



TURNING COMMITMENTS INTO RESULTS: CLIMATE–NUTRITION PRIORITIES FOR MOZAMBIQUE

Amelia Giancarlo¹, Juan Rachadell², Sofia Costa³, Oliver Camp⁴, Antony Ogolla⁵

¹Three Stones International, amelia@threestonesinternational.com

²Independent Consultant, juan.rachadell@gmail.com

³Independent Consultant, sofiabgcosta@gmail.com

⁴Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN), ocamp@gainhealth.org

⁵Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN), aogolla@gainhealth.org

Summary

Mozambique has established a strong policy foundation for integrating climate action and nutrition, although progress remains uneven across sectors. The review of 29 policies found the strongest integration in food security and agriculture policies. These policies commonly treat climate resilience and nutrition as mutually reinforcing objectives and support them through implementation plans, budgets, institutional responsibilities, and monitoring frameworks. Climate-focused policies increasingly recognize the effects of climate shocks on food security, livelihoods, and nutrition, but most lack explicit nutrition objectives, indicators, financing, and implementation mechanisms. Health and nutrition policies present a similarly mixed picture: several technical and regulatory instruments remain disconnected from climate considerations, while more recent strategies demonstrate substantial operational integration. Mozambique's principal challenge is therefore no longer establishing the rationale for climate–nutrition integration. The priority is to translate existing commitments into coordinated implementation, sustained financing, institutional accountability, and measurable results. Policies that already combine integrated objectives with dedicated implementation plans, financing, institutional responsibilities, and monitoring mechanisms provide practical models for strengthening future policies and programmes across climate, agriculture, health, nutrition, disaster management, and development sectors.

KEY RESULTS

- Climate–nutrition integration is increasingly reflected not only in policy commitments, but also in implementation plans, institutional responsibilities, financing, and monitoring, though these elements are not yet consistently present across the policy landscape.
- Food security and agriculture provide the strongest practical models for integrated climate and nutrition action
- Existing coordination mechanisms provide a platform for cross-sectoral action, but limited budgetary authority, dedicated financing, and subnational capacity constrain consistent implementation.
- Implementation is advancing across government and partner-supported programmes, although the most integrated delivery models remain concentrated in donor-funded and NGO-led initiatives and are not yet consistently embedded in routine systems.
- National commitments are not always matched by shared financing, monitoring systems, and subnational implementation capacity.
- Mozambique's next step is to consolidate and scale existing progress through stronger coordination, financing, evidence use, and locally responsive implementation.

INTRODUCTION

Mozambique faces interconnected climate and nutrition pressures that cannot be addressed through separate sectoral responses. Cyclones, floods, and droughts disrupt agricultural production, food markets, household consumption, and welfare (Baez, Caruso, and Niu 2020; Manuel et al. 2021). Research in rural Mozambique also shows that undernutrition is shaped by interacting factors across health, agriculture, food access, and water and sanitation, requiring coordinated multisectoral action (Aiga et al. 2020). Earlier analysis has shown that translating multisectoral nutrition commitments into implementation remains complex (Michaud-Létourneau and Pelletier 2017). This analysis therefore assessed whether national policies and institutional arrangements connect climate resilience with nutrition outcomes.

Responding to the need for stronger alignment between these agendas, the Initiative on Climate Action and Nutrition (I-CAN) was launched in 2022 by the Government of Egypt during COP27, in partnership with the World Health Organization (WHO), Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN), and the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Movement. I-CAN is a global, multi-stakeholder initiative that aims to accelerate transformative action at the intersection of climate and nutrition. By 2030, I-CAN envisions a world in which climate and nutrition agendas are fully integrated in policy, financing, research, and implementation. The initiative focuses on five strategic pillars, the first of which is to support national-level integration by strengthening policy coherence in countries facing both climate vulnerability and high burdens of malnutrition. Specifically, I-CAN targets four key outcomes by 2030:

1. Policy coherence: Greater integration of climate and nutrition across national policies, including NDCs, National Adaptation Plans (NAPs), National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs), national nutrition plans, food-based dietary guidelines, and public food procurement standards.

2. Scaled-up action: Accelerated implementation of climate and nutrition interventions.

3. Increased financing: Mobilisation of new and existing resources for integrated climate and nutrition agendas.

4. Cross-sectoral integration: Enhanced alignment of research, advocacy, and policy to advance both nutrition and environmental goals.

METHODS

A two-pronged light touch assessment was conducted between April and June 2026 to assess the climate and nutrition policy and stakeholder landscape in Mozambique. A light touch policy landscape analysis reviewed the content of 29 policies, including both currently active and no longer in force policies. The policies reviewed cover the thematic categories of nutrition and health, climate and environment, food security and agriculture, and general development. The policy landscaping findings were complemented by themes and results drawn from key informant interviews (KIIs) with 11 Mozambican nutrition and climate stakeholders, including government actors, development partners, private sector actors, and civil society organizations. To assess the level of nutrition and climate integration in each of the reviewed policies, the methodology outlined in the 2023 I-CAN Baseline Assessment was followed, consistent with the 2025 I-CAN Assessment update. A comprehensive keyword search was completed using Python, a high-level computer programming language. The level of nutrition and climate integration of each policy was then evaluated using the assessment criteria:

Level 1: No intentional connectedness between climate and nutrition

Level 2: Some intention to connect climate and nutrition

Level 3: Intention to mobilise resources to connect climate and nutrition

Level 4: Commitment to mobilising resources and with distinct plans to take action to connect climate and nutrition

Of the reviewed policies, food systems and agriculture demonstrated the strongest integration, with four of five policies classified at Level 4 and one at Level 2. Climate policies were concentrated at Levels 2 and 3, with five at Level 2, three at Level 3, and one at Level 4. Nutrition and health policies were more mixed, with five at Level 1, four at Level 2, and three at Level 4. Development policies were evenly distributed, with one policy each at Levels 2, 3, and 4.

KEY RESULTS

Key result 1. Climate–nutrition integration is increasingly reflected not only in policy commitments but also in implementation plans, institutional responsibilities, financing, and monitoring, though these elements are not yet consistently present across the policy landscape.

Mozambique's policy landscape shows that climate–nutrition integration is no longer limited to broad recognition of the relationship between climate shocks, food insecurity, and malnutrition. Several policies, such as the Food and Nutrition Security Policy and Implementation Strategy (PESAN) 2024–2030, the Strategic Plan for Agricultural Sector Development II (PEDSA II), the National Agricultural Investment Plan II (PNISA II), and the National Strategy for Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation (ENAMMC), and the Five-Year Government Programme 2025–2029, now translate this connection into more operational elements, including defined programmes, responsible institutions, implementation timelines, financing arrangements, and measurable indicators. The strongest policies treat climate resilience and nutrition as shared objectives and provide mechanisms for coordinated action across agriculture, health, food security, environment, and disaster management.

However, this level of integration is not yet consistent across all policies. Some technical, regulatory, and sector-specific instruments, such as the Food Fortification Regulation, the Code for the Marketing of Breast-Milk Substitutes, continue to address climate and nutrition separately, while others, such as Disaster Management Law, the Master Plan for Disaster Risk Reduction, the Updated NDC (2021), and the Public Health Law, acknowledge links between climate-related risks, food security, health, and nutrition without establishing dedicated climate–nutrition plans, financing, indicators, or implementation arrangements. Stakeholder perspectives reinforce this finding: Mozambique's policy and institutional foundation is considered relatively strong, but the extent to which commitments are implemented depends on financing, coordination, accountability, and capacity.

Furthermore, the shift from simply recognizing climate–nutrition linkages to embedding them in implementation is most evident in more recent strategies, which are more likely to include costed activities, designated institutions, measurable

targets, results frameworks, and links to national planning and budgeting processes. Overall, Mozambique has made meaningful progress, while retaining opportunities to strengthen consistency across the wider policy landscape.

Key result 2. Food security and agriculture provide the strongest practical models for integrated climate and nutrition action.

Mozambique's agriculture and food security policies provide the clearest examples of how climate resilience and nutrition can be advanced together. Agricultural and food security policies frequently recognize that sustainable production, household livelihoods, food availability, and dietary quality are closely linked. The strongest policies combine nutrition-sensitive actions, such as dietary diversification, biofortification, food reserves, and improved access to nutritious foods, with climate-resilient approaches, including conservation agriculture, climate-smart production, irrigation, resilient crops, and improved natural-resource management.

Stakeholders also described practical programmes that combine climate-smart agriculture with livelihood diversification, food production, and nutrition objectives. These initiatives demonstrate how integrated approaches can operate at community level when financing, technical support, and implementation responsibilities are aligned. However, stronger alignment is still needed between agricultural production, market incentives, climate resilience, and the availability of diverse, nutritious foods for domestic consumption. Weaknesses in storage, transport, and post-harvest systems can further reduce the nutritional quality and availability of food. Building on these existing programmes while improving storage, transport, post-harvest management, and market incentives for diverse and nutritious foods would provide a more concrete pathway for advancing both climate resilience and nutrition outcomes.



Key result 3. Existing coordination mechanisms provide a platform for cross-sectoral action, but limited budgetary authority, dedicated financing, and subnational capacity constrain consistent implementation.

Mozambique already has coordination structures that bring together actors working across food security, nutrition, agriculture, health, environment, and disaster management. These mechanisms provide an established institutional platform for aligning priorities, sharing technical knowledge, and supporting implementation across national, provincial, and district levels. Strong policies also assign responsibilities to lead institutions and coordinating bodies, demonstrating recognition that climate–nutrition outcomes cannot be achieved by one sector alone.

The stakeholder analysis shows, however, that formal structures do not always translate into consistent coordination in practice. The effectiveness of these mechanisms depends on whether they have adequate resources, clear authority, technical capacity, and the ability to influence sectoral planning and budgeting. Provincial and district coordination may also be affected by staffing constraints, limited operational resources, and turnover among trained personnel. These findings do not suggest that new structures are necessarily required, but rather that existing platforms could be strengthened through clearer accountability, more predictable financing, stronger links to sectoral budgets, and improved follow-through between national decisions and subnational implementation.

Key result 4. Implementation is advancing across government and partner-supported programmes, although the most integrated delivery models remain concentrated in donor-funded and NGO-led initiatives and are not yet consistently embedded in routine systems.

In Mozambique, climate–nutrition integration is being advanced by a broad ecosystem of actors rather than through government action alone. Government institutions provide policy leadership, regulatory authority, public services, climate information, and national coordination. Development partners and implementing organizations contribute financing, technical assistance, and community-level delivery. Civil society organizations bring local experience into policy discussions and monitor the effects of climate shocks on food security and diets. Academic and research institutions generate evidence, test locally relevant solutions, and support knowledge transfer.

The stakeholder analysis found strong commitment to integration across these groups and identified several practical examples of combined climate, agriculture, livelihood, and nutrition programming. However, implementation remains uneven because each actor operates with varied levels of funding, capacity, and geographic reach. In some cases, integration is strongest within time-bound projects where financing, expertise, and accountability are aligned. The opportunity is therefore to use lessons from these initiatives to strengthen routine systems encourage collaboration between stakeholder groups, and support approaches that can be sustained and adapted across different provincial and district contexts.



Key result 5. National commitments are not always matched by shared financing, monitoring systems, and subnational implementation capacity.

Although several national policies contain strong climate–nutrition commitments, such as PESAN 2024–2030, PEDSA II, PNISA II, ENAMMC, and the Five-Year Government Programme 2025–2029, these commitments are not always matched by shared financing, integrated monitoring systems, and sufficient subnational implementation capacity. Stakeholders identified practical constraints that can affect the implementation of commitments: integrated activities often compete with sector-specific priorities for limited public resources, while dedicated cross-sectoral budget lines remain uncommon. As a result, many integrated programmes rely on external financing, which enables innovation and implementation but can make it more difficult to sustain activities through routine government planning and budgeting systems.

Monitoring presents a similar challenge. Strong policies include indicators for climate resilience, food security, and nutrition, but stakeholders noted that systems rarely track climate stressors and nutrition outcomes together. This limits the ability to assess whether integrated interventions are producing benefits across both domains. At subnational level, financial constraints, logistics, staffing, and technical capacity can further affect the translation of national commitments into locally appropriate action. These gaps do not undermine the progress already made in policy development. Instead, they indicate where investment is needed to ensure that existing commitments are supported by practical financing, shared accountability, and sufficient implementation capacity at provincial and district levels.

Key result 6. Mozambique’s next step is to consolidate and scale existing progress through stronger coordination, financing, evidence use, and locally responsive implementation.

Evidence suggests that Mozambique already has many of the policies, institutions, and partnerships required to advance climate–nutrition integration. The priority is therefore not simply to create additional frameworks, but to strengthen how existing systems work together. This includes aligning sectoral plans

and budgets, clarifying institutional responsibilities, strengthening coordination mechanisms, and ensuring that climate and nutrition objectives are reflected in implementation and monitoring.

Stakeholders also emphasized the value of locally responsive approaches. National priorities are more likely to translate into sustainable results when provincial and district actors participate in designing and adapting interventions to local ecological, economic, and social conditions. Better use of evidence will also be important, including the development of shared climate–nutrition indicators and the translation of research into concise, actionable products for decision-makers. Finally, proven community-level and donor-supported approaches can provide useful models for wider adaptation and scale. Consolidating these strengths would allow Mozambique to move from increasingly integrated policy commitments toward more systematic, financed, and measurable action.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Fund Integration.** Embed climate–nutrition priorities within routine sectoral planning and budgeting rather than relying mainly on time-bound projects. Dedicated cross-sectoral financing arrangements, clearer costing, and stronger links to national budgeting instruments would help institutions implement shared commitments more consistently. Development partners can reinforce this by supporting programmes that include climate, nutrition, gender, and youth outcomes and by aligning funding with existing national frameworks and coordination structures.
- **Measure Together.** Develop a shared monitoring framework that tracks climate stressors, food-system resilience, and nutrition outcomes together. Existing policies already include relevant indicators, but stakeholders noted that these are rarely connected across sectors. Joint indicators and reporting arrangements would strengthen accountability, support adaptive management, and make it easier to assess whether climate investments are also improving nutrition. Academic and research institutions could support indicator development, decentralized data generation, and the translation of findings into concise products for decision-makers.

- Localize Delivery.** Strengthen provincial and district implementation by involving local authorities and communities in the design, testing, and adaptation of climate–nutrition interventions. National policies provide a strong foundation, but implementation needs to reflect different ecological conditions, livelihoods, infrastructure, and institutional capacities. Greater investment in district-level staffing, logistics, technical support, and locally appropriate planning would improve delivery. Successful community-based approaches should be adapted through existing government systems rather than replicated as uniform, externally designed models.
- Leverage and Strengthen Systems.** Use existing coordination mechanisms more effectively by clarifying responsibilities, strengthening accountability, and ensuring that coordinating bodies have sufficient authority and resources. Mozambique already has structures linking agriculture, health, nutrition, environment, food security, and disaster management, including SETSAN and its provincial and district councils (COPSAN and CODSAN), as well as the Inter-institutional Group on Climate Change, which convenes representatives from multiple sectors to support coordinated planning and action. The priority is therefore not to create additional platforms, but to improve how current structures influence planning, budgeting, implementation, and reporting across sectors and from national to district level.
- Strengthen Climate- and Nutrition-Smart Food Systems.** Align agricultural production, markets, storage, transport, and climate adaptation more closely with nutrition objectives. Existing policies provide strong models for integrating climate resilience and nutrition within agricultural planning and food-system programmes, including through climate-smart agriculture, dietary diversification, biofortification, food reserves, and early warning systems. Further action by government, development partners, and market actors should focus on reducing post-harvest nutrient losses, expanding the production and domestic availability of diverse nutritious foods, and creating incentives that better balance export goals with national nutrition priorities. Developing national food-based dietary guidelines would also help align agricultural planning with nutrition needs. WASH, livelihood diversification, climate information, and household risk-protection mechanisms should be incorporated into broader food-system resilience efforts.
- Scale Proven Approaches.** Document, adapt, and expand promising government- and partner-supported approaches that already demonstrate climate–nutrition integration. Examples identified by stakeholders include the Feed the Future Mozambique Resiliência Integrada na Nutrição e Agricultura (FTF-RESINA) Activity, which combines climate-smart agriculture with nutrition, poultry, beekeeping, and livelihood diversification, and Participatory Integrated Climate Services for Agriculture (PICSA), which helps farmers use climate information and seasonal forecasts to make practical decisions about crops, livestock, and livelihood activities. Civil society monitoring and locally grounded research also offer useful models for linking community experience and evidence with policy implementation. Lessons from these approaches should inform routine government programmes, while interventions should be adapted to local ecological, institutional, and socioeconomic conditions rather than replicated uniformly.

REFERENCES

- Aiga, Hirotsugu, Marika Nomura, José Paulo M. Langa, Mussagy Mahomed, Rosa Marlene, Albertina Alage, Nilton Trindade, Dino Buene, Hiroshi Hiraoka, Shunichi Nakada, Edgar Arinde, José Varimelo, and Américo Jeremias Chivale. 2020. "Spectrum of Nutrition-Specific and Nutrition-Sensitive Determinants of Child Undernutrition: A Multisectoral Cross-Sectional Study in Rural Mozambique." *BMJ Nutrition, Prevention & Health* 3: e000182. doi:10.1136/bmjnp-2020-000182.
- Baez, Javier E., German Caruso, and Chiyu Niu. 2020. "Extreme Weather and Poverty Risk: Evidence from Multiple Shocks in Mozambique." *Economics of Disasters and Climate Change* 4: 103–127. doi:10.1007/s41885-019-00049-9.
- Manuel, Lourenço, Orcidia Chiziane, Gaby Mandhlata, Faaiqa Hartley, and Emílio Tostão. 2021. "Impact of Climate Change on the Agriculture Sector and Household Welfare in Mozambique: An Analysis Based on a Dynamic Computable General Equilibrium Model." *Climatic Change* 167 (1): 6. doi:10.1007/s10584-021-03139-4.
- Michaud-Létourneau, Isabelle, and David Louis Pelletier. 2017. "Perspectives on the Coordination of Multisectoral Nutrition in Mozambique and an Emerging Framework." *Food Policy* 70: 84–97. doi:10.1016/j.foodpol.2017.07.001.