



Netherlands Commission for  
Environmental Assessment

# Report and Observations on First Tete Public Hearing on Products Zambezi Multi-Sector Agenda/SEA/PEOTT (26–27 March 2015)

Memorandum by the NCEA

## MOZAMBIQUE



10 April 2015



---

## 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** 10 April 2015

**Subject** **Report and Observations on First Tete Public Hearing on Products  
Zambezi Multi-Sector Agenda/SEA/PEOTT (26-27 March 2015) –  
Mozambique**

By: the Secretariat of the Netherlands Commission for Environmental  
Assessment – Mr Reinoud Post

Advice 2015-09

---

# 1. Introduction

Under the Terms of Reference for the Netherlands Commission for Environmental Assessment (NCEA) concerning involvement in the Zambezi SEA/Multisector Agenda/PEOTT/Digital Model (signed March 2014) the NCEA received an invitation from the UATA (the technical and administrative support unit of ZVDA and MICOA) to attend the first round of Public Hearings and the CAS.

The request to attend was made because the TPF consortium has made available the deliverables as part of phase 1 and 2 of the Zambezi Multi-sector Agenda/SEA/PEOTT and engages in April and May in the first round of the participation process.

# 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 the 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 finalised 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.

In October 2014, 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 (phase 1 of the Zambezi Multi-sector Agenda/SEA/PEOTT, posted on-line on the digital platform, on September 29, 2014. 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. In November, the NCEA advised on review of the phase 1 products through an Advisory report 2014-18 of 14 November 2014). The UATA sent this NCEA Advisory report to TPF in addition to previous recommendations been given to TPF by MICOA/DPE/DINAPOT and MPD/ADVZ. Susequently UATA would await the revised Phase 1 products, in which the MICOA/MPD comments would have to be addressed as well as the questions posed by the NCEA.

By mail of 19 December 2014, UATA has sent a document in which TPF provides comments on the NCEA questions. UATA also indicates that they received the Phase 2 products (posted on the digital platform on December 19, 2014). Regarding the CAS meeting and Public Hearings, UATA explained that these have not yet been held, because legally these have to be planned by MICOA-DINAPOT. Furthermore, the UATA mentions that regarding the products that they have received so far, they will close 2014 with a 65% rate of execution, and that the delay in deliverables has been reduced from 3 months to 1 month. The UATA did not give their opinion (yet) about whether or not they were satisfied with the revised Phase 1 products and/or the answers to the NCEA concerns and questions. Furthermore, UATA did not specifically request any further action of the NCEA (e.g. regarding the revised Phase 1 products and/or the Phase 2 products).

Early 2015, the NCEA sent a reaction to UATA on the 12 p. document made by TPF called 'Respostas ao parecer da NCEA de 14/11/2014 relativo aos produtos entregues a 29/09/2014, correspondentes a fase 1' and performed a quick scan of the revised Phase 1 documents. The NCEA also briefly browsed through the Phase 2 products by looking at how the scenarios are being developed. The observations have been sent to UATA in an email with attachment on 7 January 2015.

On 2 March 2015, UATA sent an up-dated version (24 p. this time) of the 'Respostas ao parecer da NCEA de 14/11/2014 relativo aos produtos entregues a 29/09/2014, correspondentes a fase 1'. Mid March, UATA invited the NCEA to attend the public hearings in Caia and Tete in April and the CAS in May.

### 3. NCEA's report on the Public Hearing in Tete

In this report, the NCEA has no opinion on the quality of the studies underlying the presentations of TPF during this Public Hearing. Advice thereon is given in separate advisory reports as mentioned in Chapter 2. This report gives an impression on the public hearing as observed by the NCEA. In addition, it gives an appreciation of the event and its insertion/integration in the planning and SEA process.

### 4. The Public Hearing in Tete

#### **Announcement:**

The public hearing has been announced using radio messages and a press release.

#### **Attendance to the public hearing:**

The following stakeholders and actors participated in the public hearing:

- **Government**  
Session chair Reinaldo Mendiante (National Director DPE MICOA/MITADER)
- **UATA**  
Helena Ribeiro (ADVZ, responsible for management of the process)  
Chango (ADVZ, administrator)  
Salvo Chamo (MICOA/MITADER)  
???????
- **Consultant Team**  
Paulo Oliveira (MSP), Adelina (SEA), Gorge Cancela (PEOT), Rosa Silverio, Adriano Silva, Madelena Dray (relations), local administrative person, M. Mestre, Carlos Litulo, local consultant.  
Facilitator: M. Jose Chiburre
- **Further attendance:**
  - Celia Jordão, the Netherlands Embassy;
  - Roberto Mito was absent due to a political meeting of FRELIMO;
  - Reinoud Post, the Netherlands Commission for Environmental Assessment;
  - two provincial directors (mining and environment);
  - many district administrators;

- some technical staff of district, provincial and other agencies (a.o. ARA Zambeze);
- many NGOs, local and international (a.o. IUCN – Maria–Regina Cruz);
- no investors/entrepreneurs (although invited);
- in total 80–90 persons.

**Objective of the Public Participation meeting:**

See press release and radio message.

**Information of participants prior to meeting and during meeting:**

- access to consultant reports in Maputo, Tete and Caia (see press release);
- hardcopy of Executive Summary of phase 1 and 2 documents at the registration booth and a pen–drive with the documents;
- programme and announcement (with a form for questions and observations on the back side) at the registration booth;
- Powerpoint presentations on the two consecutive days.

**Programme:**

2 sessions from 8h00 – 12h45 (26 March 2015) and 7h45 – 13h00 (27 March 2015)

In addition to the programme, during the first day of the Public Audience, the participants were asked to introduce themselves shortly.

**Responsiveness of the audience as observed by the NCEA:**

- in general, the audience did attentively follow the presentations;
- many questions and observations were made in programmed time slots during the two days;
- the consultant team addressed the questions one by one (according to the expertise of its members);
- the consultant team collected many written questions (around 70 as far as was observed), which the consultant team has taken home;
- during the two days there was no debate. Just questions and answers. The set–up of the programme did not allow for debate: No panels were foreseen in the programme; the consultant team did not invite to debate.

**Nature of the observations and questions (impression, non–exhaustive):**

- DG MITADER indicated that the vision must be rewritten according to the leading themes of the new government;
- district administrators corrected errors in data and suggested development options for their district;
- transport sector is more than the main axes. For development of agriculture, feeder roads must be included;
- the water sector is a separate sector that should have been addressed as such;
- climate change is important. Is the planning horizon of 30 years adequate?
- Spatial planning must be done in a participatory way with the districts (is domain of the districts);
- conservation is also a sector;
- there are already land conflicts in Angonia (agriculture/livestock and forests). Forest destruction is a big problem;
- reinstallation areas must be included in the spatial plan;

- how did you determine flood risks and flood areas. Detailed research is ongoing on this issue;
- data on planned irrigation are not correct and complete;
- not all hydropower options are included;
- study does seem to go too fast and superficial. Make a more in-depth study;
- Gurro has gold, coal and chalk. These are not indicated on the maps shown;
- vulnerability of ecosystems needs more attention. Efficiency of the use of existing Hydro dams needs attention;
- there is no quantification of scenarios: what are we talking about in fact?
- it is not at all clear how green economy, to which Mozambique is committed, is integrated in the scenarios (e.g. in the transport sector);
- while we have Cahora Bassa, we don't have electricity;
- there are coal mines that do not at all respect environmental and social rules. There is no inspection and enforcement;
- the study does not present indicators and show where we stand now and where we are heading;
- is it realistic to suggest in a scenario that every district capital has its own airport?
- tourism is not sufficiently worked out;
- coal transport puts too high a pressure on existing roads in Moatize;
- what is the basis for the choices made in the alternative scenarios?
- the project to model the Zambezi has incurred enormous delay because of the elections and reshuffle of government;
- erosion is an enormous problem in the northern zone that needs to be addressed;
- how is the spatial model linked to what happens (growth) in neighbouring countries?
- the transport plan must include storage areas in the Moatize area;
- district administrators must communicate the issues treated in this public hearing to local level!

#### **Observations of the NCEA:**

- The event was well organized. The venue was very suitable. Relevant information was made available to the public in more than one way (internet, physically in 3 different locations) well in advance. The NCEA is unaware whether internet is available at all locations in the study area so cannot judge that aspect.
- For a number of government officials funds were made available to attend the hearing.
- The general impression on the public participation session as such is favourable. Quite good attendance, good responsiveness of the public and qualitatively adequate observations. The consultant answered the questions of the audience in batches and on a number of occasions asked the person that had brought forward the question whether he or she was satisfied with the answer.
- During the Hearing, the presenters have not checked how many participants have made use of the opportunity to consult the underlying documents. It would have been useful if they would have checked.
- Critical points:
  - As a first Public Hearing it was too late in the process. The first public hearing should have addressed the data collection and collected data only. This public hearing addressed base-line data, scenarios and even a first proposal for a spatial model.

- The fact that the part of the meeting on the vision, the sector scenarios, the reference scenario, the common scenario and its alternatives and the proposal for a spatial model was presented by the consultant, and not by the authorities, documented that these items were a product of consultant work and not of participatory processes that have taken place in offices in Mozambique. There is as yet no proof of ownership for any of these 'products' of the planning process within the sectors (government level and private level) and within decision-making structures of Mozambique. This implies that in the next steps, the process has to return to each of these consecutive stages and do them over again in a participatory manner. As a result of that necessary participatory reprocessing, a quite different vision and quite different scenarios (sector, reference, common and alternatives) and spatial model may emerge.
- Although announced as objective, there has been no debate. Questions and answers, was what it was about.
- Although invited, there were no representatives of the private sector (companies), while the private sector is an important stakeholder that will face the consequences of the development scenario and the physical plan (PEOT).

## 5. Concluding remarks and suggested way forward

A meeting of the CAS is foreseen for the week of 4–8 May, 2015. This event of one week offers an opportunity to start remedying the imperfection of so far not having been a participatory process. The NCEA suggests that the UATA uses this opportunity. Therefore, careful planning of the programme for this week is crucial. The NCEA offers to act as sparring partner/coach for the UATA in drafting the programme for this week. Of all not yet made participation steps, some may be set in this week. These steps include:

- jointly evaluate the quality of the consultant work so far;
- develop the joint vision;
- develop the sector scenarios, operationalise sustainability per sector, jointly formulate the common scenario and the alternatives.

The NCEA suggests that the UATA takes the lead in this week and that the consultant is present as observer and provider of explanations/demonstrations with regard to the products the consultant has produced so far. The NCEA suggests that persons responsible for all components of the consultant contract are available during this week (including the digital model).