



REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-50922

Date: 05/04/2025

Title: Risk Management in LNG Projects in Eastern and Southern Africa: A Comparative Analysis of Mozambique and Tanzania

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is **YES**
- Accept after minor revision.....
- Accept after major revision
- Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance		✓		

Reviewer Name: **Dr.D.RAJAGOPAL**

Date: 05/04/2025

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

(To be published with the manuscript in the journal)

The reviewer is requested to provide a brief comment (3-4 lines) highlighting the significance, strengths, or key insights of the manuscript. This comment will be Displayed in the journal publication alongside with the reviewers name.

The author's call for binding mechanisms like IMF Special Drawing Rights tied to measurable outcomes (e.g., low methane intensity and local employment quotas) enhances the accountability argument. Particularly innovative is the proposal for blockchain-traced community shares, inspired by the Debswana model, and the use of AI-augmented participatory GIS to integrate indigenous knowledge, which aligns well with Ostrom's (2009) framework for managing common-pool resources.

- It highlights that technical interventions—such as militarized security in Mozambique or participatory environmental impact assessments—have limited effectiveness without corresponding institutional reforms.
- The framing of “decolonial energy justice” is especially noteworthy, emphasizing that local governance traditions (e.g., Tanzania's Baraza councils) can be fused with equity-focused innovation to ensure LNG development serves poverty alleviation and sustainability goals.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Title: Risk Management in LNG Projects in Eastern and Southern Africa: A Comparative Analysis of Mozambique and Tanzania

1. Summary of the Paper

The study undertakes a comparative analysis of risk management practices in liquefied natural gas (LNG) projects in Mozambique and Tanzania. Despite both countries being rich in natural gas resources, they are affected by different contextual risks—Mozambique by insurgency in Cabo Delgado and Tanzania by regulatory and revenue-sharing disputes. The paper utilizes a mixed-methods approach (interviews, surveys, and document review) to investigate three main dimensions: adopted risk mitigation strategies, their effectiveness, and the lessons learned. Findings reveal common strategies such as environmental monitoring, stakeholder involvement, and financial hedging, but also highlight persisting challenges in governance, regulatory enforcement, and technical capacity. The paper concludes by advocating for integrated frameworks, stakeholder collaboration, and regulatory reform to enhance resilience.

2. Strengths of the Paper

- **Relevance and Timeliness:** The topic is highly relevant, given the increasing global focus on LNG as a transitional energy source, especially in resource-rich developing countries.
- **Comparative Perspective:** The dual-country approach adds value, highlighting how similar resources are impacted by different risk factors.
- **Methodological Rigor:** The use of a mixed-methods approach strengthens the credibility of the findings, offering both qualitative insights and quantitative validation.
- **Practical Contributions:** The recommendations are actionable and targeted toward policymakers and industry stakeholders, aiming to bridge policy and practice gaps.
- **Contextual Depth:** By focusing on Mozambique and Tanzania, the paper highlights the complexity of resource governance in Sub-Saharan Africa, where political, environmental, and socio-economic factors intertwine.

3. Areas for Improvement

- **Literature Review Depth:** The literature review could benefit from deeper engagement with existing academic work on LNG project risks globally and within Africa to better position the study in current debates.
- **Clarification of Methodology:** While the paper mentions the use of interviews, surveys, and document review, more detail is needed on sample size, participant selection, and how data were analyzed.
- **Comparative Analysis Expansion:** The comparative element, though useful, could be further developed. A tabular or thematic comparison would help to clearly distinguish and evaluate the risk landscapes of each country.
- **Theoretical Framework:** The study would be strengthened by integrating a theoretical framework on risk management or development economics to guide the analysis.
- **Environmental Risk Detail:** The discussion on environmental risks is somewhat generic. Specific data on methane emissions, biodiversity impacts, or mitigation efforts would enrich the discussion.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

4. Recommendations for Revision

1. **Enhance Literature Contextualization:** Integrate more recent and region-specific studies to ground the research in broader academic discourse.
2. **Strengthen Comparative Insights:** Include structured comparisons (e.g., charts, matrices) to underscore differences and similarities.
3. **Deepen Environmental Risk Discussion:** Include quantitative or case-specific data on environmental risks to support claims and enrich analysis.

5. Conclusion and Overall Evaluation

This is a valuable contribution to the field of energy governance and risk management in developing economies. It provides an insightful comparative view of two significant LNG projects under different socio-political conditions. With some refinements in structure and depth, especially in the methodology and analytical sections, the paper has the potential to make a strong impact on both academic and policy discussions.

The passage offers a compelling and intellectually rich analysis of the institutional failures surrounding LNG projects in Mozambique and Tanzania. The argument insightfully connects fragmented governance to persistent risks, including youth unemployment and regulatory bottlenecks. Moreover, the suggestion for polycentric governance structures, such as a regional LNG authority (EALTA), and the use of digital twins for risk simulation, demonstrates forward-thinking in addressing systemic and climate-linked risks. The framing of “decolonial energy justice” is especially noteworthy, emphasizing that local governance traditions (e.g., Tanzania’s Baraza councils) can be fused with equity-focused innovation to ensure LNG development serves poverty alleviation and sustainability goals. Ultimately, the argument reinforces that institutional innovation—rather than resource endowments—is the cornerstone for achieving long-term, equitable, and climate-conscious growth.