|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WFP- Government of Zimbabwe**  ***Environmental and social risk screening and residual risk mitigation plan***  *Green Climate Fund (GCF) Proposal* |  |

## Environmental & Social Risk Screening

The “*Integrated Climate Risk Management for Food Security and Livelihoods in Zimbabwe*” project is screened against WFPs Environmental & Social Risk Screening Tool, which was developed taking GFF’s ESS requirements into account, among others. The screening is done on the basis of the activities described in the project proposal as well as on a list of *potential* activities that *could* be implemented as part of output 2.1. As stated in the project proposal, interventions under output 2.1 are designed, and assets chosen, through Community-based Participatory Planning (CBPP) sessions facilitated by WFP’s experts, which combine community’s current priorities with a long-term vision of rehabilitating degraded landscapes. Such activities will include soil and water conservation, nutrition gardens, conservation agriculture, livestock-related assets (mainly forage), support to storage and commodity aggregation points and trainings. All of these will be community-based and small scale. A list of potential activities and excluded activities is provided later in this document, after the screening itself.

As per WFP’s environmental policy and Zimbabwe national law, once the CBPP have identified the exact nature, type, location, size and specificities of the assets to be built in the frame of this project, WFP’s screening tool (provided below) will be re-applied to ensure that all the environmental and social risks have been identified and that the risk level is kept to minimum. If during that “asset-level” screening it appears that a selected asset triggers a higher risk, then the asset’s design will be modified in order to avoid or reduce the risk and keep the activity as low-risk.

A guidance on how WFPs Environmental & Social Screening Tool is used is provided below:

*The screening tool consists of a list of around 20 general level 1 questions (indicated with two digits, e.g. 3.1) and around 60 detailed level 2 questions (indicated with three digits, e.g. 3.1.1). They are categorized in nine thematic areas that correspond to the nine Environmental and Social Standards of WFP. The level 1 questions need to be answered first and they need to be answered ALL.*

*If a level 1 question is answered with a ‘yes’, it leads to more detailed questions of level 2. All level 2 questions under a level 1 question that triggered a ‘yes’ need to be answered. Level 2 questions can be answered after community consultations, while level 1 questions are answered during community consultations. If a level 1 question is answered with a ‘no’, then the corresponding level 2 questions do not need to be answered but can be if preferred.*

*Answers to the detailed level 2 questions result in one of three degrees of concern. If any level 2 question is answered with a ‘yes’, the indicated degree of concern will determine the degree of concern for the whole activity. This means that if a single question indicates a high degree of concern, the activity is classified as an activity of high concern and appropriate measures must be taken. If no question is answered with a high degree of concern, but at least one medium-level concern is raised, then the activity is a medium concern activity. If no level 1 or level 2 question is answered with a ‘yes’, then the activity is of low concern and no further action is required.*

*It is possible that a level 1 question is answered with a ‘yes’ and all associated level 2 questions are answered ‘no’ as they are more detailed and specific questions of the same issue. If all the level 2 questions are answered ‘no’, then this area will be of low concern, even if the level 1 questions was answered with a ‘yes’. There is no pre-determined degree of concern for level 1 questions.*

*If a potential impact is not covered by any of the L1 or L2 questions, it can be added in the empty box at the end of each of the nine sections.*

Below is the full screening tool with inputs/responses for the Zimbabwe project proposal in Red.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***E&S Standard 1 Sustainable Natural Resource Management*** | | | Concern | Y/N | Definition / References / Examples |
| 1.1 Could the activity lead to negative impacts on soils, groundwater, water bodies, water ways, coastal areas, or the sea | | | | No | No negative impacts foreseen, as per responses to level 2 questions below. |
| **Level 2** | 1.1.1 Could there be significant impacts on quality or quantity of surface- or ground-water? | Medium | No | If any, effects of the project will be positive and contribute to increased groundwater quantity and quality due to soil and water conservation structures, which increase groundwater percolation and storage. |
| 1.1.2 Could the activity lead to major changes in flow regimes of local waterways, conditions of water bodies, or coastal areas? | High | No | The small scale of water-related assets will not allow for such effects. If a residual risk is identified during the implementation of the project (when specific assets are identified and screening is repeated at asset-level), adequate mitigation measures will be taken. |
| 1.1.3 Could the activity lead to increased soil erosion, run-off, or significant changes to soil characteristics? | Medium | No | One of the objectives of the project is to counter soil erosion through soil and water conservation measures. Despite some small soil disturbance to create assets, the outcome will be less prone to soil erosion. |
| 1.1.4 Could the activity lead to serious soil erosion (e.g. major gullies, sheet erosion etc.) or major detriments to soil quality over a large or locally important area? | High | No | No. See response above. Moreover, the assets are of small scale. |
| 1.2 Could the activity lead to negative impacts on forests, wetlands, farming or grazing land, or other landscape elements of ecological or economic importance? | | | | No | The activities are supposed to incentivize tree planting, more sustainable farming practices (including conservation farming), and improve landscapes. |
| **Level 2** | 1.2.1 Could the activity lead to degradation or fragmentation of local forest areas, wetlands, prime farming or grazing land, or other landscape elements of ecological or economic importance? | Medium |  |  |
| 1.2.2 Could forests, wetlands, prime farming or grazing land, or other landscape elements of ecological or economic importance be almost fully destroyed or degraded or heavily fragmented? | High |  |  |
| 1.2.3 Could the activity lead to significant increase in consumption of locally sourced fuel-wood? | Medium |  |  |
| 1.3 Could the activity lead to changes in local tenure arrangements for existing resources or resources created by the activity? | | | | No | Communal assets are built on communal areas and managed by the community. If built on private land, contractual agreements are signed to make sure that clear compensations and rights are provided and respected. |
| **Level 2** | 1.3.1 Could the activity lead to changes in tenure arrangements that potentially could put groups or individuals at a disadvantage or could lead to disagreements and conflicts? | High |  |  |
| Other issue(s) | | |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***E&S Standard 2* *Biodiversity & Ecosystems*** | | | Concern | Y/N | Definition / References / Examples |
| 2.1 Could the activity lead to negative impacts on biodiversity, natural habitats, or endangered species? | | | | No | No negative impacts foreseen, as per responses to level 2 questions. |
| **Level 2** | 2.1.1 Could the activity lead to degradation of biodiversity or significant reduction in one or more common animal, insect, or plant species? | Medium | No |  |
| 2.1.2 Could the activity lead to loss (eradication or removal from local area) of one or more animal, insect, or plant species? | High | No |  |
| 2.1.3 Could there be negative impact on any endangered or critically endangered animal, insect, or plant species? | High | No |  |
| 2.1.4 Could there be negative impacts on critical migration corridors of endangered or otherwise or important animal or insect species? | High | No |  |
| 2.1.5 Could the activity lead to increase in unregulated or unlicensed collecting, hunting, or fishing? | Medium | No |  |
| 2.1.6 Could the activity lead to introduction of invasive alien varieties or species which could influence local genetic resources? | Medium | No | Tree planting activities may represent a risk of introducing invasive species by inadvertence to the area. To avoid this risk, the project will use native species only. The residual risk is therefore minimal. |
| 2.1.7 Could the activity lead to introduction of invasive alien varieties or species which potentially could eradicate, change, or significantly reduce local naturally occurring varieties or species? | High | No | Tree planting activities may represent a risk of introducing invasive species by inadvertence to the area. To avoid this risk, the project will use native species only. The residual risk is therefore minimal. |
| 2.1.8 Could the activity introduce genetically altered organisms? | Medium | No | WFP follows national law regarding the use of GMOs. Zimbabwe does not allow GMOs in the country, so there is no risk of the project introducing GMOs. |
| 2.1.9 Could a natural habitat be significantly degraded, fragmented, or more than half of extent destroyed? | Medium | No |  |
| 2.1.10 Could a natural habitat be almost fully destroyed or degraded so that it no longer could function as natural habitat for the original fauna/flora? | High | No |  |
| 2.2 Could the activity lead to negative impacts in protected or internationally recognised areas? | | | | No |  |
| **Level 2** | 2.2.1 Will any major constructions be located close (<200m) to critical habitats, protected areas, or areas of particular or locally recognised ecological significance? | Medium |  |  |
| 2.2.2 Could the activity lead to negative impacts on protected or internationally recognised areas? | High |  |  |
| Other issue(s) | | |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***E&S Standard 3 Resource Efficiency and Waste Management*** | | | Concern | Y/N | Definition / References / Examples |
| 3.1 Could the activity lead to very high resource use (such as fuel or water) during operation? | | | | No |  |
| **L2** | 3.1.1 Could the activity lead to more than 100,000 litres per year of diesel, in vehicles and/or generators? | Medium |  |  |
| **Level 2** | 3.1.1 Could the activity lead to major use of water from unsustainable sources (bottled and transported, gradual depletion of ground- or surface-water, change of local waterways etc.)? | Medium |  |  |
| 3.2 Could the activity lead to generation or transport of hazardous or non-hazardous waste which could have negative environmental impacts? | | | | No |  |
| **Level 2** | 3.2.1 Could the activity lead to significant increase in generation of waste that will not be disposed of in an environmentally friendly manner (recycled, re-used, or recovered) by WFP, beneficiaries, or third parties? | Medium |  |  |
| **Level 2** | 3. 2.2 Could the activity lead to generation of hazardous waste which will not be handled and disposed of safely by following normal Standard Operating Procedures? | Medium |  |  |
| Other issue(s) | | |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***E&S Standard 4 Pollution Prevention and Management*** | | | Concern | Y/N | Definition / References / Examples |
| 4.1 Could the activity lead to significantly increased release of pollution to air, land, or water during construction or operation? | | | | No |  |
| **Level 2** | 4.1.1 Could the activity lead to a dangerous increase in release of pollutants (incl. noise) to air, land, or water during **construction** or as result of accidents? | Medium |  |  |
| 4.1.2 Could the activity lead to a dangerous increase in release of pollutants (incl. noise) to air, land, or water during normal **operation**? | Medium |  |  |
| 4.1.3 Will the activity lead to any open burning of plastic waste during construction or operation? | Medium |  |  |
| 4.1.4 Could the activity lead to significant negative impacts on visual aesthetic values? | Medium |  |  |
| 4.1.5 Could the activity lead to discharge of untreated wastewater to the environment? | High |  |  |
| 4.2 Could the activity lead to procurement, transport, or use of chemicals, hazardous materials, or ozone depleting substances subject to international bans? | | | | No |  |
| **Level 2** | 4.2.1 Could the activity lead to procurement, transport, or use of chemicals or other hazardous materials, including asbestos and ozone depleting gases which will not be handled and disposed of safely by following normal Standard Operating Procedures? | Medium |  |  |
| 4.2.2 Could the activity lead to procurement, transport, or use of chemicals or other hazardous materials subject to international bans? | High |  |  |
| 4.3 Could the activity lead to increased use of agro-chemicals? | | | | Yes |  |
| **L2** | 4.3.1 Could the activity lead to use of agro-chemicals that potentially could be replaced or reduced by alternative environmental friendly products or techniques? | Medium | No | Improved livelihoods and investments could lead to increased amounts of fertilizers at smallholder farmers level. The project however is encouraging the use of conservation agriculture practices that limit the use of chemical fertilizers, and rather provides techniques for compost-making and other natural techniques. Spraying against pests and weeds will be reduced by providing ecological alternatives during the conservation agriculture training. The residual risk is therefore minimal. |
| 4.3.2 Could the activity lead to use of pesticides or other chemicals, which could have an unintended effect on non-target species and environment? | Medium | No | Same as above. Spraying against pests and weeds will be reduced by providing ecological alternatives during the conservation agriculture training. |
| 4.3.3 Could the activity lead to use of WHO class 1a, 1b, or Class II pesticides without proper application of the International Code of Conduct on Pesticide Management? | High | No |  |
| 4.3.4 Could the activity lead to use of pesticides, herbicides or other chemicals or materials containing or polluted by Persistent Organic Pollutants (POP’s) as listed by the Stockholm Convention? | High | No |  |
| Other issue(s) | | |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***E&S Standard 5 Climate Change*** | | | Concern | Y/N | Definition / References / Examples |
| 5.1 Could the activity lead to increased exposure, increased vulnerability, or reduced resilience of beneficiaries to the effects of climate change? | | | | No |  |
| **Level 2** | 5.1.1 Could the activities result in increased exposure to climate induced hazards? | High |  |  |
| 5.1.2 Could the activity result in beneficiaries being more vulnerable to climate-related stresses? | High |  |  |
| 5.1.3 Could the activity lead to beneficiaries having less means or options to withstand shocks resulting from extreme weather events (floods, storms, drought)? | High |  |  |
| 5.2 Could the activity lead to increases in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions or to reduction of carbon sinks? | | | | No |  |
| **L2** | 5.2.1 Could the activity lead to significant increases in GHG emissions during **operation** phase? | Medium |  |  |
| 5.2.2 Could the activity lead to significant degradation or destruction of elements which absorbs and stores carbon from the atmosphere (trees, plants, soils)? | Medium |  |  |
| Other issue(s) | | |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***E&S Standard 6 Human Rights*** | | | Concern | Y/N | Definition / References / Examples |
| 6.1 Could the activity lead to violation of human rights, use of child or forced labour, involuntary resettlement, or negatively affect vulnerable groups? | | | | No | WFP has clear policies and directives on human rights, child labour, accountability to affected populations that the organization and its partners have to adhere to. All project design and implementation approaches used are designed to ensure the participation, consultation and adequate consideration of vulnerable and marginalized groups, including women. |
| **Level 2** | 6.1.1 Could the activity, or that of partners, contractors, or suppliers, lead to violation of fundamental human rights as defined by international, national or local law? | High |  |  |
| 6.1.2 Could the activity aggravate the situation of vulnerable, marginalised, or otherwise disadvantaged individuals or groups? | High |  |  |
| 6.1.3 Could the activity, or that of partners, contractors, or suppliers, involve use of child (<14y) or forced labour? | High |  |  |
| 6.2 Could the activity negatively affect indigenous peoples or cultural heritage? | | | | No | Zimbabwe does not recognize any specific group as indigenous peoples, however there may be some minority groups. All the consultation processes used by WFP and its partners in the field are designed to be totally inclusive of all the groups represented in the area where the project will be implemented. Local knowledge of the area and constant support from various local stakeholders will help ensure this is the case. The same goes for implementation and the choice of activities which are done by the communities themselves, with some activities targeted to the most vulnerable groups. The needs, situation and preferences of minority and vulnerable groups are of special concern during these consultations, activity design and implementation. |
| **Level 2** | 6.2.1 Could the activity lead to involuntary economic or physical resettlement of households or individuals? | High |  |  |
| 6.2.2 Could the activity negatively affect indigenous peoples, culturally or otherwise, without their specific Free, Prior, Informed, Consent (FPIC)? | High |  |  |
| 6.2.3 Could the activity negatively impact any form of cultural heritage? | Medium |  |  |
| Other issue(s) | | |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***E&S Standard 7 Gender Equality*** | | | Concern | Y/N | Definition / References / Examples |
| 7.1 Could the activity lead to gender-based inequality, discrimination, exclusion, unwanted workload, or violence? | | | | No | WFP has a strict gender policy, which bars WFP from engaging in any activity that could increase gender-based inequality. All the consultations and projects are designed to ensure the proper participation of women, and that their views and preferences are taken into consideration into project design. Most of the assets to be created as the activities of this project specifically target women and aim at their empowerment. The specific gender action plan of this project will ensure any residual risks are avoided. |
| **Level 2** | 7.1.1 Could the activity create or amplify conditions for gender-based inequalities? | High |  |  |
| 7.1.2 Could the activity lead to gender-based violence? | High |  |  |
| 7.1.3 Could the activity lead to gender inequities in who makes decisions? | Medium |  |  |
| 7.1.4 Could the activity lead to increased unpaid work for women and girls? | Medium |  |  |
| Other issue(s) | | |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***E&S Standard 8 Community Health, Safety and Security*** | | | Concern | Y/N | Definition / References / Examples |
| 8.1 Could the activity lead to increased risk to community health and safety from use of equipment, materials, transportation, or natural hazards? | | | | No |  |
| **Level 2** | 8.1.1 Could activities during construction or operation phase lead to increased community risks from e.g. increased traffic, inappropriate design or use of equipment and materials which would not be handled by following normal Standard Operating Procedures? | Medium | No |  |
| 8.1.2 Could the activity cause community exposure to water-born, water-based, water-related, vector-born or communicable diseases? | Medium | No | The small scale of water-related assets will not allow for such effects. If a residual risk is identified during the implementation of the project (when specific assets are identified and screening is repeated at asset-level), adequate mitigation measures will be taken. |
| 8.2 Could the activity lead to influx of a temporary or permanent alien workforce? | | | | No |  |
| **Level 2** | 8.2.1 Could the activity lead to influx of a temporary or permanent alien workforce of relatively small size in a relatively isolated or culturally sensitive community? | Medium |  |  |
| 8.2.2 Could the activity lead to influx of a relatively large temporary or permanent major alien workforce (>10% of existing community) or a smaller group which could be expected to have important cultural, health, or socio-economic impact on a local community? | High |  |  |
| 8.3 Could the activity create or exacerbate intra- or inter-community conflicts? | | | | No | Community participation and equity principles will make sure to have an equal distribution of assets and project benefits across the different members of the community. Community consultations and O&M plans will ensure clear and approved access/use/maintenance of assets. Once assets have been finalised, they will also be assigned to specific groups, as decided during community consultations. Finally, the grievance mechanism will allow unforeseen negative effects of the project to be reported to WFP for corrective actions. |
| **Level 2** | 8.3.1 Could activities lead to opening up of existing or creating new minor conflicts or disagreements within or between groupings or communities? | Medium |  |  |
| 8.3.2 Could activities lead to opening up of existing or creating new conflicts or disagreements within or between groupings or communities which potentially could become entrenched, violent, or spread to additional groups or communities? | High |  |  |
| 8.3.3 Could the activity bring unequal economic benefits to a limited subset of the target group? | Medium |  |  |
| 8.3.4 Could the activity lead to increased un-employment that would not be absorbed by other sectors or activities? | Medium |  |  |
| Other issue(s) | | |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***E&S Standard 9 Accountability to Affected Populations*** | | | Concern | Y/N | Definition / References / Examples |
| 9.1 Could the target beneficiaries or stakeholders be dissatisfied due to limited consultation during activity design or implementation (including due to inadequate Complaints and Feedback Mechanisms)? | | | | No | Most of the activities are built bottom-up, with for example, the assets being identified by the communities through Community-Based Participatory Processes (CBPP) and the climate information services being developed together with communities and based on their needs and preferences. Community consultations and O&M plans will ensure clear and approved access/use/maintenance of assets. Participation of and benefits for women and other vulnerable groups within the communities will be ensured and discussed with the community at wide during consultations.  In addition, local knowledge of the area and constant support from various local stakeholders will help avoid this risk.  Finally, the grievance mechanism will allow for unforeseen negative effects of the project to be reported to WFP for corrective actions. |
| **Level 2** | 9.1.1 Could the activity lead to dissatisfaction or negative impacts due to lack of beneficiary or other stakeholder participation in planning, design, implementation, or general decision making? | Medium | No | As stated above, the tools and processes used by WFP and its partners in the field are designed to avoid such risks. Strong adherence to these processes/approaches will be ensured. |
| **Level 2** | 9.1.2 Is there a risk that not all relevant stakeholders, and especially marginalised or vulnerable groups, have been identified and consulted or that they have been exposed to internal or external pressure or coercion or not able to comprehend the consultations? | Medium | No | Local knowledge of the area and constant support from various local stakeholders will help avoid such risks. |
| 9.1.3 Could there be negative impacts due to an inadequate Complaints and Feedback Mechansism during project implementation? | Medium | No |  |
| Other issue(s) | | |  |  |  |

## Attestation of screening

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name and location of activity: | | | Integrated Climate Risk Management for Food Security and Livelihoods in Zimbabwe | | | |
| Responsible WFP unit or office: | | | WFP Country Office Zimbabwe | | | |
| Expected timing & duration of activity: | | | 2020-2024 | | | |
| Brief summary: | | | Climate change project funded by GCF | | | |
| Result of screening:  Category A / High |  | Category B / Medium | |  | Category C / Low | X |
| Type and scale of activities result in low degree of concern/Category C. Asset creation activities will be screened again once identified by communities through CBPP and all specifics of each asset is defined. If a higher degree of concern is identified at that point, changes in design will be made to ensure that any activity implemented within this project is low-risk. | | | | | | |

# Potential residual low-level risks, impacts, and mitigation plan

As mentioned above, in addition to the presented overall risk screening and once the communities have identified the assets of output 2.1, each asset creation activity will be screened once more as required by law and by WFP’s Environmental Policy. The Government of Zimbabwe Environmental Management Agency (EMA) screens each asset at feasibility and design stage, in order to identify any potential environmental or social risk and ensure they are either avoided, minimized or managed. WFP has similar requirements under its new Environmental Policy. This screening will apply to activities under output 2.1 and activities. WFP will closely work with the EMA to ensure all the planned activities are aligned not only with the GCF and WFP E&S safeguards and remain “low risk”, but also with EMA’s safeguards and requirements which follows national legislation. Any mitigation measure or further assessment required by the EMA will be carried out in alignment with the project management structure and through consultation with affected communities. EMA’s screening checklist template for WFP’s asset creation activities is added as Annex 19 (the file provided is an example of filled in checklist). WFP’s screening checklist is the one provided above in this document.

This section identifies a selected number of potential asset creation activities that could be implemented under output 2.1 of this project. It also provides a list of excluded activities, that come from WFP’s list of assets, that are medium to high risk and will therefore not be implemented under this project. Finally, it presents some potential residual risks with possible mitigation actions. The mitigation actions listed below are not comprehensive and different mitigation activities might be identified and selected during the “asset-level” screening.

Table 1: Indicative list of assets for output 2.1 (note: based on the results of community consultations – CBPP – other similar assets could be selected. This list is therefore not exhaustive.)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Asset Creation Activity Areas** | **Potential Environmental Risk \***  (low, moderate, high) |
| **Soil and water conservation / water harvesting** | |
| Hand-dug wells | Low |
| Low-cost micro-ponds | Low |
| Percolation pit or pond | Low |
| Farm dam construction < 3m high and < 10,000 m3 | Low |
| Small stone bunds with run-on and run-off areas | Low |
| Narrow stone lines along contours (staggered alternatively) | Low |
| Stone faced / soil or stone bunds with run-on/ runoff areas | Low |
| Conservation bench terraces(s) | Low |
| Tie ridge(s) | Low |
| The Zai and planting pit system | Low |
| Large half-moons (staggered alternatively) | Low |
| Small diversion weir design and construction | Low |
| Trees planted on contours | Low |
| **Nutrition gardens** | |
| Fencing plot for garden | Low |
| Planting vegetable crops | Low |
| **Conservation Agriculture** | |
| Mulching and crop residues management | Low |
| Compost making | Low |
| Fertilization and manuring | Low |
| Strip cropping / Crop rotation / Intercropping | Low |
| Minimal tillage | Low |
| Introduction of drought tolerant crops (Non-GMO) | Low |
| **Livestock related assets** | |
| Forage bushes introduced | Low |
| **Storage and commodity aggregation points** | |
| Thatching and roofing | Low |
| Construction of protection shelters | Low |
| Provision of storage containers | Low |
| **Training and skills** | |
| NRM training | Low |
| Asset management training | Low |
| \* The indications of ‘low, moderate and high’ are qualitative estimates of the risk level for the activity. The scale, intensity, location and other contextual factors will determine the actual risk level. | |

To ensure activities are kept within the low risk category, a short list of excluded activities is provided in relation to this project. This list is not exhaustive as an unlimited number of activities are excluded, but this list indicates some of the assets that can be built in WFP projects which are moderate to high risk and therefore will be excluded from this project.

Table 2: List of excluded activities/assets

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Excluded Asset Creation Activities** | **Potential Environmental Risk \***  (low, moderate, high) |
| Hillside terraces | Moderate |
| Spring development | Low, Moderate |
| River-bed or permeable rock dams | Moderate |
| Earth road on flat and rolling terrain – stable soils | Low, Moderate |
| Earth road on mountainous terrain–stable soils | Moderate, High |
| Gravel road on flat and rolling terrain – sandy or weak soils | Moderate |
| Gravel road on mountainous terrain – weak soils | Moderate, High |
| Gravel road on flat and rolling terrain– black cotton soils | Moderate |
| Road on escarpment | Moderate |
| Brickmaking | Moderate |
| Dip tanks | Moderate, High |
| Construction of dams, weirs and reservoirs higher than 3m or with storage volumes higher than 10,000 m3 | Moderate, High |
| Any activity that will lead to involuntary resettlement | High |
| Activities that will lead to increased use of agrochemicals | Moderate, High |
| Assets that result having a medium or high concern after the WFP asset-level screening is done and for which no lowering of the risk – either through modification in design or location – is possible | Moderate, High |
| Activities that require a thorough EIA according to EMA’s policies and rules | High |

Due to the small-scale nature of the assets, the risks for the proposed assets and activities is considered “Low”. However, some residual risks are possible, as identified by the risk screening, despite the low risk level, and to minimize those, the next table identifies them and provides possible mitigation measures. The asset-level screening will define if any residual risk is present and select the most appropriate mitigation measures to be implemented.

Table 3: Residual risks and Mitigation Measures for selected activities

| Residual risks and Mitigation Measures for selected activities | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Types of activities | Positive impacts | Summary of residual risks | Mitigation measures | Risk significance | Responsible party/person | Schedule | Expected results | Cost/Budget |
| Water harvesting | ↗ Water availability  ↗Water retention; ↘ Run-off;  ↘ Soil erosion;  ↗ Soil moisture | Increase in temporary waterlogging on less permeable soils  Increased flood risk if not well designed or stabilized.  Increased human health (vector- and water-borne diseases) | Integrate with soil drainage solutions if waterlogging risk is identified  Integrate with revegetation measures to enhance stability.  Adequate training/sensitization on vector- and water-borne diseases.  Water should be used for irrigation only. | Low  Medium  Medium | Project Management Unit (PMU) – in particular Project Coordinator and Risk Reduction Officer | Mitigation measures to be planned/ designed at asset design stage and implemented during asset building stage | Water harvesting assets are stabilized with adequate vegetation measures.  In less permeable soils, drainage solutions avoid waterlogging.  In case risks to human health are identified, trainings adequately address that issue. | No additional costs as these should be part of the assets building budget. |
| Tree planting | ↗ Stabilization  ↗ Biodiversity  ↗ Carbon sequestration  ↗ Biomass production  ↘ Run-off  ↘ Erosion  ↘ Evapo-transpiration  ↗ Water table recharge | Negative ecological impact from non-native species  Increased water demand depending on species chosen | During asset design, ensure proper choice of species and avoid invasive species. Use native species only. | Medium | PMU, in particular Project Coordinator and Risk Reduction Officer | Mitigation measures to be part of asset design | Trees planted are adapted to the local context and soil/climate specificities.  No invasive species are introduced | No additional costs as these are part of design. |
| Nutrition gardens | ↗Nutrition  ↗ Food production  ↗ Resistance to crop loss | Potential soil and water pollution by chemical fertilizers and pesticides | Avoid or limit use of chemical fertilizers, herbicides and pesticides.  Encourage compost making and conservation agriculture.  Vegetate areas around fields for IPM. | Low to Medium | PMU, in particular Project Coordinator and Risk Reduction Officer | Mitigation measures to be part of asset design and asset building | Use of agrochemicals is avoided or reduced to the maximum in nutritional gardens.  Compost is created and used. | No additional costs as these should be part of the assets building budget. |
| Conservation agriculture | Soil protected from wind and water erosion;  ↗ Soil fertility.  ↗ Soil stability.  ↘ Soil evaporation.  ↘ Run-off  ↘ Soil erosion | Competition for water and nutrients between crops | Ensure proper choice of crops to be grown. | Low | PMU, in particular Project Coordinator and Risk Reduction Officer | Mitigation measures to be part of asset design | CA techniques are applied with the adequate crops | No additional costs as these are part of design. |
| Livestock related assets | ↗ Livestock health  ↗ Food production | Increased tensions between farm land versus migration | Match land use to land capability to minimize conflict | Moderate | PMU, in particular Project Coordinator and Risk Reduction Officer | Mitigation measures to be part of asset design | Tensions between people/groups are avoided | No additional costs as these are part of design. |
| Trainings and skills enhancement | ↗ Knowledge | Vulnerable/minority groups excluded from trainings | Ensure women and vulnerable/minority groups are able to participate in trainings by adapting content/location/time to their specific needs | Moderate | PMU, in particular Project Coordinator and Risk Reduction Officer | Mitigation measures to be part of activity design | Women and vulnerable/minority groups participate in trainings and skills enhancement activities | No additional costs as these are part of design. |
| Construction on lands | ↗ Assets and resilience | Increases tensions  Reduced land access | Community consultations and action plans will inform where assets can be built on communal land to minimize tensions and land access issues.  If any, land acquisition for the project (either communal or private land) should be on a “willing buyer/willing seller” principle | Moderate | PMU, in particular Project Coordinator and Risk Reduction Officer | Land issues to be discussed during Community-based Participatory Planning (CBPP) and sorted out before asset building | Status of land where the assets are built is clear for all.  If any, land acquisition for the project will be on a “willing buyer/willing seller” principle | No additional costs as these are part of design. |

# Summary of findings and alignment with IFC Performance Standards

The proposed project has been screened according to WFP’s and GCF’s Environmental and Social Safeguards. The type of activities planned in the frame of this project are not expected to have adverse environmental or social impacts. Therefore, the overall project is categorized as **Category C[[1]](#footnote-2)**.

The following details the compliance of the project with the eight IFC Performance Standards:

* ***PS1: Assessment and management of environmental and social risks and impacts*** – Component 1 of the project includes capacity strengthening activities, workshops, knowledge sharing sessions, fairs, training sessions on Climate, Early Warning Systems (setting up trigger system), studies, and a compilation of best practices. Component 3 has capacity strengthening activities in the form of trainings only. These types of activities don’t have negative environmental and social impacts.

Component 2 “Increasing the adaptive capacity of food insecure households through community-based asset creation and risk transfer” has some concrete adaptation measures under output 2.1 “Risk reduction through the creation of climate adaptation assets”. The assets that will be developed through this project will be small-scale and at individual household or community level. They will be identified, planned and created with the beneficiary communities. The type of activities foreseen include: soil and water conservation interventions, nutrition gardens, conservation agriculture, livestock related assets, support to storage and commodity aggregation points, trainings and skills enhancement that help diversify livelihood opportunities and develop alternative income sources.

As mentioned before, The Government of Zimbabwe Environmental Management Agency (EMA) screens each asset at feasibility and design stage, in order to identify any potential environmental or social risk and ensure they are either avoided, minimized or managed. WFP has similar requirements under its new Environmental Policy. This screening will apply to activities under output 2.1.

* ***PS2: Labour and working conditions*** – through asset creation activities under Component 2, beneficiaries will have opportunities to produce small scale agricultural assets that benefit communities’ livelihoods and support their adaptation to climate change. The amount and type of work that each individual will do will be identified through consultations and will take account of men’s and women’s chores, roles and obligations. The assets building activities will be executed in compliance with government regulations. The program adheres to the criteria of the Decent Work Agenda (DWA). The international community, including WFP, has endorsed ILO’s definition of Decent Work as being productive work for women and men in conditions of freedom, equity, security and human dignity. The DWA involves providing opportunities for work that is productive and delivers a fair income, provides security in the workplace and social protection for workers and their families, offers better prospects for personal development and encourages social integration, gives people the freedom to express their concerns, to organise and to participate in decision that affect their lives; and guarantee equal opportunities and equal treatment for all.

In May 2016, WFP corporately has conducted consultations with relevant government agencies, UN and NGO partners involved in infrastructure building projects and reviewed and updated assets building work norms considering gender and protection aspects. All participants will be between 18 and 65 years of age and will have access to first aid facilities, which also meets WFP, cooperating partners and stakeholders’ requirements. This includes introducing lighter activities to engage women or specific vulnerable people unable to participate in heavy activities; ensure asset creation occurs during a favourable period to women and ensures children’s care at the village; set hours that are respectful of chores, roles and obligations of men and women.

According to WFP’s practices in Zimbabwe, complementary trainings and sensitizations are also conducted focusing on gender, nutrition, women health and infant and young child feeding, and social behaviour change. Besides trainings, other concrete actions were taken to promote gender, protection and social behaviour changes. All sites had child-friendly corners and work-norms were adjusted to suite gender issues. During implementation emphasis on worker safety at project sites was emphasized. All partners were required to take public liability insurance, acting as a safeguard against injuries whilst communities work at asset creation sites. It is a prerequisite for all sites to be equipped with first aid kits and community members trained in first aid, and clear referral paths established with local health centres up to district level health institutions to provide primary care in case of injuries. In one district, disability-friendly latrines have been constructed and are being show cased as best practice for the future as a way of enhancing protection issues and inclusivity for people living with disabilities.

* ***PS3: Resource efficiency and pollution prevention*** – The project activities will not generate pollution and will promote sustainable use of natural resources (water, soils and energy). WFP will closely work with key stakeholders at community level (districts and wards) with the Department of Agricultural Extension (Agritex) and the Department of Mechanization to ensure all activities comply with the relevant national legislation. Pollution prevention will be monitored through the Environmental Management Agency and departments under the Ministry of Agriculture.
* ***PS4: Community health, safety and security*** *–*Activities of the project will lead to improved food security and nutrition levels amongst the target population. There will be no safety and security risks introduced by the project. The project will mobilize local populations for all asset creation activities, including the creation of gardens not less than 1 hectare in size where vegetables, wood lots, tree nurseries or orchards can be developed in a healthy, safe and secure environment. WFP is committed to promoting a safe and healthy workplace for its community-driven projects in order to accomplish its mandate and strategic objectives. Project partners will have to ensure that safe working conditions are in place at the project site and that first aid kits are available. WFP is guided by the Occupational Health and Safety Assessment Series (OHSAS) and international standards on occupational safety and health. In 2003 Zimbabwe ratified the Occupational Safety and Health Convention 1981 (No. 155) and the proposed activities meet the Zimbabwe Occupational Health and Safety council requirements (see also overlaps with PS2).
* ***PS5: Land acquisition & involuntary resettlement***– there will be no resettlement of people under the project. The adaptation actions will target the most vulnerable rain-fed agricultural areas and rehabilitate watersheds within the local boundaries, based on the Community Based Participatory Planning (CBPP) and Seasonal Livelihood Programming (SLP) recommendations. The project objective is to promote livelihood activities that enable communities to continue to live sustainable lives in harmony with nature in the same place where their ancestors lived. Stakeholder engagement carried by WFP through a Legal Frameworks Workshop in 2016 and ongoing capacity development and training in collaboration with the host government ensure that activities undertaken do not result in illegal land acquisition and involuntary resettlement.
* ***PS6: Biodiversity conservation and sustainable management of living natural resources*** *–*The project activities will conserve local biodiversity and improve ecosystem services in the target areas. Tree planting will be promoted and gardens will include orchard development in the form of fruit tree lining around or within their perimeter. Rainwater harvesting ponds will enable and promote ground water recharge. Introduction of new seeds, saplings and trees will be done in consultation with the relevant ministries to ensure that invasive species are not introduced, and local species are used. Weirs and dams constructed across streams will have outlet pipes to avoid uncontrolled restriction of river flow and subsequent negative impacts on downstream ecology. Corridors for livestock watering and access to water shall be created to prevent siltation of created water sources through hoof traction and agitation of water edges. The department of livestock shall look at possibility of stocking created water sources with fish in order to improve dietary diversity of the surrounding communities. The Environmental Management Agency will give permit and guidance on the minimum clearing of vegetation required for each project. All of the activities will result in a net positive impact on the environment and the products from completed projects shall not affect the sustainable management of living natural resources. WFP programmes in Zimbabwe complement national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAP), the first of which were developed by the Zimbabwe government in 1998.
* ***PS7: Indigenous peoples (and vulnerable groups)*** – The project will address the development priorities for livelihoods, targeting the disadvantaged and most vulnerable local communities. Guided by the current legislation and the memorandum of understanding between WFP and the host government, the programme activities to be implemented will not have adverse impacts on the human rights, dignity and aspirations of the local population. The project will not only respect but reinforce human rights, especially those related to ensuring access, equity and prioritization of marginalized and vulnerable groups. It shall also address other cross-cutting issues related to gender equity and women’s empowerment, core labour rights and protection for all. The project will be working in areas with a homogeneous population with no minorities. Everyone in the target districts of Masvingo and Rushinga belongs to the Shona ethnic group.
* ***PS8: Cultural heritage*** *– Although* no specific monuments/buildings/areas of cultural heritage have been identified in the target communities, WFP will nonetheless ensure that other types of cultural heritage (sacred spaces, landscapes, etc..) are not impacted by activities of this project, if discovered. Communities will be consulted on this topic during Community Based Participatory Planning processes and WFP will ensure that any concern raised by communities on potential impacts on critical cultural heritage that is essential to their identity and/or cultural, ceremonial, or spiritual aspects of their lives is addressed. Certain activities in components 1 and 2 will aim at building trust amongst community members and shall serve to strengthen preservation of indigenous knowledge systems on climate and environmental issues. All WFP activities under this project will be implemented in compliance with the *Natural, Historical Monuments and Relics Act / ordinance* for Zimbabwe and conform to the Legal Frameworks requirement for the protection of immovable cultural heritage in Africa.

# Gender Equity and Women’s Empowerment

As stated before, the project will take into account issues/challenges related to gender relations to ensure that the design of the activities is gender sensitive and in line with WFP’s new Gender Action plan which lists actions, responsible WFP units, indicators and targets to be achieved by 2020. Programme indicators linked to each gender policy objectives are mapped and embedded in WFP reporting frameworks, and new indicators are included in the results framework.

Programme processes detail the internal work that WFP needs to carry out to ensure that concrete results related to gender equity and women empowerment (GEWE) are achieved. These processes further enhance the influence of GEWE mainstreaming on WFP needs assessment, programme design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation and lessons learned including those results obtained through the collection, analysis and use of sex and age desegregated data.

WFP’s asset creation implementation guidelines stipulate that projects should not have a negative effect on gender relations and, where feasible, contribute to improved gender equity. This also takes into consideration the fact that in farmer communities of Zimbabwe, women often actively participate in agricultural activities, while also seeing to household chores and raising children. This has implications on the availability of women to participate in activities. However, because women play a key role in achieving food security, in terms of food availability, access and utilization and nutrition security, their active participation is crucial. Therefore, activities will be designed in such a way that women on the ground participate in and take the lead in planning, designing and implementing projects and ensuring that they make full use of the means, knowledge and skills that allow them to fulfil their potential. For more information please refer to Annex 4.

# WFP Grievance mechanisms and hotline

WFP has three different but connected feedback mechanisms for beneficiaries. Community feedback mechanisms provide a platform for assisted people and communities to request information, provide feedback or raise their concerns regarding WFP programmes. This can be done through direct interface, suggestion boxes and tollfree helplines. Beneficiaries are free to make a choice of which feedback mechanism to use. Use of these mechanisms enhances feedback and accountability, increases monitoring coverage and the toll-free gives WFP a direct line of contact with the people being assisted.

The help desk is constituted by WFP, cooperating partner, chief/headman, ward councillor, district drought relief members and 3 ex-officio members (co-opted members) of which 2 should be women or members of minority groups. The help desk is chaired by the chief or his appointee (headman or senior village head). The help desk committee is available at every registration/distribution point and they sit at a designated spot/table and are responsible for receiving and recording complaints and feedback from members of the community. At all times feedback is given promptly and for those requiring investigations, the Incident Management Protocol is followed and this requires that investigations be done between 2-5 working days and findings shared with relevant stakeholders. The Help Desk follows the calendar of the registrations/distribution dates.

Suggestion box is a free and easy way to collect real experiences and honest suggestions from anyone. The suggestion box is mostly used where anonymity is required by the user. The suggestion box is located at a strategic, secluded and convenient place so that people are not afraid to use it. It is lockable and the keys are kept with the cooperating partner M&E focal person for the district. The box is opened in the presence of the district project coordinator or at the end of distributions/registrations by the help desk team. All feedback is documented and categorised for reporting and/ or follow-up if necessary.

The tollfree hotline is accessible throughout the country. People can call or text their suggestions and complaints related to WFP assistance. The hotline number is shared at the distribution point during registrations/distributions. CPs also ensures that they visibly display banners with hotline through use of posters. The number is also available on WFP SCOPE cards. The management of the toll-free is done by a third party, an accounting firm. All calls that come in are documented and categorised and transmitted to WFP. Immediate response can be given depending on the type of feedback/complaint.

For all the 3 mechanisms, data is captured into an excel spreadsheet and some of the information collected includes name of the person providing feedback, village, ward, district, cooperating partner, programme, nature of feedback. Issues are followed-up, investigated and action taken to improve on programme delivery. Issues of a severe nature that needs urgent escalation are referred immediately to CO management within 24 hours. All non-WFP related cases are referred to relevant stakeholders. Depending on the nature, the incident management protocol can also be initiated. Data is analysed and reports are shared monthly. Feedback is also communicated through stakeholder meetings and beneficiary meetings during registrations and distributions. For sensitive issues, feedback is given to the concerned persons bilaterally.

# Stakeholders engagement plan

The engagement of stakeholders will be a continuous process and will be conducted in all project areas. The stakeholders’ engagement plan is presented below as a calendar and the mentioned activities will repeat/take place each year.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Stakeholder Engagement Plan for GCF Activities** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Activity** | **Who** | **When** | | | | | | | | | | | | **Comments** |
| **Jan** | **Feb** | **Mar** | **Apr** | **May** | **Jun** | **Jul** | **Aug** | **Sep** | **Oct** | **Nov** | **Dec** |  |
| Community Based Participatory Planning | WFP, Contractors/Partners, Ward Level Agritex, Ministry of Women Affairs and Health staff, community representatives of different socio-economic groups with balanced gender representation, Ward Councilor. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Carried out each year in the new wards where the project is expanding. |
| WFP monitoring the project and receiving feedback from participants | WFP Project Manager and Field Office Staff |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Carried out every month to follow up on activities on the ground by partners and receive feedback. The amount of monitoring is increased during the asset creation season (July to November), to more than once a month. |
| Post Distribution Monitoring for asset creation (feedback from participants) | WFP Field Office Staff |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Post Distribution Monitoring for Asset Creation |
| Provision of tailored climate services information to stakeholders | WFP, Met Services, |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Feedback on index insurance outcomes provided throughout the season via mobile phones/other channels | Old Mutual |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Insurance Post Distribution Monitoring (data collection and feedback from participants) | WFP Field Office Staff |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | This can happen anytime during the rainy season in case the index has triggered a payout. |
| Insurance and Climate Services Post Season Assessment | WFP, SNV, Insurance Company Staff, Met Service Department |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | This is carried out at the end of every season to provide and get feedback on the insurance product and climate services from the communities. |
| VSL and access to markets feedback processes | SNV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | The establishment of VSL is a highly participatory process, and dedicated staff will be living in the actual communities. |
| Quarterly Meetings in Harare | PMU, including Contractors/Partners, National level Agritex and Met Service Department, Climate Change Management Department, and in addition Donors providing co-funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Twice per year the quarterly meetings will be in the Capital |
| Quarterly Meetings in Districts | PMU, including Contractors/Partners, National level Agritex and Met Service Department, Climate Change Management Department, and in addition Donors providing co-funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | One meeting carried out in Masvingo and one in Rushinga |
| GCF project partners visits to the field | PMU, including Contractors/Partners, National level Agritex and Met Service Department, Climate Change Management Department, and in addition Donors providing co-funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Wards will be visited by the full range of partners to assess developments and obtain feedback from communities. It will happen during the quarterly meetings in the field. |
| Complaints mechanism/ hotline | WFP, participant communities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Feedback mechanisms will be in place all the year round. |

1. Category A: Activities with potential significant adverse environmental and/or social risks and/or impacts that are diverse, irreversible, or unprecedented; (b) Category B: Activities with potential mild adverse environmental and/or social risks and/or impacts that are few in number, generally site-specific, largely reversible, and readily addressed through mitigation measures; (c) Category C: Activities with minimal or no adverse environmental and/or social risks and/or impacts;. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)