4.0 *STAKEHOLDER MAPPING RESULTS, PROSAVANA*

Stakeholder Mapping, ProSAVANA

Relevant Stakeholder	Profile and Status	Programme Issues	Programme Expectations	Potential Influence on Programme	Influence and Interest Rating
Government entities:					
National government bodies (mostly MASA), but also the Environment Ministry, Finances, and others.	The national government creates the frame conditions for investments in Mozambique. These are manifest at several different levels, ranging from the Constitution at the uppermost level to the specifics of project and land authorizations on the other. Also included in the frame conditions are verbal communications and policy statements from national government officials.	The GoM at this point is strongly in favour of ProSAVANA. Recent statements show government's desire to adapt ProSAVANA polices and strategies to the Mozambique context. The Majol team was specifically instructed by the MASA ProSAVANA team leader that what is needed is a more "Mozmbican" ProSAVANA. The Majol team were also told that positive civil society dialogue is critical.	National government expectations are that a widely supported ProSAVANA programme will enable the Government to reduce absolute poverty all across the ProSAVANA landscape. Associated with this is the hope that it will improve the image of the government in these sometimes politically sensitive areas.	Critically influential. GoM polices and approvals make or break ProSAVANA.	High Influence, medium Interest. If dialogue can be promoted with civil Society, interest will change to high. If not, GoM will find ways to distance itself from the programme leading to its demise. Some high ranking officials may have their personal prestige and even political futures at stake.
Provincial government, especially provincial representations of the agriculture, planning, and environment ministries	Provincial governments in theory are the provincial arms of the national government and thus their influence is closely aligned with that of the national government. In practice, government is not monolithic, and provincial governments of course will lobby and favor decisions and activities that benefit the provincial situation rather than the nation as a whole.	The Provincial Governments affected are highly in favour of ProSAVANA. They also share concerns that Mozambican voices be more incorporated into project plans. Majol received specific orientations from the Nampula Provincial Governor to improve dialogue and make sure Mozambican institutions and civil society have input into ProSAVANA.	Similar to national Government, above. They have a particular partisan interest, however, and fear the loss of the programme due to conflict.	High Influence, as it will be they who will be involved in the day to day implementation of ProSAVANA.	High Influence and High Interest, due to the previously-mentioned partisan interest.
DPA Niassa Alfonso Sebastian, Acting Director	DPA is the head of the Provincial Department of Agriculture.	Producers want the program, but there appears to be an outside influence, causing programme disruption.	Increase of agricultural production and productivity; better care of environment; development of eco/bio production systems.	Provincial Departments of Agriculture have key positions in implementation, though	Influence medium. Interest high.

Relevant Stakeholder	Profile and Status	Programme Issues	Programme Expectations	Potential Influence on Programme	Influence and Interest Rating
				not much political voice.	
DPA Zambezia Ilidio Bande, Director	DPA is the head of the Provincial Department of Agriculture.	He is concerned about: developmental models are not inclusive, so Mozambican people's role might be that of labourers only; concerned about disrespect or negligence of the environment; there is also danger of misuse of fertilisers.	New technologies. Income for communities. Less poverty.	Good relationship with CSOs, can bring influence to bear.	Influence medium to high, interest high.
DPASA Nampula Americo Wasiquete, Focal Point ProSAVANA.	The Focal Point is the first point of contact between Civil Society and the Government. Main task is dissemination of information, both to Government staff and outside world.	ProSAVANA has been politicised. Civil society does not want to see that the Master Plan is evolutionary and will change over time. People confuse other projects with ProSAVANA.	ProSAVANA must be Mozambicanised. It will be important to use business-oriented approach to develop the small/family farmers.	Provincial Departments of Agriculture have key positions in implementation, though not much political voice.	Influence medium to high. Interest high.
DPASA Niassa Kanath Sousa da Silva, Focal Point ProSAVANA; Alberto Enoch Cuinhane, Senior Agricultural Technician	The Focal Point is the first point of contact between Civil Society and the Government. Main task is dissemination of info, both to Government staff and outside world.	Little disclosure in the beginning, when designing was already going on. Appearance of foreigners raised suspicion. By the time info started flowing, distrust had started. Illiteracy sometimes results in poor perception, or in taking advantage by opportunists. Contract production model can reduce food crops + food security. ProSAVANA not always being given chance to explain itself, because of antagonism from civil society.	Can be highly effective due to great depth of baseline study. Master Plan constantly being improved, with Model experiences feeding back into the Master Plan. Rapid Impact Projects already showing results. No land grabbing in Niassa.	Provincial Department of Agriculture have key position in implementation	Influence medium to high. Interest medium.
District government (including sub-levels such as Administrative Posts)	The district government relates to the provincial government as the provincial government relates to the national one.				
SDAE Chimbunila, Niassa Province Jeremias Cosme, Rural Extension Network Supervisor	District extension office for economic activities, including agriculture.	None	Better technical advice available. Organisation of transport for farmers' products.	Farmers' perception of ProSAVANA will greatly depend on how the front-line extension is done.	Influence low. Interest medium.

Relevant Stakeholder	Profile and Status	Programme Issues	Programme Expectations	Potential Influence on Programme	Influence and Interest Rating
SDAE Malema, Nampula Province Henriques Joao, Director	District extension office for economic activities, including agriculture.	Barriers in public consultations due to actions by CSOs. They do not represent farmers, who want the program. Instability drives investors away.	Financing for small farmers in a revolving fund. Available to those who have DUATs. Survey was done.	Farmers' perception of ProSAVANA will greatly depend on how the front-line extension is done.	Influence low. Interest medium.
SDAE Alto Molocue, Zambezia Province Arsénio Pedro Candua, Director	District extension office for economic activities, including agriculture.	Insufficient info reached the basis in the beginning. This created opening for planting of misinformation, including fear of land grabbing. Wrong representation of opinion at district level and below by provincial and national CSOs. Antagonism and suspicion due to presence of foreigners.	Improved extension models. Change in approach towards better consultations. Avoid seeing the proposed Working Committee as a battleground.	Farmers' perception of ProSAVANA will greatly depend on how the front-line extension is done.	Influence low. Interest medium.
Political parties	The ruling party is in favor of the program, but experience has shown that individual politicians will use any project success to further their own political agenda. Because of this,therehave been cases where individual politicians of opposition parties have taken positions against certain investments.	The program must be aware that it may be used as a political pawn and must maintain a strictly apolitical approach. In the rural areas, resistance from the opposition parties can be overcome through fairness as well as opening lines of direct communication.	Politicians of all parties will use the program to further their own ends.	Handled badly, any political party could raise opposition to the program.	High influence, low interest.
National, provincial and district business community, including MSME's and producer organizations.					
CTA Luis Eduardo Sitoe	Federation of private sector trade associations, aiming to promote good business environment in Mozambique through dialogue with Government. Non-profit, non-partisan. Organises studies + research to influence public policy and business environment.	Concrete action required from Government to show that they are serious to implement right policies, best practices, create clean environment, not just promises. Government image is tarnished and weak.	To be implemented in partnership with private sector. Will create opportunities for new companies and economic development in north Mozambique. Shift of business emphasis from Maputo, provided business training is undertaken for companies in provinces to be able to compete with Maputo companies. CTA	CTA is key to private sector involvement. Encourages members to engage in Corporate Social Responsibility activities, in alliances with Government or CSOs, e.g. endemic diseases.	Influence high, interest high

Relevant Stakeholder	Profile and Status	Programme Issues	Programme Expectations	Potential Influence on Programme	Influence and Interest Rating
			considers new government more open than old one, CSOs should grab their chance.		
International NGOs and CSO's	International NGOs and civil society at national level are opinion makers, with particular influence over public opinion, the news media, and potential partners such as USAID. Some NGOs have a very specific focus on land and social justice issues, while others are more focused on community development or environmental issues. Note that once the Working Committee has gained some experience it will be necessary to update this stakeholder engagement plan with a specific list of the most important stakeholders and what is needed to engage with them further.	Social justice and land focused NGOs are following ProSAVANA pronouncements on land rights very closely. Inadequate flow of information and lack of proper consultation beforehand have caused much misinformation and suspicion.	Development NGOs would most likely be interested in partnerships in their fields of focus.	Land and social justice NGOs are creating international reputational issues for ProSAVANA. This is backfiring to even the level of donor Governments. Community development NGOs have much to offer in the way of experience with community development efforts. These organizations can be opinion leaders, and set the tone of the national dialogue.	Interest might be medium, but influence is high.
<u>Action Aid</u> Country Director Amade Suca, office: (21) 314342/5, 823094310, pers.cel 828671300	Involved in rights-based work, agricultural extension, livelihoods, and many others. Helped convene Portucel Advisory Committee. Linked to Action Aid International. Director is a high profile and influential opinion leader in civil society.	Has been involved in attempts to start a dialogue, and in campaigns against ProSAVANA since the beginning. Has process issues with the top-down implementation manner. Against being asked to correct documents, but wants to co-create. Not against aims of ProSAVANA as such, but against implementation style, and has serious issues with inadequate safeguards for the land rights of people and other uncertainties.	Liked idea of 3rd party mediation to solve current situation. Has set clear preconditions for involvement in dialogue process. 1: must be genuine openness to co-create ProSAVANA, looking at all issues, everything must be on the table. 2: discussion must include development model, how/if to involve agrobusiness in development with focus on family sector. 3: doubts if co-creation process can be completed within current deadline, even that must be negotiable. 4: communications must be improved at all levels. Clear focal points, moments and mechanisms must be	Potential influence: Is opinion leader and can sway others to cooperate. If conditions are not met, he is quite willing to let ProSAVANA die and many will follow. He believes there is already a hard core of NGOs that have written ProSAVANA off: Justiça Ambiental, UNAC, OMR and others. Many don't read documents any more, even himself.	Influence rating: high. Interest rating: medium. If dialogue can be created, interest high; but if not, couldn't care less (0 interest).

Relevant Stakeholder	Profile and Status	Programme Issues	Programme Expectations	Potential Influence on Programme	Influence and Interest Rating
			created.Under those conditions is willing to help co-create something Goverment and Civil Society can support.		
Oxfam Mozambique Adelson Rafael	International organisation, advocacy and monitoring of programs, agriculture, natural resources, womens rights. Working with 62 partner organisations in Mozambique.	Oxfam is a co-founder of ASCUTE. They want especially the land rights aspect of ProSAVANA addressed.	More inclusive. Approach must be changed to assure land rights for the poor.	They are financing the campaign for land rights (ASCUTE).	Influence high, partly because of international reach. Interest medium.
WeEffect Diamantino Nhampossa (Director) Telf: +258 824904050 Email: diamantino.nhampossa@weeffect.org Inácio Timane (Director de Programa) Inacio.timane@weeffect.org	A Swiss NGO that promotes self help among agriculturalists, adopting a rights-based approach. WeEffect finances other NGO's such as UNAC, OMR, AENA. Has been involved in the campaign against ProSAVANA since 2009, but now thinks that the time has come to dialogue. Has funds available to promote such dialogue.	The Major problem of ProSAVANA was very pooor communications. ProSAVANA lacks baseline data and studies. ProSAVANA master Plan as written now smply goes down the road travelled by ProAGRI and PAMA, other failed projects. Need new models. ProSAVANA as is does not respond to the real needs of the population. MASA needs to do a better job of outreach, communication, and dialogue.	WeEffect feels that there may be an opportunity for CSO's to dialogue with ProSAVANA and has funds available for this. WeEffect hopes for a concerted effort to develop a vision and strategies leading to a better ProSAVANA.	As a financer and opinion Leader, WeEffect has an extremely high influence.	High Interest, high Influence. One of the Most strategic partners. Needs to be cultivated and listened to very closely
National NGO's (Maputo based):					
ADECRU adecru2007@gmail.com Vicente Adriano cel 82 5132059	Advocacy, basic rights, social inclusivity, use of natural resources, grassroots organisation, inclusion of youth and women in development activities. Extensive network of local, district, and provincial community organisations.	Government behaviour and lack of dissemination of information. Imposition of the entire program from above, lack of broad dialogue. Wrong choice of development models, methodology not linked to real needs. Broken promises regarding making info available. News about ProSAVANA has	A real development program would first and foremost allow communities to influence the type of development that is chosen.	Broad based grassroots structures could influence implementation of many aspects.	Interest high, as current program runs counter to ADECRU philosophies. Influence on local population medium, on other CSOs low (too leftist).

Relevant Stakeholder	Profile and Status	Programme Issues	Programme Expectations	Potential Influence on Programme	Influence and Interest Rating
		led to large scale land grabs in the area by high placed individuals with aim to benefit from land deals with foreign investors.			
CESC Paula Monjane	Human and civil rights sensitisation and protection, development of awareness of civil rights and duties.	Against. Want to scrap ProSAVANA. They have doubts about use of land legislation for ProSAVANA. Already much land grabbing, not by ProSAVANA but by influential people in anticipation of ProSAVANA. Government lost credibility by breaking up dialogue.	Gaps in land legislation are to the detriment of people's rights. People are ignorant about laws and are at a disadvantage in negotiations. International pressure will leave Goverment no way out: either change or stop ProSAVANA.	Working with local NGOs. Want to be involved to protect those who cannot protect themselves.	Interest high. High influence through networks.
CTV Tel.: 21321257 http://www.ctv.org.mz Marcos Pereiro	Environmental advocacy and studies.	ProSAVANA will promote poverty through landlessness. Government is manipulating to stifle civil society.	Co-create new project, instead of manipulating civil society.	Large network of village paralegals who monitor violations of rights.	Influence high through environmental. studies. Interest moderate, but can become high.
Forcom Benilde Nhalvilo	National Forum of Community Radios. Their institutional approach is rights-based.	Part of campaign "No to ProSAVANA"	Against ProSAVANA in its present form.	Large network at community and national level. Strong leadership defending especially women's rights.	Influence High. Interest medium.
Fórum Mulher Graça Samo, Directora Executiva Tel.: 21414 037 www.forumulher.org.mz	National organisation, focus on womens rights and feminism. Strong grassroots network, member organisations in all provinces. Model for other NGOs.	Opposed to ProSAVANA, but won't talk in absence of other campaign members.	Want to close it down.	Strong voice because of large membership.	Influence high, Interest medium.
GMD Eufrigina dos Reis Mandela Tel.: 21419523 divida@tvcabo.co.mz http://internationalbudget.org/groups/grupo-moambicano-da-	Platform of CSOs, nationally and in some provinces. Was instrumental in setting up the Development Observatory, a watchdog body in the fields of public debt, development finance, and participatory planning.	Great silence around ProSAVANA, no official information. Absence of dialogue, no democratic space, in line with Government behaviour in many other fields. Are against the top-down	Want a robust discussion on all aims and means, open debate, and real change if the majority demands it.	Have done their own study on agricultural development issues. Through member organisations on the ground GMD can exert strong influence on	Interest moderate, more as part of greater issue of style of government. Influence high via member organisations on the

Relevant Stakeholder	Profile and Status	Programme Issues	Programme Expectations	Potential Influence on Programme	Influence and Interest Rating
dvida-gmd/ Humberto Zaqueu (intvw) humbertozaqueu@gmail.com		methods of imposing the programme. Doubts about basic rights and food security issues.		implementation.	ground
Justicia Ambiental Av.Mao Tsé Tung, 549 1º, Flat D, Maputo Tel.: 21496668 / 21496668 Cel: 843106010 / 823061275 http://ja4change.org/index.php/pt/contact Vanessa Passades, Joao Nhampossa	National organisation (central).	Government is not transparent and inclusive in its dealings with ProSAVANA. Apparent openness is not genuine, people are the same as before. Agricultural development model not clear, especially regarding use of land. The Plan is not what Mozambique wants and needs, inappropriate model. Also critical of Japanese and Brasilian Governments.	Are against. ProSAVANA should be closed. Would only consider participating if Government gives a clear commitment.	They are a strong adversary.	Interest none, influence high.
Provincial and local NGOs	There are a number of local NGOs in the three provinces. Some of them focus on land rights, while others have a generalized focus on one or another aspect of community development.	As of this writing, local NGOs in Zambezia and Niassa have not raised many issues. In Nampula civil society has split, with a small but vocal group (with backing from Maputo) arguing the total scrapping of the program (No to ProSAVANA), and a majority asking for changes in methodology, in certain aims, as well as guarantees regarding people's rights (ASCUTE, Humanisation of ProSAVANA).	Consensus exists over the main focus: improvement of productivity and market access of smallholder agriculture. If the programme will also include projects with outside investors, there should be no forced resettlement, and fair compensation must be paid.	Issues here are those of reputation, with some local NGOs having good connections with media and other outlets. These are opinion leaders and should be treated as such.	Low interest, high influence.
Nampula:					
AENA Jordão Matimule Junior, Director Executivo 843024421 matimulejunior@yahoo.com.br	Associação Nacional de Extensão Rural. Food security, advocating in natural resources and extractive industry, gender issues.	Big lack of clarity about program intentions. Early intentions were not right. Much was changed, later it became better.	ProSAVANA has approaches that benefit farmers. Against any development that promotes landlessness. Government must change stance towards CSOs.	Host of the network of agriculture + natural resources. Want to help promote the dialogue.	Interest high, influence moderate to high.

Relevant Stakeholder	Profile and Status	Programme Issues	Programme Expectations	Potential Influence on Programme	Influence and Interest Rating
Akilizetho António Muagerene, Director Cel.:	Akilizetho builds links to local government. Strengthens community development committees. Deals with the rights of participation and capacity building	Concern that no-one had infoabout the program. That communities did not participate, were not consulted. High risk of corruption and land grabbing.Clear strategies need to be defined for family sector. "Small farmer" is a controversial term, could mean production of commodities, not for food security.	"Humanization of ProSAVANA". Agriculture is a system and not an isolated issue.	Through community development committees as well as links to local governments	Interest high, influence moderate
FDCM (Forum Distrital de Camponesas, Mutuali) Manuel Pedro Massaua, Pres. do UNAICA Dionísio André – Animador Associativo	Network of 10 farmer associations, 530 members. Production of food crops and cotton, for own consumption and sales	No proper consultations were held, no answers to questions given.	Expect to have a say in the program design. Extension of credit for inputs and improvement of production. No intimidation, no land grab. Proper representation in consultations, all sectors represented.	As a grassroots organisation, not much influence.	Influence low. Interest high.
Forum Terra Waly Manuel, Project Manager	Ensuring land rights of communities are registered. Promoting understanding of land and forest laws. Assistance in sustainable use of land.	Lack of info, poor communication methods, broken promises, accusations, poor engagement.	Respect for farmers rights. Protection of farmers seeds and other resources. Credit guarantees.	Relatively minor	Interest high, influence moderate (working in 5 districts)
Justiça e Paz Padre Jacinto Augusto, Coordinador do Secretariado	Human rights in communities, family law, land law, assistance in obtaining DUATs.	Implementation modalities unclear. No consultation at all. The name ProSAVANA is an insult; Nampula has no savanna, just miombo; this is an indication that dialogue and studies are lacking.	Genuine consultations need to be made.	Through church. "Padres against ProSAVANA".	Interest high, influence high to medium.
ORAM Calisto Ribeiro	Focus on land security and ownership. Financed by Netherlands government through ITC. Well organised through regional offices and technical staff. Cover 14 districts.	No peasants and no communities consulted for the plan until 2013. Even then, comments were not considered. What commercialisation model? What about food crops? Not against the programme, but	Inclusivity.	Good grassroots organisation and reputation with rural population.	High influence and high interest.

Relevant Stakeholder	Profile and Status	Programme Issues	Programme Expectations	Potential Influence on Programme	Influence and Interest Rating
		against the way the process is conducted.			
PPOSCN António Muagerene, tel 26218541, 826061426 António Lagres	Platform with large membership of CSOs, monitoring policies and programs of Government on District and Provincial level. Also co-ordination of member activities	Not against, but overall objectives not clear. Some models not suitable. Poor ProSAVANA communications. Research is done mostly on commodities. Credit systems so far not working. Submitted comments and are waiting for reaction.	More inclusivity and better communications. In favour of "humanised" ProSAVANA	Good communication channel with CSOs.	High influence because of large membership. Interest moderate.
Solidaridade Nampula Antonio Mutoua (vice president of Nampula platform)	National NGO, works on monitoring of Government policies and programs in food security and natural resources.	Not against; commented on MasterPlan but have not had a reaction. The name ProSAVANA is an insult; Nampula has no savanna, just miombo; this is an indication that dialogue and studies are lacking.	Expect to have Master Plan changed according to comments, and approved.		Influence high because of position in platform, have worked in advocacy and monitoring for a long time. Interest moderate, but only if changes are made.
UPCN Costa Estevao, Presidente 865184605	Stepped organisation: Farmers Union at provincial level is a conglomerate of district unions, which again are a group of local associations. No direct farmer members in provincial or national organisations.	ProSAVANA based on foreign concepts. No empowerment of family sector. No public consultation before projects started.	Stop and start afresh. Involve platforms and CS organisations. Strong emphasis on family farming sector. Commercial farming only if it supports food production. Against private land ownership. More open consultations.	Through international contacts much influence on donor opinions. Links with the farmer base are not as strong as they claim.	Interest high, influence high
Niassa:					
Associacao 25 Setembro Filipe Nbuane, Presidente	Association of 14 farmers at Lussanhando, Lichinga district	Rapid Impact Project gave some assistance, but not enough	Better implementation, more technical assistance, larger loans	Minimal	Influence low, interest high
ITC-F Nelson Jackson, Gestor Provincial http://www.itc.co.mz/	Active in 8 districts, going up to 10. Land delimitation for communities, interpretation and extension of land law, partnerships between communities & private companies,	Many issues unclear, not enough info. What is a small producer? Link between land rights and small producers. How will cash crops affect food crops?	ProSAVANA should focus on support to small farmers. Land matters should be made clear.	ITC finances a lot of CSOs that could assist in ProSAVANA implementation, or hinder it.	Influence and interest both high.

Relevant Stakeholder	Profile and Status	Programme Issues	Programme Expectations	Potential Influence on Programme	Influence and Interest Rating
	natural resource management.	Authoritarian and intimidating attitude of Government.			
ORAM Felix Cossa, Delegado Provincial Cel.: 822770749 Kossa.felix33@gmail.com Intvw Leonardo Antonio Abilio, Program Offcr	Focus: land demarcation for communities &associations, especially for community associations focusing on women. Support the channelling of 20% community shares in commercial forestry. Increase awareness of land law and law on flora and wildlife protection. Provincial branches in the whole country. Focal points in districts. In 7 corridor districts in Niassa.	Happy with provincial Government, but critical of arrogant implementation style of Government projects at district level. Manipulation of use of the land law to benefit Government officials and other well connected individuals. No issues with ProSAVANA itself, it hasn't started.	ProSAVANA could be a big boost for the development of the economy and rural areas of Niassa.	Very good contacts at grassroots level. Well established.	Influence high because of contacts Interest high.
ROADS Emílio Muempezar, Coordenador Tel.: 27131487 Cel.: 822904789 Intvw: Agostinho Chiporo, Vice Pres of Board of FONAGNI and member of ROADS	Land delimitation, environmental protection and conservation, sustainable development. Work in 4 or 5 districts implementing projects.	Critical of arrogant implementation style of Government projects at district level. Manipulation of use of the land law to benefit Govt officials and other well connected individuals.	Any investment welcome, including ProSAVANA. Could be a big boost for development. But when? What will it look like? Inclusivity? Consultations of parties should not be done by Government, but by platforms like FONAGNI. Previous condition was inclusivity, especially of people on the ground, not intermediaries. Those who are anti-ProSAVANA and anti-development, what do they want?	Many contacts, well established.	Interest high, Influence medium
UPCN Abdul Magomba	Provincial farmers union with 11 district unions. Claims 22000 members.	Secrecy, lack of info, mistrust. Uncertainty about land rights and management, the family farming sector, real beneficiaries, and Government attitude.	Increased production and productivity are good things. If family farm sector is targeted, it will have much benefit.	Speak for a lot of farmers, but less than they claim. Can still be a big force pro or contra.	Influence medium, interest high
Zambesia:					
AMCELA Luisa da Silva, Exec. Director	Rights of women peasant farmers. Eight focal points in Zambezia.	There was exclusion of CSOs from the start. The Master Plans do not reflect reality on the ground. Designed without input from people affected.	More scope for affected people to be involved in planning and decision making.	Through women organisations in working areas (rice production).	Influence medium, interest high.

Relevant Stakeholder	Profile and Status	Programme Issues	Programme Expectations	Potential Influence on Programme	Influence and Interest Rating
FONGZA Marcos do Amaral, Presidente 828920020; Amade Naleia, Coordenador Cel.:825503920 gppdz@yahoo.com.br	Dialogue body between CSOs and the government of Zambezia, + other actors and stakeholders. Part of FONGZA are thematic working groups (networks) of CSOs, and district platforms.	Exclusion of CSOs from start of the program. The major problem in communication with communities lies in the start of the program before communities were consulted.	Bottom-up design, not top-down. Clear statements of intents, strategies and models are needed.	Influence through dialogue and consultations	Influence moderate to high, interest high.
ITC-F Hilario Patricio, Manager Land Initiatives	Focused on catalysing communities to gain positive leadership, and prepare before any contact with investors. Main beneficiaries are rural communities, groups of farmer associations or others living on the basis of use of natural resources for their survival.ITC works with providers of various services from more vibrant OCSs in protecting rights of communities, as well as with private sector.	Lack of adequate preparation and consultation of NGOs and communities. Questions the development models and lack of community participation.	Communication mechanisms at all levels from the bottom to Tokyo. Information on plans and roles available to all parties. Investment yes, but inclusion and organisation of communities a must from the start.	Finances a lot of CSOs that are active and key players in ProSAVANA districts.	Interest high, influence high.
RADEZA Daniel Maula, Exec. Director	Network of NGOs in Environment, Natural Resources, and Community Development	CSOs excluded since beginning in 2005. Improving production techniques only works if farmers are organised and prepared. This is not the case, top-down found them unprepared. Why monoculture cash crops at expense of "real" food crops? Master Plan poorly done, had to be changed often, a "Chameleon Master Plan". No logic, no clear paths.	Government to promote open and transparent communication with CSOs, and avoid opportunism + gossip among state workers. Test ProSAVANA in a few districts first. The Government ProSAVANA team should not only include agronomists but also other specialists. Very positive move for MASA to seek rapprochement.	Strong presence in all districts of Zambezia gives it strong voice.	Influence high, interest high.
Oram Zambezia Lourenço Duvane	CSO dedicated to land and resource rights. This is a national delegation of a national organization.	There are huge communication problems between DPASA Zambezia and Civil Society.	Actively working with WeEffect to improve the dialogue in Zambezia.	Highly influential, cooperated with WeEffect to organize a stakeholder seminar already in Zambezia, to develop better communications.	Influence high. Interest higth.

4.1 SU MMARY OF RESULTS

The following table shows a summary of results of the consultations. Color Coding is as follows:

Red	No to ProSAVANA, unwilling to dialogue.
Purple	Will dialogue if certain conditions are met. Most NG's here very clear that these conditions consisted of the following, as best summarized by Action Aid Director Amade Suca: 1) Genuine openness to 'co-create'ProSAVANA, looking at all the issues, 'everything must be on the table'. 2) Discussion must include the development models to be used, including how/if to involve agrobusiness in family-sector focussed agriculture development. 3) Due to doubts that'co-creation' process can be completed within current deadline, even deadlines must be negotiable. 4) Communications must be improved at all levels. Clear focal points, moments and mechanisms must be created. Most also liked the idea of 3rd party mediation to solve current situation.
Yellow	No clear institutional position taken on ProSAVANA
Green	Supportive of ProSAVANA. Note that every institution coloured 'green' as in favour of ProSAVANA also noted the need for it to change before they could endorse it fully. Not one ' green' organization was prepared to accept ProSAVANA as is. All called for better dialogue and for Civil Sciety input to be taken seriously. See Stakeholder Map above for details.
No colour	Government Institutions. By their nature, these do not have independent positions vis a vis ProSAVANA.

Interview Results, Stakeholder Mapping

Organisation Location and Name	Organisation Type	Interview type	Interview Notes on file?	Stakeholder Map Completed?	Survey Monkey Completed?	Position with Respect to ProSAVANA
Maputo:						
Action Aid	NGO (Int)	in person	√	√	√	Not dead against. Will participate if conditions are met and right climate is created among CSO's (see purple color coding above).
CTV	Nat'l NGO	telephone.	√	√		Suggests that ProSAVANA should be open to co-creation of

Organisation Location and Name	Organisation Type	Interview type	Interview Notes on file?	Stakeholder Map Completed?	Survey Monkey Completed?	Position with Respect to ProSAVANA
						project. GoM should stop trying to 'manipulate' civil society.
CESC	Nat'l NGO	telephone	√	√	√	No to ProSavana
CTA	Nat'l NGO forPrivate sector coordination	telephone	√	√	√	In favour of dialogue with ProSAVANA yet wants improvements. CSO's should 'grab their chance' to dialogue.
Forum Mulher	Nat'l NGO	telephone	√	√		No to ProSavana
Oxfam	NGO (Int)	in person	√	√	√	Not fighting ProSAVANA but rather land grabbing (ASCUTE). Against some design and implementation methods of ProSAVANA. Prepared to discuss on same terms as ActionAid.
ADECRU	Nat'l NGO	skype	√	√	√	Against this ProSAVANA. If fundamental discussion under right conditions, could participate.
GMD	Nat'l NGO	in person	√	√	√	Very interested in ProSAVANA. As forum not against, but some members are. Will participate in initiatives that will strengthen dialogue between CS, Gov't and any other actors. But mechanism must be open, honest and transparent.
Justiça Ambiental	Nat'l NGO	in person	√	√	√	No to ProSAVANA
WeEffect	International NGO	In Person	√	√		One of the earliest activists against ProSAVANA, now favouring dialogue, but hotes that MASA and ProSAVANA must open up to CSO's.
Niassa:						
ORAM	Nat'l NGO	in person	√	√	√	Want to be of help, but contributions must be valued and taken seriously.
ROADS	Nat'l NGO	in person	√	√	√	Looking forward to ProSAVANA, but with corrections and greater inclusivity. Discussion should not be mediated by

Organisation Location and Name	Organisation Type	Interview type	Interview Notes on file?	Stakeholder Map Completed?	Survey Monkey Completed?	Position with Respect to ProSAVANA
						Government.
DPA Niassa	Gov't entity	in person	√	√		
DPA Focal Point	Gov't entity	in person	√	√		
Lussanhando, Associacao 25 de Setembro	Farmers Association	in person	√	√	√	With improvements, ProSAVANA is welcome.
SDAE Chimbunila	Gov't entity	in person	√	√	√	
ITC-F, Niassa	Nat'l NGO	in person	√	√	√	Not enough info to decide for or against. Consultations however should be led by neutral party.
UPCN Niassa	Provincial Farmers' Union	in person	√	√	√	No to this ProSAVANA. If some things are clarified, then perhaps yes. More openness to dialogue and change needed.
Nampula:						
ORAM	Nat'l NGO	in person	√	√	√	Dialogue platform welcome, but involve established structures.
Akilizetho	Nat'l NGO	in person	√	√	√	Discussion platform very welcome, but use existing platforms too. Want to "humanise" ProSAVANA. Most of Nampula network against the 'No to ProSAVANA' campaign, and not aligned with UNAC.
UPCN Nampula	Provincial Farmers' Union	in person	√	√	√	No to ProSAVANA. Want to co-operate and give input, but the process must start from scratch.
Forum Distrital de Camponesas, Mutuali	District Farmers'Union	in person	√	√	√	Want ProSAVANA, but want clear models and want to contribute. Directly involved, or through approved representatives, not imposed ones.

Organisation Location and Name	Organisation Type	Interview type	Interview Notes on file?	Stakeholder Map Completed?	Survey Monkey Completed?	Position with Respect to ProSAVANA
SDAE Malema	Gov't entity	in person	√	√		
Forum Terra	Nat'l NGO	in person	√	√	√	Not 'No to ProSAVANA', but no to the current process and to non-participation. No to land usurpation (ASCUTE). Doors open to meaningful discussion.
AENA	Nat'l NGO	in person	√	√	√	Want to participate in dialogue. In favour of ProSAVANA, but with some changes. Current ProSAVANAMaster Plan has some valuable approaches.
DPA Focal Point	Gov't entity	in person	√	√		
Pedro Carvalho (Opinion Leader, former member of OMR)	Individual	in person	√			Discussion platform very good idea, but make sure to involve existing platforms.
Antonio Lagres (Opinion Leader, former member of both CARE andSolidaridade)	Individual	in person	√			Not against ProSAVANA, but against the current method of implementation. He suggests to use the Agriculture&Natural Resources Network to organize the dialogue, as it is working better than platform.
Solidaridade	Nat'l NGO	telephone	√	√		Commented on MasterPlan, want to continue discussion.
Justicia e Paz	Nat'l NGO	in person	√	√	√	Interested in participating in dialogue, but it must be must be a genuine consultation with the community and include civil society.
PPOSC Nampula	NGO platform	telephone	√	√		Not against, submitted comments on Master Plan in writing but still waiting for answer.
Zambezia:						
SDAE Alto Molocue	Gov't entity	in person	√	√		
UNAC Alto Molocue	District-level farmers'Union	telephone	√			No position stated because of level of representation, though nationally UNAC is in the 'No to ProSAVANA' Campaign.

Organisation Location and Name	Organisation Type	Interview type	Interview Notes on file?	Stakeholder Map Completed?	Survey Monkey Completed?	Position with Respect to ProSAVANA
DPA Zambesia	Gov't entity	in person	√	√		
ORAM	Nat'l NGO	in person		√		Very interested in the dialogue.
ITC-F, Zambezia	Nat'l NGO	in person	√	√	√	Many open questions; 'investment yes, but communities must be included'
FONGZA	NGO platform	in person	√	√	√	Agreed to participate in the founding meeting and co-ordinate the Zambezia NGOs
AMCELA	Nat'l NGO	telephone	√	√	√	Would like to participate in dialogue, even though a founding member of 'No to ProSAVANA'.
RADEZA	Nat'l NGO	in person	√	√	√	Would like to participate in dialogue, even though a founding member of 'No to ProSAVANA'.

Result Totals

4 Institutions hardline against ProSAVANA (3 National NGOs and one Provincial Farmers Union)

7 Institutions strongly against, but will talk if dialogue conditions are met (4 National NGO's, 2 International NGO's, one Provincial Farmers' Union)

2 Institutions with no clear position (one National NGO, one Provincial Delegation of National NGO)

19 in favour of ProSAVANA, but with some changes (2 Opinion Leaders, 12 national NGO's, one international NGO, 2 provincial NGO forums, 1 District Farmer' Union, one Farmer's Association)

7 Government Entities

39 Interviewees, Total