Sector Agenda/SEA/PEOTT process.

The NCEA used the Final Inception Report as well as the 'Cronograma' as a review framework.
- As a first step, the NCEA had a look at the Final Inception Report to check whether it had incorporated UATA comments (summarized in 'Parecer') and the NCEA comments (summarized in Advisory report nr. 2014-06). The NCEA noticed that the Final Inception Report addresses a great amount of observations made by UATA/NCEA. The chapters on SEA and MSP have been adapted/extended. The chapters on the MD and PEOTT remain without changes. Annex 2 summarizes the parts from the NCEA's advice which had not

(yet) been given follow-up and still remain issues of concern. These observations have been used while reviewing the 7 documents.
- Secondly, the NCEA took notice of UATA's concerns amongst which e.g. TPF's insufficient physical presence in the Zambezi Valley. This concern is particularly relevant for the vision and the sector-scenario's for instance. The former has to be the result of consultation and negotiation processes with national and regional authorities. The lattter have to be the result of a consultation and negotiation process with the sector itself and important sectors being responsible for the implementation of the scenarios. The NCEA has therefore not only looked at quality and completeness of the 7 documents, but also checked whether these participatory processes have taken place and whether and how these have been documented in the various reports.

The main observations are presented in Chapter 5 below. Annexes 3-6 give detailed observations for each of the 7 products. Chapter 6 provides some concluding remarks and suggestions for the way forward.

5. Main observations on the Phase 1 products

Each of the sections below starts with a general concluding remark, illustrated with examples from the documents.

No analysis of data to create relevant information for the MSP/SEA/PEOTT nor MD

Conclusion: the overall impression after reading the documents is that a great effort has been invested in the collection of existing data, probably through internet search in publicly available documents. A large number of pages is filled with these data. However, a critical analysis what all this information means for the Zambeze region is lacking. In other words, while the reader is swamped by an enormous amount of data, the consultant hardly provides information relevant for the planning process. Clearly, no scoping has taken place of the data needs of the various elements in the planning process (Multi-sector plan, Strategic Environmental Assessment and PEOTT).
What the provided information actually means for the Zambeze region, and what the relative importance of certain topics is, remains unclear. This is exemplified by the presentation of the information being a mix of regional and national information. The reports do not make an attempt to sort out the information for the Zambeze region; the available information appears to be simply copy-pasted into the reports.
Furthermore, there is no evidence of on-the-ground verification of the information, either through fields visits or through consultation with stakeholders. Paper realities don't necessarily refer to real life.

Examples:
- Chapter 3.1 of the SEA provides a long list of public and private institutions and other interested parties, without any indication of their linkages to the planning process, their mandates, etc. It may seem obvious that some authorities have a greater role to play than others. Supposedly some kind of agreement has to be made who will represent government in this process since it is impossible to involve all of them.

- Chapter 3.2 of the SEA deals with public governance in general terms, applicable to any African country and beyond. The link to the present plan is not obvious. What can be expected from government, what cannot, how does the team address these obstacles in practise?
- Summary P. 11 of the MSP: soil degradation is causing people to leave their grounds; no indication in what soils and where.
- Summary Figure 7 & 8 of MSP: why the entire country? Focus on Zambeze.
- Tomo 1: Chapter 3 of MSP. Strategic and legal setting: 16 page overview of national and sector policies and legislation. No conclusions nor indication what all of this implies for the Multisector Plan.
- Tomo 1: Chapter 4 of MSP: Environmental overview of present situation: 120 pages overview of environmental information. No explanation on where and how this information has to fit. Why these issues were chosen as relevant is not explained.
- Tomo 1: Annex 1 of MSP: 79 pages with a species list with IUCN status! Without site specification. No relevance.
- Tomo 1: Annex 2 of MSP: actual land use per district; what is provided is land cover.
- Tomo 1: Figures annex of MSP: beautiful maps, but no idea what their relevance is. Often the use of similar colours makes it impossible to distinguish between categories in the legend.
- Tomo 2: 1.1 – 1.3 of MSP. Administrative boundaries (again!) and more information per district. Relevant policies and legislation. Poverty indices, education, gender, even an overview per district of construction materials used for houses. Why all these data?
- Tomo 2: In the MSP only one section (transport) has a 'Conclusions' section with generalising remarks that could be used to convey the message to further stages in the planning process.
- Tomo 2: The sheer amount of pages in the MSP makes it questionable whether the information will ever be used.
- Tomo 3: Chapter 2 of MSP provides development perspectives derived from the National Development Strategy, Agenda 2025, sector policies, and information from Tomo 1 and 2. In spite of the enormous amount of information available, the language is very generic and does not specify any concrete actions. On agriculture for instance, only 6 lines can be found.
- Tomo 3: Chapter 4 of MSP: Social and economic projection for 30 years ahead, developed for each sector. PEOT provides the visions, identical to the development perspectives from Chapter 2 (?). That's all – 2 pages. A few lines are provided on the potential impact of climate change. This is not what one would call a projection. It is a repetition of vision statements; a projection should contain more calculated information, for example on population and economic growth. Climate change is serious matter, especially in areas vulnerable to cyclones and inundations. Any projections and plans on that?
- Tomo 3 Chapter 6 of MSP: Characterisation and diagnosis of the economy, for Mozambique in the world, for provinces in Mozambique, and for districts in Zambezi. How does this relate to the 200+ pages on economy in Tomo 2? Market potential per capita is presented for entire Mozambique.

Absence of a clear methodology

Conclusion: the documents lack a clear work vision and linked methodology. It remains largely unclear why certain choices have been made; neither is it clear how the different documents are linked and feed into each other. No attempts have been made nor guidance provided on how to focus the planning process on the most relevant issues and provide what is minimally necessary for a good process. In a country with weak institutions and limited implementation capacity a focus on the most relevant issues is a first priority for any planning and assessment process. A concluding statement at the end of each section on what the presented information means for the region and/or for the planning process would help immensely.

Examples:

- Chapter 4.2.2 of SEA makes an inventory of visions of 10 sectors, but is remains unclear on what grounds these sectors are selected as the ones considered relevant for evaluation?
- Chapter 5 of SEA: Baseline situation for 10 sectors plus 6 new ones. Not clear why these have been added here and why? This raises the question for example, haven't any policies and investments been foreseen for disaster risk reduction and pollution control?
- Tomo 2, Chapter 1.4-1.7 of MSP shows inconsistencies in analysis: for the livestock sector a SWOT analysis is presented, which sounds relevant for the MSP. For other sectors this SWOT is lacking (supposedly as it didn't occur in the literature).
- Tomo 3 of PM starts with a summary analysis of main environmental problems, sensitivities and opportunities. It contains 10 annexes containing sector profiles. It is unclear how these relate to the information provided in Tomo 1 and 2. Neither is clear why these problem tables are called environmental, while it is based on environmental, social and economic analysis. The tables are clear and provide good summary information per sector. Opportunities are clearly linked to legal or policy incentives. These tables could replace most of the preceding information as it sets the stage for planning.
- PM Tomo 3, 7.1 to 7.4 is a general introduction to ecosystem services valuation. 7.5 indicates how values are obtained. Then it stops. No analysis has been done. The choice of ecosystem services is not explained. Loads of sectoral information has already been provided, while ecosystem services valuation by definition deals with the use of natural resources by economic sectors and society. It is the link between environment and human activities and can serve as a structuring framework to provide information in a coherent manner. This is not done. Any methodological considerations are lacking. It leaves the reader in bewilderment. The reliability of figures from economic valuation of ecosystem services in areas where people live of subsistence farming can be questioned. The text is generic and doesn't say anything about the study area except for a table of some non-explained ecosystem services.
- In the Modelo Digital document there is no explanation on what kind of information would minimally be needed from the perspective of the end users, and what data actually are available and accessible.

Double work

Conclusion: the different reports have not been designed in a way that they reinforce each other. They appear to have been elaborated independently, sometimes borrowing large sections from one of the other processes, sometimes collecting the same information twice, but presenting it in a different manner. This results in repetitions of information (e.g. environmental risk pictures have been presented four times in MSP and SEA), or in inconsistent provision of similar information.

Examples:
- Introduction of SEA: one of the aspects is the analysis of social, economic and environmental aspects of the region. Why having hundreds of pages in the MSP on the same topic?
- Chapter 2 (P. 21) of SEA: the objective is to create a territorial frame integrating social, economic and environmental aspects. This is similar to what has been done in the MSP.
- SEA Chapter 4 on Visions and investments: repetitive from MSP. On national level; no information whatsoever how this relates to the planning area. What is the relevance of this information for the plan?. What conclusions can be drawn from all this information?
- Chapter 4.2.1 of SEA: Identification of legal instruments that determine the sector investments, incl. 3 tables: table 6: cross-cutting themes, table 7 per sector and table 8 international protocols and conventions signed by Mozambique. Again, similar information is provided in MSP. Recommendation: make 1 document with legal and regulatory framework, including implications/conditions for AAE/MSP and PEOT, to be used by each of the components.
- Chapter 4 of Tomo 1 MSP: Again as of p. 150-177 Polucao....Vulnerabilidades: Largely overlapping with p. 120-139 of AAE. Also chapter 5.1 of AAE seems to be summary of Chapter 4 of MSP.
- Chapter 2 of Tomo 1 MSP: administrative boundaries: similar to inception report and SEA (and repeated again in Tomo 2).
- Chapter 1.4 – 1.7 of Tomo 2 MSP Overview of information on all economic sectors: repetitive information, such as climatic risks occurring in both Tomo 1 and 2;
- It is not clear whether all information provided in the documents is integrated in and/or generated by the Modelo Digital. It is neither clear how continuous updating of information will be organised.

Completeness / functionality of the Digital model

Conclusion: from the Levantamento de Requisitos (phase 1 document on the Digital Model) and the web based facilities actually available, the NCEA cannot conclude that the proposed model complies with the model as intended by the Terms of Reference.

- The Terms of Reference for the Digital Model (February–March 2013) specify that the model should include the following submodels: Traffic model, Air pollution model, Hazardous substances deposition model (for nature reserves, health, groundwater [flows], fish, soil), Energy models, Agricultural models, Cost Benefit model (eco-system services based), Fisheries model, Tourism model, Conservation model, Family income model). These models must calculate and geographicly present the consequences (in a dynamic way over a 30 year timestretch) of the individual sector scenarios, the common scenario (multisector agenda) and finally the PEOTT.
- From the documentation and the web-site in its present form the NCEA cannot conclude that the Digital Model presently under development will have these functionalities.

Process: no sign of local presence nor input

Conclusion: chapter 8 of the MSP deals with design of sector and participatory workshops to verify the information provided in the report and to communicate the results of the spatial plan (PEOT). Public involvement appears to be at the end of phases, so only to verify what has been produced. This is contradictory to good practise planning, especially in developing countries. A focus on issues that are considered important by stakeholders (public participation in scoping) provides clarity on where to invest limited time and resources. Normally one would expect participatory workshops and field trips prior to the data collection effort in order to provide input in / guidance for work ahead.

Examples:
- The SEA Section 5.2: "problems, sensitivities and opportunities" provides relevant information. It is nevertheless unclear how this is derived from all the other information. This is the relevant part for SEA. Yet, there is no information on the relative importance of each sector and each issue within a sector.
- Section 5.3.1 of the SEA: for each of the 16 sectors/themes an inventory is made of gaps in information and recommendations for how to bridge these. Makes sense. Recommendations depend on what the MSP considers important sectors and where according to PEOT activities will be implemented. If one wants to implement all recommendations (>60) we need two more years of study. Example: do a census on elephants in Tete. It is the SEA that should come up with proxis that can be used. For example ask local residents on wildlife conflicts. Is a rapid manner to map problem areas. Another example clarifies that the authors of the report have a European view on issues. The recommendation is to make the cadastre up to date. Such a suggestion would take 10 years in an African context. It all sounds like a desk study without having had any feet on the ground in the plan region. It remains unclear what needs to be done with all these recommendations.

- Chapter 5.4 of SEA: cause effect chains for sector problems: no information on the severity and localization of each of the problems. It is all textbook knowledge; no links to the actual region.
- Chapter 6 of the SEA: Critical issues for decision makers usually encompass a maximum of 7 clearly defined and demarcated issues and not 25 with about 120 indicators. Furthermore, these criteria have to be defined in close consultation with formal decision making authorities and stakeholders through a scoping procedure.
- Modelo Digital: It is not clear to what level the end users in Mozambique have been involved in this definition phase. There has been an analysis of existing procedures and software available at relevant departments, concluding that nothing similar to the proposed functionality is available. P. 9 describes that all project team members have contributed to a common vision and that requirements have been defined. But there is no information on the role of the end users.
- Yet, three capacity development workshops have been held in three provinces. If the participants had some background in the field, the training programme is relevant and to the point. The impression is that the instrument has been developed already; the training workshops were aimed at transferring operational skills to local officials. It is difficult to understand why this report is called analysis of requirements of the model, if the model is already operational and people can be trained to use it?

6.   Concluding remarks and way forward

The phase 1 documents are intended to assist decision making in a country with limited staff capacity and resources. The present documents do not help. A focus on the main issues would help enormously. Concluding statements at the end of each section on what the information means for the plan would enhance the readability of the documents.
Below, the NCEA provides a overview of the essence of the information that the MSP and SEA should generate, and challenges TPF to provide a summary of information and conclusions reached so far for each of the steps spelled out below:

- Setting the geographical and time boundaries and describing the political and legal context. This can be done based on the Phase 1 documents. Relevant national laws and policies, and international treaties and agreements have already been exhaustively inventoried but need an additional effort to determine the boundaries and conditions within which the planning process has to take place. It would be usefull to also have a look at policy coherence.

- Identifying the 'business as usual' scenario: what environmental, social and economic development is expected without a multi-sector development plan. This scenario is intended to form the basis for a comparison with the common multi-sector scenario to be developed later on. This also can be based on the Phase 1 documents, but has not happened yet. A lot of ingredients are in place, and TPF should try to develop this scenario urgently. It is strongly recommended to include expected consequences of climate change in the business as usual scenario.

- The next step is the development of individual sector scenarios, integrating social, environmental and economic issues. This sector by sector scenario development process needs to occur in a participative manner, where per sector scenario all relevant other sectors are involved and where the inter-governmental advisory platform and the public private platform are consulted. This has not happened yet, and it is recommended that TPF provides a proposal for how this next step will be handled.

- Subsequently, these sector scenarios are cross-checked, e.g. for compliance with the legal and policy framework, against each other using consistency analysis to find synergies and conflicts in the development of sectors and using the Digital Model to identify conflicts with regard to geographical footprint and unacceptable environmental and social impacts. The Inception Report already made a start with this (referring to information in the NCEA's advisory report of November 2011). The phase 1 documents contain a first analysis of synergies, bottlenecks and issues, both within sectors and those relating to the interdependencies among sectors (as part of SEA and MSP), but this requires further elaboration. TPF has indicated that this will be part of the phase 2.

- In the following phases, the individual sector scenarios are combined into an integrated 'common multi-sector scenario': the best (most coherent) combination of all sector scenarios developed that responds to the vision for the region. With the help of the Digital Model, this scenario is then assessed on its main social, environmental and economic impacts and compared to the impacts of the 'business as usual scenario'. The common multi-sector scenario is then translated into a multi-sector agenda for the Basin.

The multi-sector agenda can be developed, once the PEOT has meanwhile developed the vision. This draft vision has now been developed by the TPF team (see PEOT document), but this has not yet been checked with relevant stakeholders. In view of the amount of work still lying ahead, the lack of a participatory approach so far and the delays that are already occurring currently, the NCEA below suggests a way forward to make use of Ecosystem Services Assessment as a means to establish the linke between sector and spatial planning. The stakeholders linked to these services are thus also in the picture. Applying the eco-system services approach will help in identifying the information relevant for the planning process in the bulk of information that TPF has gathered so far.

The MSP and PEOT strive to create development strategies that allocate the land to the uses that provide the greatest sustainable benefit and thus manage conflicts and synergies be-tween different land uses. An important feature of these plans is their inter-sectoral nature. Parallel to the MSP and PEOT processes an SEA is carried out to ensure that environmental and social impacts and sustainability aspects are well considered in the planning process. In the present process the planning and SEA processes run in a parallel manner providing op-portunities for exchange of information during the process.

Ecosystem services is a concept that links the biophysical environment to stakeholders. Where sector plans are driven by development needs (the demand side), an inventory of eco-system services describes the biophysical environment in terms of products and services it can deliver for human development (the supply side). By using ecosystem services assess-ment as a tool to inform the planning process in a more pro-active manner it provides rele-vant input in the planning process by providing the boundaries between which the plans

should be developed. A simple straightforward methodology is suggested to provide a complete overview of ecosystem services, their stakeholders, their quantitative importance and the development opportunities or constraints they represent[1].

Step	Link to present planning and SEA process
1. Define bounda-ries of study area	Has been done.
2. Identify and map ecosystems within the study area	Can be natural, or semi-natural ecosystems or man-made landscapes. Land cover maps are available; land use maps will most probably be available from the Modelo Digital.
3. Describe poten-tial linkages with neighbouring areas	There may be interdependencies between different areas, for example linked to surface and groundwater flows, wildlife migration patterns, movements of cattle, or migration of people. Some aspects have been referred to in the presented documents, such as labour migration be-tween countries and of course the up- and downstream uses of water from the Zambezi river.
4. For each ecosys-tem, identify and quantify ecosystem services	Starting with expert inventory, this is an iterative process with stake-holders. (See next step.) Quantification in terms of the service itself (e.g. amount of sustainably harvestable water for irrigation; surface area of wood production times productivity per ha., similar for grazing area, fish production in tonnes/year, wildlife species and numbers per species, etc.). Relevant information has been collected already in the MSP; however, this still needs to be verified with stakeholders in order to select relevant prior-ity ecosystem services.
5. Identify (groups of) stakeholders of each ecosystem service	Stakeholders can be direct users (farmers, fishermen), or organisations speaking on behalf of users (user association), on behalf of a service (wildlife conservation), or having governmental responsibility for a ser-vice. At this planning level government authorities are the prime group of stakeholders, but local NGOs can provide relevant input. Steps 4 & 5 are iterative until all agree that all relevant services are covered. This has not been done yet, but participatory workshops are foreseen.
6. Quantify value for each (group of) stakeholder(s)	Values of services can be expressed in social, ecological or economic terms. Examples: market value of agricultural produce; number of households depending on fisheries; number of red-listed species (or conservation status of species). Since regional planning is a participa-tory process the definition of values can best be done in a participatory manner; for quantification expert input may be needed, especially

---

[1] Steps adapted from:
  - Integrating Ecosystem Services into Development Planning (2012), GIZ / BMZ. http://www.ecosystemassessments.net/resources/tools-and-publications.html
  - Voluntary Guidelines on Biodiversity in Impact Assessment (2006), Convention on Biological Diversity. http://www.cbd.int/doc/publications/imp-bio-eia-and-sea.pdf

	where it concerns economic valuation. This expertise is available in the team.
7. Baseline situation and trends for eco-system services	What is the present condition of an ecosystem service. Does an ecosystem service represent a development opportunity (under-exploited) or a constraint (already overexploited). What is the past and expected future trend; what drivers of change are at work (at what scale do they work; at what scale can they be managed; what management options are available in the region).
8.Regulatory or policy frameworks applicable to eco-system services	Existing legal or policy frameworks may apply to the use and manage-ment of ecosystem services, thus representing boundary conditions for future planning. The inventory of policies and laws applying to the area is available; it now is a matter of matching the ecosystem services with the applicable policies and define the limits within which scenarios can be developed.
9. Gaps in information	Quantification of services and their values will be based on existing in-formation. It will most probably not be possible to find all necessary information so proxy's or semi-quantified values may have to be used. Consequences of such choices for the reliability of information will have to be discussed.

Depending on the nature and timing of using the ecosystem services concept, the following step can be either to:
- Pro-actively inform the planning process on development opportunities and constraints provided by the area: what ecosystem services provide room for further development and what services are in need of proper management measures to avoid further or future over-exploitation.
- Re-actively assess the consequences of proposed plans for the performance of ecosys-tem services and provide input for the developments of alternatives and mitigation/com-pensation measures.

The level of detail in which ecosystem services are quantified may differ. When following a pro-active approach the quantification is preferably in absolute numbers to be able to define development opportunities in quantitative terms. When comparing development alternatives semi-quantified or even expert judgement may suffice for comparison.

ANNEXES

Advice on Phase 1 Products Zambezi Multi-Sector Agenda/SEA/PEOTT

(annexes 1 to 6)

ANNEX 1
Guião de productos

AVALIAÇÃO AMBIENTAL ESTRATÉGICA, PLANO MULTISSECTORIAL, PLANO ESPECIAL DE ORDENAMENTO TERRITORIAL DO VALE DO ZAMBEZE E MODELO DIGITAL DE SUPORTE A DECISÕES

AVALIAÇÃO AMBIENTAL ESTRATÉGICA (AAE), PLANO MULTISSECTORIAL (PM), PLANO ESPECIAL DE ORDENAMENTO TERRITORIAL DO VALE DO ZAMBEZE (PEOT) E MODELO DIGITAL DE SUPORTE A DECISÕES (MD)

GUIÃO DE INTERPRETAÇÃO DOS ENTREGÁVEIS DA FASE 1 (entrega 29 Setembro 2014)

A. Organização dos Entregáveis

- em conformidade com
  - Termos de Referência
  - Plano de Trabalhos e Índices aprovados no Relatório Incepção

- em volumes individualizados e por componente:

  - **PM** – **Tomo 1 - Quadro Estratégico e Legal e Diagnóstico Ambiental**

    Tomo 2 - Diagnóstico Social e Económico

    Tomo 3 – Síntese de Diagnóstico e Definição Preliminar de Cenários

    Sumário Executivo

  - **AAE** – **Relatório de Definição de Âmbito da AAE e Diagnóstico Ambiental**

  - **PEOT** – **Relatório de Caracterização Territorial e Diagnóstico Provincial**

  - **MD** - **Aceitação do Levantamento de Requisitos**

- **Matriz de Correspondência entre os "Produtos Esperados"** (CGC, 13.1, p. 37 do Contrato) **e os conteúdos de cada volume**

Parcelas	Produtos Esperados (Contrato - CGC 13.1)	Produtos Esperados organizados de acordo com o faseamento anexo ao contrato, com os Termos de Referência e com o Relatório Inicial Aprovado	Obs.
		PLANO DE FACTURAÇÃO CONTRATUAL (CGC 13.1) VERSUS FASEAMENTO ANEXO AO CONTRATO E APROVADO NO RELATÓRIO INICIAL	
1	1. Assinatura do Contrato	1. Assinatura do Contrato / Reunião de Início de Actividades	
2	2. Relatório de Incepção	2. Relatório Inicial	
3	3. Relatório de Diagnóstico Ambiental, social e económico (AAE/PM/PEOTT)	Nos conteúdos dos: - Tomo 1, 2 e 3 do Relatório do PM. "Fase 1 -Diagnóstico Estratégico"; - No ponto 5.1. Análise dos Aspectos Ambientais, Sociais e Económicos do Relatório da AAE. "Fase 1 -Definição de Âmbito da AAE e Diagnóstico Ambiental"; - No ponto 4.1.(1.A) Ideias e palavras-chave fundamentais para a construção da Visão do Vale do Zambeze do Relatório do	Ver Nota 1
	4. Inventário dos Instrumentos legais	Nos conteúdos dos: - Tomo 1 do Relatório do PM. "Fase 1 -Diagnóstico Estratégico"; - No ponto 4.2.1. Identificação dos Instrumentos Legais que regem os principais aspectos de investimentos sectoriais - Quadro de Referência Estratégico e no Anexo 2 do Relatório da AAE. "Fase 1 -Definição de Âmbito da AAE e Diagnóstico Ambiental" - No ponto 4.1.(1.B e ANEXO) Ideias e palavras-chave fundamentais para a construção da Visão do Vale do Zambeze do Relatório do PEOT. "Fase 1 - Caracterização Provincial e Diagnóstico Territorial"	Ver Nota 1
	5. Cenário de Referência e visão futura e indicadores de sustentabilidade para a zona de intervenção	Nos conteúdos dos: - Ponto 5: Capítulo 9 do Tomo 3 do Plano Multissectorial - No ponto 5. Avaliação da Situação de Referência (Cenário de Referência), no ponto 4.2.2. Estabelecimento da Visão geral dos Sectores de Actividade na Região e no ponto 6.1. Evolução temporal dos processos ambientais e definição dos respectivos indicadores de sustentabilidade do Relatório da AAE. "Fase 1 -Definição de Âmbito da AAE e Diagnóstico Ambiental"; - No ponto 4.2.Proposta de Visão a 30 anos para o Vale do Zambeze do Relatório do PEOT. "Fase 1 - Caracterização Provincial e Diagnóstico Territorial".	Ver Nota 1
	6. Matriz de consistência através da sobreposição dos cenário sectoriais	Nos conteúdos dos Tomos 2 e 3 do Relatório do PM. "Fase 1 -Diagnóstico Estratégico", nos quais foram mostrados mapeamentos dos sectores sobrepostos, identificadas relações de influência e de concorrência entre sectores, tendo-se detectado a necessidade de consolidar os conteúdos da matriz de consistência antes de a apresentar, prevendo-se no Programa de Trabalhos aprovado que essa actividade seja concluída na Fase 2	Ver Nota 1
	7. Avaliação de impactos estratégicos do cenário de referência	Nos conteúdos do ponto 5. Avaliação da Situação de Referência, designadamente no 5.2. Quadro Problema - principais problemas, sensibilidades e oprtunidades, 5.3. Identificação das insuficiências básicas e estabelecimento de recomendações para colmatar lacunas e 5.4. Tendências de Desenvolvimento (5.4.1. Identificação das relações de causa e efeito, referentes aos principais problemas ambientais da região e 5.4.2. Identificação das principais pressões e potencias usos concorrentes entre as diferentes propostas de usos dos recursos ambientais) do Relatório da AAE. "Fase 1 -Definição de Âmbito da AAE e Diagnóstico Ambiental"	Ver Nota 1
	Outros	- Resta referir que foi ainda apresentado o Relatório do MD, conforme previsto nas condições Contratuais, ainda que não identificado na CGC 13.1 - Foi também antecipado o conteúdo previsto para a fase 2 do PEOT, de apresentação do Modelo Territorial Actual do Vale do	

Nota 1: Conforme Programa de Trabalhos anexo ao contrato e anexo ao Relatório Inicial aprovado e nos indíces (PM, AAE, PEOT e MD) propostos no Relatório Inicial aprovado

CONSÓRCIO

B. Organização dos Conteúdos dos Entregáveis

- ## Plano Multissectorial (PM)

TOMO 1

Introdução	• Objectivos do relatório
Área de Abrangência e Enquadramento Administrativo	• Definição da área de estudo
Enquadramento Estratégico e Legal	• Principais Instrumentos Estratégicos de carácter Multissectorial e Sistematização das Estratégias Sectoriais
Diagnóstico Ambiental	• Descrição das condições naturais e dos recursos naturais existentes (clima, geologia e recursos minerais, relevo, solos, paisagem, recursos hídricos, biodiversidade, poluição e riscos naturais)

TOMO 2

Diagnóstico Social e Económico	• Caracterização socio-económica e descrição das actividades económicas dos sectores primário, secundário e terciário, infra-estruturas e equipamentos sociais e respectivo quadro estratégico e legal

TOMO 3

Síntese de Pressões Ambientais, Sociais e Económicas	• Identificação dos principais problemas, sensibilidades e oportunidades para cada uma das áreas
Perspectivas de Desenvolvimento	• Perspectivas sectoriais de desenvolvimento
Identificação de Oportunidades	• Identificação de objectivos de investimento público e privado em face das oportunidades existentes
Projecções da Situação Social e Económica	• Projecções tendo em conta as visões sectoriais
Caracterização e Diagnóstico da Economia do Baixo Zambeze	• Cadeias de valor, factores de desenvolvimento regional, estimativas dos potenciais de mercado
Serviços dos Ecossistemas	• Serviços dos ecossistemas existentes e definição das bases para a sua avaliação económica
Preparação dos Workshops Interactivos	• Estrutura de workshops a realizar e metodologias a adoptar
Definição Preliminar de Cenários	• Bases para a definição dos cenários: sectores fundamentais de desenvolvimento, indicadores e metas para avaliação dos cenários, problemas/efeitos sectoriais, Mapeamento

- **Avaliação Ambiental Estratégica (AAE)**

RELATÓRIO DE DEFINIÇÃO DE ÂMBITO E DIAGNÓSTICO AMBIENTAL

1. Enquadramento
- Apresentação dos conteúdos desenvolvidos na Fase 1.
- Apresentação da componente de AAE, do contexto do estudo, da área objecto de avaliação, do enquadramento legal e do processo de participação pública

2. Objectivo e Método de AAE
- Descrição dos objectivos gerais e específicos da AAE do Vale do Zambeze
- Descrição do processo metodológico de AAE, respectivo faseamento e actividades
- Detalhe metodológico das tarefas desenvolvidas na Fase 1

3. Envolvimento Público e Institucional
- Identificação das entidades públicas e privadas com responsabilidades nos processos de tomada de decisão – configuração institucional de acompanhamento e outras partes interessadas
- Análise crítica do desempenho, da capacidade e das inter-relações institucionais das entidades públicas com responsabilidade na região

4. Descrição do Objecto de Avaliação
- **Âmbito Territorial**
  - Delimitação geográfica da área de avaliação e de influência estratégica
- **Âmbito Estratégico**
  - Identificação dos instrumentos legais que regem os principais aspectos de investimentos sectoriais –Quadro de Referência Estratégico (Temas Transversais e Sectores de Actividade)
  - Estabelecimento das Visões formais dos Sectores
  - Estabelecimento dos Objectivos de investimento público e privado nos Sectores
  - Identificação das Razões que fundamentam a estratégia de aumento das actividades dos Sectores

RELATÓRIO DE DEFINIÇÃO DE ÂMBITO E DIAGNÓSTICO AMBIENTAL

5. Avaliação da Situação de Referência
- Análise dos aspectos ambientais, sociais e económicos dos sectores/áreas de actividade considerados
- Avaliação ambiental estratégica da Situação de Referência de cada sector/área de actividade:
  - a construção de Quadro Problema onde são identificados os Problemas, Sensibilidades e Oportunidades
  - a identificação das Insuficiências básicas de informação e estabelecimento das respectivas Recomendações
- Avaliação das tendências de desenvolvimento de cada sector/área de actividade:
  - a identificação das Relações de Causa e Efeito referentes aos principais problemas ambientais
  - a identificação das principais Pressões e potenciais Usos Concorrentes

6. Definição dos Factores Críticos para a Decisão e dos Processos Ambientais
- Identificação dos Factores Críticos para a Decisão (FCD) e estabelecimento dos Processos Ambientais (Critérios, Objectivos de Sustentabilidade) e Indicadores de Sustentabilidade
- Processo participatório para apresentação, discussão e aprovação dos produtos da Fase 1

CONSÓRCIO

TPF · TPF PLANEGE · synergia SOCIOAMBIENTAL · PROJETEC · biodesign · VU University Amsterdam Institute for Environmental Studies

- **Plano Especial de Ordenamento Territorial do Vale do Zambeze (PEOT)**

RELATÓRIO DE CARACTERIZAÇÃO TERRITORIAL E DIAGNÓSTICO PROVINCIAL

Etapa	Conteúdo
1. Introdução e Enquadramento	• Enquadramento legal, área e limites administrativos. • Objectivos e actores a envolver.
2. Temas essenciais e Metodologia para a Elaboração do PEOT	• Metodologia para a elaboração do PEOT e a sua relação com o Plano Multissectorial (PM) e Avaliação Ambiental Estratégica (AAE).
3. Ordenamento Territorial relevante para a Elaboração do PEOT	• Apresentação do estado do ordenamento em Moçambique e no Vale do Zambeze, identificando os problemas e potencialidades associadas ao processo de ordenamento.
4. Definição da Visão Prospectiva a 30 anos para o Ordenamento Territorial do Vale do Zambeze	• Construção da Visão baseado num processo técnico, estabelecido através de: características biofísicas, recursos e potencialidades, estratégias sectoriais de âmbito nacional, e estratégias sectoriais de âmbito internacional.
5. Definição do Modelo Territorial Actual para o Ordenamento do Vale do Zambeze	• O que é um modelo territorial • Construção do modelo • Sequência do Ordenamento Territorial

ANNEX 2

NCEA observations on Final Inception Report (July 2014)

This overview is made as a check on whether the NCEA observations (Advice on Draft Inception Report Zambezi Multi-Sector Agenda/SEA/PEOTT of 27 May, 2014) have been addressed.

In the Inception Report a great amount of observations made by NCEA have now been addressed. The chapters on AAE and MSP have been adapted/extended. The Chapters on the MD and PEOT remain without changes.

Hereunder, the parts from NCEA's advice which have not been given follow-up are summarized.

These observations will be used while reviewing the 7 documents which are currently being reviewed as products at the end of Phase 1.

- There seems to appear an imbalance in collecting more and more information (too much) and contacting/involving stakeholders in Mozambique (too limited, see also item 5 in Parecer, regarding 'Configuracao Institucional e Key Stakeholders' about the importance of support by the sector stakeholders). Collection of information must be tailored to what is needed for the PEOTT, MSP, SEA and Digital Model. Now the process of information collection just seems to continue without keeping in mind that all this information has to be checked by the key stakeholders.

- Enquadramento legislativo/normativo: In general, providing a long list (and description) of policies, strategies, national programs, international conventions, national laws etc. is not useful if no insight is given in, or conclusions are drawn on what the legislative framework implies for the Zambezi Valley. Or in other words, a translation should be made into what kind of restrictions or guiding principles the legislative framework poses on e.g. the development of a strategic vision, of the different scenarios to be developed.

- It is explained that the District Environmental profiles will be used as an information base for the other components, however, lists of contents not always consistent. Moreover it is not yet fully clear how the information will be used in the other components (Digital Model? SEA? PEOTT?).

- Abordagem geral de caracterizacao e diagnóstico económico and Abordagem geral da caracterizacao e diagnóstico social. Difficult to understand what TPF pro-poses to do here.

- Análise custo-beneficio e avaliacao económica dos servicios dos ecosistemas. The activity is said to lead to an identification of land use conflicts and a valuation of ecosystem services which will be integrated in the assessment of the reference situation under the SEA, the strategic diagnosis under the PM and the territorial characterization and diagnosis under the PEOTT. In a later stage, the scenarios developed as part of the PM and SEA will be assessed for their economic impacts.... and will put certain conditions for the PEOTT. This seems a useful application of the tool. However, under the AAE, PM and PEOTT description, nowhere any reference is made to the use of the ecosystem services valuation.

- Elementos sectorais. Text has not been adapted and therefore has not taken into consideration the recommendation in the Parecer item 11 PEOTT, regarding inclusion on land rights (DUAT) and mapping of ecosystem services.

- As it is envisaged that the first capacity building activity will take place as part of the first mission/Forum 1, it would be helpful to already develop a more concrete program for this activity for approval by UATA (i.e. who will prepare, organize and give the training, who will be the participants (names, institutions), logistics etc. General observation: focus is still very much on information, not so much on participative character of Forums etc.

Concluding remarks still remain valid

The NCEA has concerns about the quality of this Relatorio Inicial. A lot of text has been added, creating an imbalance between each of the four components (e.g. around 15 p. on digital modal, 15 on AAE, 30 on MSP and 10 on PEOTT). But just adding text does not really make the quality better. It seems as if what TPF tried to 'repair' or add, creates even greater confusion and makes it much more complex.

The NCEA is of the opinion that this material is not suitable, nor easily accessible, for presentation at the Inception workshop. It is very difficult to understanding/grasp the proposed methodologies and moreover the link between each of the processes.

The lack of integration of the different processes is clearly demonstrated in Chapter 8 of the Relatório, with the tables of contents of each of the 4 processes, which appear to be prepared by each of the 4 teams in isolation. The most important products as expected of the whole exercise, namely the MSP and the PEOTT are not even mentioned.

The NCEA's impression is that the TPF consortium general coordinator should play a much stronger role, being responsible for good coordination and integration of the 4 processes (AAE, PM, PEOTT and the use of the MD in all this), but also managing the capacity building/formation processes and the stakeholder dialogue with the institutional parties in Mozambique. Not only (environmental) knowledge is needed, but also communication and dialogue abilities and connections to/network with sector planners/decision makers in Zambeze.

As expressed by the NCEA previously, it is crucial for the TPF team having physical presence in Mozambique during the whole process. TPF now proposes to arrange all activities in 5 missions around the Forums, which is not a feasibly option for a good quality process.

The NCEA suggests to ask TPF to prepare a much more accessible (short) version of the Relatorio Inicial deleting all the 'textbook' like parts and focusing more on a product that can be presented at the Inception workshop and understood by important stakeholders.

ANNEX 3

Detailed observations on AAE: Definition of scope of SEA and Environmental Diagnosis, 265 p. 29 September 2014

General remark:

The title suggests that this report is a combination of the scoping report and environmental diagnosis. One would expect that scoping already took place in the ToR, tender proposal and the subsequent inception report. If the scoping takes 200 pages, what to expect from the actual SEA??

There is no Executive summary.

Chapter 1: Introduction

P. 13 short description of 9 chapters of current document. One of the 9 aspects is the analysis of social, economic and environmental aspects of the region. Why having hundreds of pages in the MSP on the same topic?

P. 14-15 Goal of SEA and map with study area (study area also features in Multi Sector plan- MSP)

P. 16-20 Short description of legal framework and public participation process (incl. figure showing PP process). Public involvement appears to be at the end of phases, so only to verify what has been produced, not to provide input in/guidance for work ahead.

Chapter 2: Objective and methodology of SEA

P. 21 Describes different sets of objectives, one of them being to create a territorial frame integrating social, economic and environmental aspects. This is similar to what is done in MSP.

P. 22-23 Describes methodology of 5 phases, current document is about phase 1, consisting of activity 1 and part of activity 2. It is stated that activity 1 incorporates information collected as part of the strategic diagnosis of the MSP and that the products of phase 1 will feed into the PEOT (definition of strategic axes of PEOT and Revision of the Vision for the Region) and the MSP (Definition of Scenarios). This will need to be checked later on.

It is also stated that this phase will culminate in Forum Zambezi 2 (meeting with UATA, meeting with CAS, first public hearing and capacity building activities. Unclear when this will take place?

It is also stated that all components will benefit from the Digital model, but does not specify how precisely.

P. 24-25 Describes interrelation between the 4 components (incl. in figure 4). This provides some clarity on the process. This is however entirely lacking in the MSP. It remains difficult to see which plan is having the lead: MSP or PEOT. Most of the arrows point towards PEOT.

Chapter 3: Public and institutional involvement

P. 26–29 Describes public and private institutions with decision making responsibilities (incl. table with functions of institutions following the AAE/MSP and PEOT studies).

P. 30 Nice scheme!!! with coordination committee, UATA, CAS and PPP

P. 31–34 Other interested parties, however: what is the use of providing such a long list of institutions without any indication what their linkages to the process are, their mandates, etc.

p. 35–36 Short paragraph (3.2) on critical analysis of performance, capacity and relations between different public entities with responsibilities in productive activities in the region. Overview of current weaknesses and success factors needed for effective implementation of PEOT. But: this is about public governance in general, applicable to any African country and beyond. What is the link to the present plan; what can be expected form government, what can't, how does the TPF team address these obstacles in practice?.

Chapter 4: Subject of SEA

P. 37–40 Geographical boundaries of study area and strategic influence, including list with districts, map and short characterization of the area (similar to what is in MSP).

P. 41–50 Identification of legal instruments that determine the sector investments, incl. 3 tables:

table 6: cross-cutting themes, table 7 per sector and table 8 international protocols and conventions signed by Moz. The implications of each of these legal instruments is summarized in Annex 2. Again, similar information is provided in MSP.

This inventory is made (p. 41) to establish general vision, public and private investment goals and the reasons for the strategy for increase of productive activities in the region.

P. 50–62; makes an inventory of visions of 10 sectors (agriculture, animal husbandry, forests, fisheries, conservation, mining, energy, water resources, tourism and transport) as can be found in relevant sector documents. Is it not explained why these 10 sectors are considered relevant for evaluation. These visions are the 'formal' ones (QRE, strategic reference framework) and will be compared with the vision that has been prepared as part of the PEOT (see figure on p. 51). Not clear where and when this comparison will be made.

P. 62 Nice summary of visions of 10 sectors.

P. 63–78 Inventory of public and private investment goals per sector, taking into consideration legal instruments and vision. Each paragraph concludes with overview of general, public and or private investments. Therefore lists with bullets, no clear summary

P. 79–89 Identification of reasons supporting the strategy to increase productive activities in the region per sector, based on the vision and goals of public and private investment goals. Again, lists with bullets per sector, no clear summary

Final remark about these visions and investments (apart from that the same information appears in the MSP): On national level; no information whatsoever how this relates to the planning area. What is the relevance of this information for the MSP?. What conclusions can be drawn from all this information?

Chapter 5: Assessment of baseline situation

P. 89 Baseline situation for 10 sectors plus also 6 new ones (water and sanitation, social issues, education, health, natural and human risks and climate change and pollution). Not clear why these have been added here an why? This raises the question for example, haven't any policies and investments been foreseen for disaster risk reduction and pollution control?

P. 90-139. For each of these 16 sectors/themes an analysis of environmental, social and economic aspects is provided (1-3 p. description each, except for 'natural and human risks and climate change', 16 p. and pollution 5p.)

P. 139-159. For each of the 16 sectors/themes an overview is made summarizing main problems, threats and opportunities. Although relevant information, it remains unclear how this is derived from all the other information. This is the relevant part for SEA. Yet, there is no information on the relative importance of each sector and each issue within a sector.

P. 159-170 Again for each of the 16 sectors/themes an inventory is made of gaps in information and recommendations for how to bridge these. Makes sense. Recommendations depend on what the MSP considers important sectors and where according to PEOT activities will be implemented. If one wants to implement all recommendations (>60) we need two more years of study. Example: do a census on elephants in Tete. It is the SEA that should come up with proxis that can be used. For example ask local residents on wildlife conflicts. Is a rapid manner to map problem areas. Other example: make cadastre up to date????? It all sounds like a desk study without having had any feet on the ground in the plan region. It remains unclear what needs to be done with all these recommendations.

P. 171-187 Development trends for each of the 16 sectors/areas, based on baseline situation, taking into consideration the problems, threats and opportunities and development perspectives in the region. The assessment was done by making a cause-effect overview of the main environmental problems per sector/area. There is however no information on the severity and localization of each of the problems. It is all textbook knowledge; no links to the actual region.

P. 187-200 Identifying main pressures and potential concurrent uses between the different proposals of use of natural resources. Use is made of symbols indicating pressures, and overlapping use, with short descriptions where these situations occur (incl. 3 example maps).

Bit unclear what is final conclusion of all this?

Chapter 6: Critical decision factors for environmental processes

P. 201-215 Overview (tables) of criteria, sustainability goals and sustainability objectives for 4 main areas (governance, sustainable use of natural resources, risks and climate change and livelihoods. These will be used for assessment of reference scenario and sector scenarios which will be developed as part of the MSP as well as for development options that will be elaborated as part of the PEOT. Critical issues for decision makers however usually encompass a maximum of 7 clearly defined and demarcated issues. Not 25 with about 120 indicators. (pers. com. Partidario). Furthermore, these criteria have to be defined in close consultation with formal decision making authorities and stakeholders through a scoping procedure.

P. 216 Describes what will happen in Forum 2 and which documents of the AAE will be made available for consultation.

7. Bibliography

P. 217-238

Annex 1 and 2

P. 241-243 List with stakeholder in public-private platform

P. 245-264 Table with legal framework, and implications.

Overall impression: producing as many pages as possible, filling it with existing information without significant critical analysis nor focus on relevant topics. No sign of on-the-ground verification of the information nor with stakeholders. Paper realities don't necessarily refer to real life. The documents are intended to assist decision making in a country with limited staff capacity and resources. A focus on the main issues would help enormously. Concluding statements at the end of each section on what the information means for the MSP or PEOT would enhance the readability of the documents.

Why having endless repetitions of information without proper analysis. Environmental risk pictures have been presented four times in 2 documents.

ANNEX 4

Detailed observations on Multi-Sector Plan

General

Objectives of first phase:
- identification of sectoral strategies;
- analysis of opportunities and constraints of existing resources;
- preliminary definition of development scenarios to be discussed in workshops.

For this, the most important ecosystem services of the region have been valued, to be confirmed by participatory methods and workshops.

Sumario executivo MSP

General observation: no map of provinces, regions, types of vegetation, soils, location of dams, or whatsoever. Considering that nobody will be able to read all volumes, one would consider the executive summary the most important part. This should be a standalone and readable document.

P. 9 Figure 1: from the legend it is impossible to find out which part of the pie-chart belongs to what category (use of similar colours; no link to chart).

P. 11 Soil degradation is causing people to leave their grounds; no indication in what soils and where.

P. 21 Figure 6: no legend.

P. 22-23 Figure 7 & 8: why the entire country? Focus on Zambeze.

P. 13 – 29 'Riscos naturais e antrópicos e mudancas climáticas' is largely overlapping with P. 120-139 of AAE. Moreover: No methodology why these are the issues of importance for a multisectoral plan. Text also refers to the entire country. Sounds like copy paste form other documents. Why talk about noise pollution?? Is this relevant? Why provide lists of numbers of animals and plants species without geographical reference ?

P. 32 Questioes sociais: Also 5.1.12 of AAE contains paragraph on questioes sociais, but with different kind of information?

P. 33 Questioes de genero: Latest inception Report contains text in 6.4.3.7 on Gender as well, much more elaborate and refers to AAE where this will receive further attention. The AAE however does not contain text on gender (but the MSP does, which is confusing). Better explain in which document gender (strategy) will be dealt with

P. 35 Short paragraph on 'workshops interactivos'. Strange to have this text here, because is not on contents as rest of summary. Move to other part of summary, not logical here

P. 36-58. Description of sectors. However not exactly the same at the 16 sectors/themes which are part of the AAE. Unclear why there is this difference, not consistent and thus confusing. Explain differences and/or be consistent

Concluding:
- No identification of sectoral strategies. Just description of sectors, nor facts and figures about relative importance of each sector.
- Opportunities and constraints per sector: OK.

- Development scenarios: criteria for a reference scenario, based on visions coming from PEOTT. Very unclear what actually is provided. ENDE provides the overarching development objectives.

Tomo 1: Quadro estratégico en legal e diagnóstico ambiental (201 pages)

P. 13-14 on geographical boundaries: same as Chapter 2 of AAE, p. 14-15
P. 15-32 Chapter 3 on enquadramento estratégico e legal: 16 p. overview which largely overlaps with Chapter 4.2.1 (and Annex 2) of AAE. However, overlap is not 100%, not clear why? No consistency analysis has been done nor a reference framework is distilled from all these national and sector policies and legislation to be used in the MSP. Recommendation: make 1 document with legal and regulatory framework, including implications/conditions for AAE/MSP and PEOT, to be used by each of the components
P. 33. Chapter 4: diagnótisco ambiental-situación actual. Great amount of baseline information. No explanation where and how this information has to fit. Why these issues were chosen as relevant. Again as of p. 150-177 Polucao....Vulnerabilidades: Largely overlapping with p. 120-139 of AAE. Also chapter 5.1 of AAE seems to be summary of Chapter 4 of MSP.

Annex 1: 79 pages with a species list with IUCN status! Without site specification. No relevance.
Annex 2: actual land use per district; what is provided is land cover.
Figures annex: beautiful maps, but no idea what their relevance is. Often the use of similar colours makes it impossible to distinguish between categories in the legend.

Concluding:
- Baseline description is almost 150p., too much information which is not easily accessible and usable. What is the essence? Main conclusions?
- How will this information be used to draft the district environmental profiles?

Tomo 2: Diagnóstico social e económico

In total 330 pages with baseline information (see table of contents for chapters/aspects dealt with).

1.1-1.3 Administrative boundaries (again!) and more information per district. Relevant policies and legislation. Poverty indices, education, gender, even an overview per district of construction materials used for houses. Why, why, why all these data.
1.4-1.7 Overview of information on all economic sectors:
- Repetitive information, such as climatic risks occurring in both tomo1 and 2.
- Inconsistencies in analysis: for the livestock sector a SWOT analysis is presented, which sounds relevant for the MP. For other sectors this SWOT is lacking (supposedly as it didn't occur in the literature).
- Only one section (transport) has a 'Conclusions' section with generalising remarks that could be used to convey the message to further stages in the planning process.

The sheer amount of pages makes it questionable whether the information will ever be used.

Tomo 3 Síntese de diagnóstico e definição preliminar de cenários.

P. 13-56 (1. síntese de presses amtientais, sociais e económicas, 2. perspectivas de desenvolvimento and 3. identificação de oportunidades) is same information as in p. 51-89 and p. p. 139-159 of AAE.

Chapter 1 starts with a summary analysis of main environmental problems, sensitivities and opportunities. It contains 10 annexes containing sector profiles. It is unclear how these relate to the information provided in Tomo 1 and 2. Neither is clear why these problem tables are called environmental, while it is based on environmental, social and economic analysis.

The tables however are clear and provide good summary information per sector. Opportunities are clearly linked to legal or policy incentives. These tables could replace most of the preceding information as it sets the stage for planning.

Chapter 2 provides development perspectives derived from the National Development Strategy, Agenda 2025, sector policies, and information from Tomo 1 and 2. In spite of the enormous amount of information available, the language is very generic and does not specify any concrete actions. On agriculture for instance, only 6 lines can be found.

Chapter 3 on identification of opportunities. It is unclear how these opportunities relate to the ones mentioned in the tables of chapter 1. The chapter lists all policy objectives and investment initiatives for the sector.

P. 57 Chapter 4: Social and economic projection for 30 years ahead, developed for each sector. PEOT provides the visions, identical to the development perspectives from chapter 2 (?). That's all – 2 pages. A few lines are provided on the potential impact of climate change. This is not what one would call a projection. It is a repetition of vision statements; a projection should contain more calculated information, for example on population and economic growth. Climate change is serious matter, especially in areas vulnerable to cyclones and inundations. Any projections and plans on that??

P. 60 Chap. 5 Gaps in knowledge. Refers to the relevant chapter in the SEA. No further information.

P. 61-89 Chapter 6 on diagnosis of economy of Lower Zambezi. The information provided is for Mozambique in the world, for provinces in Mozambique and for districts in Zambeze. How does this relate to the 200+ pages on economy in Tomo 2? Market potential per capita is presented for entire Mozambique.

P. 93-103 Chapter 7 on ecosystem services. An economic valuation of a number of ecosystem services, different from those mentioned in the executive summary, serves as a baseline for comparison of scenarios. 7.1 to 7.4 is a general introduction to ecosystem services valuation. 7.5 indicates how values are obtained. Then is stops. No analysis has been done

The choice of ecosystem services is not explained. Loads of sectoral information has already been provided, while ecosystem services valuation by definition deals with the use of natural resources by economic sectors and society. It is the link between environment and human activities and can serve as a structuring framework to provide information in a coherent manner. This is not done. Any methodological considerations are lacking. It leaves the reader in bewilderment.

The reliability of figures from economic valuation of ecosystem services in areas where people live of subsistence farming can be questioned. The text is generic and doesn't say anything about the study area except for a table of some non-explained ecosystem services.

P. 104-109 Chapter 8 on preparation of interactive workshops: not clear why this is part of Tomo 3, not yet well elaborated. The objective of the sector and participatory workshops is said to verify the information provided in the report and to communicate the results of the spatial plan (PEOTT). One would expect that this would have been done already?

P. 109-122 About preliminary definition of scenarios: speaks about main pillars, fundamental sectors, sectoral perspectives, risk and success factors and proposed indicators. Only the official policy scenario seems to be developed and a number of indicators. Unclear why the Sustainability indicators, developed as part of the AAE, are not mentioned here.

P. 123-143; on problemas gerados pelos sectores: similar to p. 171-193 from AAE.

P. 133, Par. 9.8 speaks of reference scenario that will be drafted when Foro Zambezi 2 will be held. When is this to be expected? Conclusion: no reference scenario yet

Concluding:
Again: large amount of information: 180 p. and an additional similar amount of pages annexes (1-10).

ANNEX 5

Detailed observations on Modelo Digital: 75 p. 29 September 2014

General

Three phases: concept, implementation, transition; now in phase 1: detailed analysis of requirements.

Not clear to what level the end users in Mozambique have been involved in this definition phase. There has been an analysis of existing procedures and software available at relevant departments, concluding that nothing similar to the proposed functionality is available.

P. 9 describes in very general wording that all project team members have contributed to a common vision and that requirements have been defined. No word on the role of the end users.

Further the report describes what has been done with the available data; it doesn't sound like a definition of requirements.

P. 12 Quality check of provided data using 5 criteria (completeness, consistency, exactness of position, time and theme).

Data has been received by e-mail. In other words: the work has been done in Portugal.

P. 12-42 Technical requirements. Rather incomprehensible language for a non-expert in data processing.

P. 43 Chapter 8: initially not foreseen in the project but proposed by the consortium is a web-based public participation platform (hosted on the Portuguese project website).

P. 46 Chapter 9 Three capacity development workshops in three provinces; 1 day; 78 participants. 8 Training objectives to be treated in one day seems rather ambitious. Sounds more like sensitisation. If the participants had some background in the field, the training programme looks relevant and to the point.

P. 53 Chapter 10. Consultant proposes to link this digital model to a decision support instrument. This isn't part of the present project? They also propose special applications for PM, AAE and PEOT. Unclear how continuous updating of information is organised.

Concluding:

- Unclear why this report is called analysis of requirements of the model, if the model is already operational and people can be trained to use it?

- It is not clear whether al information provided in the other documents is integrated in and/or generated by this model.

- Not a word what kind of data would minimally be needed from the perspective of the end users, and what data actually are available.

ANNEX 6

Detailed observations on PEOT: 120 p. 29 September 2014

P. 11. Par. 1.5 mentions CAS and approval process of PEOT.

Chapter 2 contains similar figures compared to AAE.

Chapter 3 is about Legal framework on territorial planning, again partly overlapping with Tomo 1, chapter 3 of MSP and 4.2.1. and Annex 2 of AAE. Also Annex 1 again on legislation. See recommendation above: make one single document to be used by all components.

Chapter 4 is about ideas and key-word for the construction of a visao.

P. 69-84, Estratégias sectorais: Quadro 7 and 8 are also part of AAE (p. 44-50).

P. 86. Chapter 4.2. Vision for 30 years has been developed by TPF team: how will this be shared with Moz. stakeholders?