BUILDING CLIMATE RESILIENCE OF VULNERABLE AGRICULTURAL LIVELIHOODS IN SOUTHERN ZIMBABWE

Green Climate Fund (GCF) Full Proposal Development

Pre-Appraisal Workshop

Date: 27 July 2018

Venue: MEWC 12th Floor Boardroom, Kaguvi Government Building, Central Avenue Harare

Apologies
Apologies were received from the Meteorological Services Department.

Introduction
The Government of Zimbabwe through the Ministry of Environment, Water and Climate (MEWC) with support from UNDP convened a Pre-Appraisal workshop to validate the GCF MEWC-UNDP Project Proposal: "Building Climate Resilience of Vulnerable Agricultural Livelihoods in Southern Zimbabwe" for the Green Climate Fund. The draft of the project proposal was shared with participants a week in advance of the meeting to allow participants time to review. It was noted that most stakeholders had received earlier versions of this document before during the formulation process. In addition, participants were also encouraged to send through written comments in preparation for the pre-appraisal workshop. The meeting agenda, the presentation made to the participants and the attendance register are attached.

Welcome remarks
At 0935hrs, the Chairperson, Mr. Tirivanhu Muhwati, Acting Deputy Director Climate Change Management Department, Ministry of Environment Water and Climate (MEWC) declared the meeting duly constituted. He welcomed all members to the meeting and invited all members to introduce themselves.

Following the introductions, the chair provided a brief background of the project proposal as below:

Background to the Proposal Development Process

First and foremost, the chair highlighted that the proposal development process had taken approximately two and a half years starting with a pre-feasibility study which was followed by the development of a concept note submitted to the GCF Secretariat in September 2016. Furthermore, the chair indicated that the internal approval of the concept note and the feedback from GCF

Secretariat in December 2016 had been followed by a full feasibility study. He indicated that the feasibility study took into consideration an economic analysis, a technical analysis of irrigation schemes as well gender and environmental safeguards. Next, he indicated how the feasibility study was followed by the development of a full project proposal. He also elaborated how the other relevant Government of Zimbabwe (GoZ) institutions had been engaged to secure their buy in during the proposal development stage including that the GoZ had committed to co-financing the project to a tune of US$13 million in cash and kind (of this, US$ 7.124 million in cash). The chair emphasised how the proposal development process had been an outcome of core leadership by a Think Tank and intensive stakeholder dialogue and consultation at all levels including with development partners and local communities and thanked all the stakeholders for their participation. In light of this, participants were encouraged to provide final feedback in line with the approval process requirements and to highlights any aspects that needed to be refined. In conclusion, the chair wished everyone fruitful deliberations.

Presentation of the Project Proposal Document

Ms. Anne Madzara, UNDP Team Leader Poverty Reduction, Environment and Climate Change was requested to present the proposal. First and foremost, she thanked the various stakeholders for participation during the proposal development process with special mention to the Climate Resilient Irrigation Development Facility who were said to have been key in contributing to the technical design of the project on irrigation infrastructure climate proofing and MLARR Departments for the agriculture related components of the proposal. She went on to elaborate the project design process, the project theory of change including barriers as well as giving the project overview which included implementation arrangements, project financing and the project logic framework guided by the presentation annexed.

Highlights of the presentation were as follows:

It was indicated that the project design process had been country driven:

- Project design was informed by Government of Zimbabwe's vision for development and addressed country climate change concerns and priorities (ZIMASSET, National Climate Change Response Strategy, NDC).
- Project design and development was guided by the Think Tank meetings and multilevel stakeholder consultation.
- Feasibility Study and sub assessments were produced to inform the project design. Extensive consultations with communities in the field, development partners, private sector and CSOs were conducted as part of this process.

The presenter went through the project Theory of Change and Logframe and elaborated on the three Outputs. The corresponding activities of the three outputs were also presented.

- Output 1: Increased access to water for agriculture through climate-resilient irrigation systems and water resource management.
- Output 2: Scaled up climate-resilient agricultural production and diversification through increased access to climate-resilient inputs, practices, and markets.
- Output 3: Improved access to weather, climate and hydrological information for climate-resilient agriculture.

The presentation also covered the project financing arrangements and implementation mechanism

The presentation also highlighted that knowledge management and capacity building components were embedded in all outputs.

- The presentation elaborated on how target beneficiaries were selected based on climate vulnerability criteria using the Zimbabwe Resilience Building Fund (ZRBF) climate related hazard mapping analysis of 2016 overlaid on the Poverty Atlas mapping. It was noted how the feasibility study further justified the need to direct climate change adaptation support to the Southern provinces, Matabeleland South, Manicaland and Masvingo even though other development work had concentrated in those areas.
- It was highlighted that the project was designed to build on previous investments and development work and ongoing resilience building initiatives in the targeted areas. For example, Output 3 would build on the Scaling up Adaptation Project efforts by scaling up the density of coverage of weather/climate and hydrological observation networks and strengthening the capacities of MSD and AGRITEX to develop and disseminate tailored and localised climate, weather and hydrological products among other initiatives. It was also emphasised that the project would complement existing efforts under the broader Zimbabwe Resilience Building Framework with more emphasis on building climate resilience of rural livelihoods. The project was designed to establish strategic and operational synergies with the Zimbabwe Resilience Building Fund (ZRBF).
- The project financing arrangement and budget was also presented indicating a total cost amounting to USD 37,7 million that includes GCF (US$29.4 million), UNDP (US$1.5 million) and GoZ (US$ 7.124 million financing). On the implementation arrangements, it was highlighted that the project would be an assisted NIM implemented by the Ministry of Environment Water and Climate with Department of Irrigation; Department of Agricultural Extension Services, the Meteorological Services Department and ZiNWA as Responsible Parties. The Project would be implemented by a project management unit. It was highlighted that a coordinated management and governance structure with the ZRBF had been proposed.
- The presentation presented highlights from the other assessments that were done including the Climate Resilient Irrigation analysis, Value Chain Analysis, CSA package analysis, Economic and Financial analysis, Gender Analysis and Action Plan, Risks and Social and Environmental sustainability analysis.

Key Discussion Points and Responses

The following are the comments, questions and specific recommendations from the validation meeting participants and the responses and action points.

Technical comments on specific outputs and activities

Maters raised	**Discussion/Response**	**Action required**
Adherence to the GCF Investment Criteria	The validation meeting raised a question on the need to elaborate how the aspects of the GCF investment criteria had been addressed. It was highlighted that the proposal had a section detailing how the project would contribute to the achievement of the Fund's objectives and result areas, specifically the impact potential, paradigm shift potential, sustainable development potential. The participants were also pointed to a section elaborating how the project was designed to meet the needs of the beneficiaries and country ownership.	No change required in the project document
Value chain development and private sector engagement	The validation meeting noted that value chain development, including engagement with the private sector were not coming out clearly in the proposal. In response, it was highlighted that the proposal should be read together with the detailed feasibility study and other annexes. However, in brief it was highlighted that private sector (including input suppliers, contractors, processors, buyers, credit providers) would be convened through Innovation Platforms to strengthen the climate-smart production and climate resilience in value chains; CSA packages and participation in the provision of weather information to farmers. The project would also leverage on current successful private sector engagement and partnership arrangements with private sector, namely through the ZRBF consortia and the UNDP/GEF Scaling Up Adaptation project. The meeting also noted the current challenges being faced by formal microfinance organisations	Review the statements on how private sector will be involved in this project to elaborate on the points raised. Including elaborating on how the existing rural farmers-private sector links, documented in the value chain and CSA package analysis, could be scaled up by the project.

	which were not operating optimally to support small holder farmers hence as a solution would be to scale up Village Saving and Lending Groups (VSLA) in areas where these groups are not already functional. It was noted that private sector engagement would be achieved either through Gvt or UNDP co-financing or leveraging with existing projects.	
Gender Analysis, Strategy and Action Plan	There is a need to relook at the gender strategy and action plan and improve on it in the following areas: - avoid sweeping statements on roles of women e.g. elaborate on how women are responsible for nutrition - the project should take into consideration social and cultural norms and how to address them e.g. empowering women to be leaders in the project without compromising their gender roles of the homes; ensure project does not perpetuate violence and conflict. i.e. elaborate on how the role of care may be potentially compromised by putting women in leadership roles and engaging them in project activities. - consider breaking down women by age, marital status etc. to avoid the strategy and plan appearing as if women are a homogenous group. - there is also a need to take note of other vulnerable groups such as children, children headed households etc.	Review Gender Strategy and Action Plan; Risk Assessment and SES to incorporate the recommendations; Incorporate mechanisms to monitor negative impacts throughout the project
Low cost meteorological and hydrological observation technology	Output 3 makes mention of low cost technologies e.g "It will enhance existing observational networks (meteorological and hydrological), utilizing a combination of standard and low cost (particularly for O&M) technologies." The meeting expressed concern over the adoption of low cost technologies as they perceived them as high cost maintenance and not durable considering the project lifespan and the expectation that they should operate beyond the project.	No action required

	In response, it was highlighted that globally low-cost weather products were generally considered quality products that are compliant to World Meteorological Standards. It was clarified that that low cost meant they were simple and not expensive to maintain.	
Agricultural colleges/centres of excellence	The validation meeting recommended that, under activity 3.3.3, there is need to identify an agriculture college within the Save-Runde Catchment so as to cater for this region. To cater for this region, the meeting recommended Chisumbanje Research Station as an additional college. Also, on activity 3.3.3, the meeting recommended that the name Mushagashi Agriculture College be changed to the formal name which is Makoholi Agriculture College.	Include Chisumbanje Research Station in the Proposal Replace the name Mushagashe with Makoholi Agriculture College in the proposal
G.2. Risk Factors and Mitigation Measures Risk Rating	The meeting recommended that the risk ratings of some risks needed to be revised as a few of them could realistically not be rated low risk. For example, erosion and siltation had been rated low risk, yet, given the experience to the torrential rains and catchment activity, this was considered a medium to high risk. In the same discussion, the meeting recommended the need to mobilise resources and engage in partnerships for in catchment management as a mitigation measure.	Review the Risk Factor 5 on "*Extreme weather events result in widespread erosion and sedimentation of irrigation infrastructure"* to HIGH Revise the mitigation measure.
	It was recommended that seasonal crop price fluctuation was a potential risk/threat and a there was need to incorporate aspects of a profit planner which is a continuous assessment of crop prices so as to ensure farmers will always be in business from one season to the other.	Include in the section of Risk analysis the risk of crop price fluctuations and consumer demand.
Section E: Country Ownership	It was recommended that, under National Ownership on existing plans and policies, there was need to make reference to the Irrigation Policy and ZAIP.	Revise section E.5.1 to include the Irrigation Policy and ZAIP.
Solar Investments	It was questioned why Solar Systems were not a	No action required.

	key feature of the project and the mitigation potential. In response, it was clarified that an Irrigation design and solar PV viability analysis had been done and that some of the irrigation schemes would have solar installations for water pumping and that such installations would be part of GoZ co-finance and that Rural Electrification Authority (REA) was currently being engaged to ensure provision of energy to the irrigation schemes.	
C.7. Institutional / Implementation Arrangements	The meeting noted the strategic link to the ZRBF programme. The meeting recommended the need to review the statement on the Governance Arrangements – for more clarity. Also review the statement and include a narration on the proposed GCF Steering Committee in the Governance structure to conform to the diagram – check on the project steering committee and the technical committees narration. The inclusion of the Department of Economics and Markets which is under the MLARR was recommended as one of the collaborating partners on markets and value chain development.	Review as recommended and possibly consult with the ZRBF.
Monitoring and Evaluation of the Gender Action Plan	The validation meeting recommended the need to include a gender specialist in the PMU team who would oversee the implementation and monitoring of the Gender action plan including gathering gender-based information and making sure this aspect is effectively delivered. In addition, there was need to include a budget for this role.	Consider review the budget provision to include services of a gender specialist on an ongoing basis. Check if the current provision is adequate to address the need.
Partnerships	The validation meeting sought clarity on how the project featured the complementarity between the WFP/MEWC USD$9million GCF project; IFAD irrigation support; and the IPFA Feed the Future	

	Programme for example. In response it was clarified how WFP project would complement the proposed GCF project Output 3 through PICSA in two additional districts, that the two projects were strongly leveraged as WFP would be engaged a service provider on implementation of PICSA in the proposed UNDP/MEWC GCF project to coordinate and ensure synergies. In addition, the two projects will coordinate and complement each other on activities related to the seasonal rainfall and hydrological forecasting. WFP proposed an elaboration of how the PICSA component would be implemented and a possible review to the implementation arrangement in this regard. It was highlighted that consultations had been done with IFAD, where synergies had been discussed and coordination had been done to avoid overlaps of targeted irrigation schemes. It was also noted that there was need to establish knowledge exchange platforms with other projects and to consider climate proofing some of the irrigation rehabilitation investments of other stakeholders in a future phase of the project.	

Summary of the Pre-appraisal Recommendations and Endorsement

The Chair summarised the comments and discussion and requested that if any stakeholder needed to submit a written submission they were welcome to do so by close of business, Friday 3 August 2018. The chair sought for endorsement of the proposal from the meeting.

Resolution: The stakeholders present unanimously endorsed the project proposal and gave_no objection to its submission to the GCF.

Discussion on the next steps

The following next steps were agreed:

i. UNDP due diligence completed with this pre-appraisal/validation meeting, comments from the validation meeting considered and minutes produced (End of July)
ii. GoZ internal clearance for submission and Letter of No Objection (1st week of August)
iii. Submission for UNDP technical and financial clearance (August 2018)
iv. Submission to GCF (Mid to 3rd week of August 2018)
v. GCF and Review process: Depends on the pipeline of projects; This involves the GCF Secretariat review, Independent Technical Advisory Panel (ITAP) review; and final Board Recommendation
vi. Potential GCF Board meetings at which the proposal could be considered (based on GCF's pipeline management) were October board session in 2018 or board session early 2019 (TBD)

Closing Remarks

Chairperson thanked all present for active participation. There being no further business chair closed the meeting at 1122 hrs.

Annex A – Responses to comments

Matters raised	Discussion/Response	Action required	Status
Value chain development and private sector engagement	The validation meeting noted that value chain development, including engagement with the private sector were not coming out clearly in the proposal. In response, it was highlighted that the proposal should be read together with the detailed feasibility study and other annexes. However, in brief it was highlighted that private sector (including input suppliers, contractors, processors, buyers, credit providers) would be convened through Innovation Platforms to strengthen the climate-smart production and climate resilience in value chains; CSA packages and participation in the provision of weather information to farmers. The project would also leverage on current successful private sector engagement and partnership arrangements with private sector, namely through the ZRBF consortia and the UNDP/GEF Scaling Up Adaptation project. The meeting also noted the current challenges being faced by formal microfinance organisations which were not operating optimally to support small holder farmers hence	Review the statements on how private sector will be involved in this project to elaborate on the points raised. Including elaborating on how the existing rural farmers-private sector links, documented in the value chain and CSA package analysis, could be scaled up by the project.	Revised, see section C3, activity 2.1

Matters raised	Discussion/Response	Action required	Status
	as a solution would be to scale up Village Saving and Lending Groups (VSLA) in areas where these groups are not already functional. It was noted that private sector engagement would be achieved either through Gvt or UNDP co-financing or leveraging with existing projects.		
Gender Analysis, Strategy and Action Plan	There is a need to relook at the gender strategy and action plan and improve on it in the following areas: - avoid sweeping statements on roles of women e.g. elaborate on how women are responsible for nutrition - the project should take into consideration social and cultural norms and how to address them e.g. empowering women to be leaders in the project without compromising their gender roles of the homes; ensure project does not perpetuate violence and conflict. i.e. elaborate on how the role of care may be potentially compromised by putting women in leadership roles and engaging them in project activities. - consider breaking down women by age, marital status etc. to avoid the strategy and plan appearing as if women are a homogenous group. - there is also a need to take note of other vulnerable groups such as children, children headed households etc.	Review Gender Strategy and Action Plan; Risk Assessment and SES to incorporate the recommendations; Incorporate mechanisms to monitor negative impacts throughout the project	Noted. The corresponding documentation will be revised accordingly.
Monitoring and Evaluation of the Gender Action Plan	The validation meeting recommended the need to include a gender specialist in the PMU team who would oversee the implementation and monitoring of the Gender action plan including gathering gender-based information and making sure this aspect is effectively delivered. In addition, there was need to include a budget for this role.	Consider review the budget provision to include services of a gender specialist on an ongoing basis. Check if the current provision is adequate to address the need.	Note, the budget includes provisions for 40% of UNDP CO gender advisors time, and the ToRs of each technical expert in PMU will integrate gender considerations
Agricultural colleges/centres of	The validation meeting recommended that, under activity 3.3.3, there is need to identify an	Include Chisumbanje	Revised. In implementation

Matters raised	Discussion/Response	Action required	Status
excellence	agriculture college within the Save-Runde Catchment so as to cater for this region. To cater for this region, the meeting recommended Chisumbanje Research Station as an additional college. Also, on activity 3.3.3, the meeting recommended that the name Mushagashi Agriculture College be changed to the formal name which is Makoholi Agriculture College.	Research Station in the Proposal Replace the name Mushagashe with Makoholi Agriculture College in the proposal	a choice between relevant DR&SS research stations / AGRITEX agric colleges to be made, budget for 5 IP's only.
G.2. Risk Factors and Mitigation Measures Risk Rating	The meeting recommended that the risk ratings of some risks needed to be revised as a few of them could realistically not be rated low risk. For example, erosion and siltation had been rated low risk, yet, given the experience to the torrential rains and catchment activity, this was considered a medium to high risk. In the same discussion, the meeting recommended the need to mobilise resources and engage in partnerships for in catchment management as a mitigation measure.	Review the Risk Factor 5 on "*Extreme weather events result in widespread erosion and sedimentation of irrigation infrastructure"* to HIGH Revise the mitigation measure.	Revised
	It was recommended that seasonal crop price fluctuation was a potential risk/threat and a there was need to incorporate aspects of a profit planner which is a continuous assessment of crop prices so as to ensure farmers will always be in business from one season to the other.	Include in the section of Risk analysis the risk of crop price fluctuations and consumer demand.	An additional risk has been listed (#9) on page 75.
Section E: Country Ownership	It was recommended that, under National Ownership on existing plans and policies, there was need to make reference to the Irrigation Policy and ZAIP.	Revise section E.5.1 to include the Irrigation Policy and ZAIP.	Revised, now mentioned.
C.7. Institutional / Implementation Arrangements	The meeting noted the strategic link to the ZRBF programme. The meeting recommended the need to review the statement on the Governance Arrangements – for more clarity.	Review as recommended and possibly consult with the ZRBF.	Reviewed with stakeholders, see below.

Matters raised	Discussion/Response	Action required	Status
	Also review the statement and include a narration on the proposed GCF Steering Committee in the Governance structure to conform to the diagram – check on the project steering committee and the technical committees narration. The inclusion of the Department of Economics and Markets which is under the MLARR was recommended as one of the collaborating partners on markets and value chain development.		
C.7. Institutional / Implementation Arrangements	**Review + decisions made with ZRBF stakeholders 2.aug 2018** **Proposed GCF project Steering committee:** Ensure that the composition of people on **GCF PSC** should include: - All ZRBF PSC members, incl. ZRBF donors - Other relevant technical/ responsible partners/departments, e.g. MSD, DLVS, ZINWA, DR&SS, Dept of Economics and Markets, AGRITEX, - Key service providers/collaborators, e.g. WFP - Research institutions and - UN agencies / development partners as relevant – e.g. FAO, if there is potential for collaboration on the climate modelling **National resilience building platform:** The idea of contributing into a national resilience building platform should be based on current government thinking to setup a shared national platform to mainstream resilience thinking across GoZ ministries, departments and projects. In the context of this project we can promise to ensure synergies between the two projects by having the same people on the PSC – the consecutive steering committee meetings will thus function as a resilience building	Revise C7 as per consultation with ZRBF	Revised

Matters raised	Discussion/Response	Action required	Status
	platform, but it is not an extra layer of governance. It is about making sure that the two projects communicate/ complement, builds on each other's initiatives – and also entails a commitment to feed into a national resilience building platform (which is still in discussion) that can incorporate different initiatives. **Staff time/budget allocation:** - ZRBF Resilience Advisor/ Project Coordinator to take a progressive resilience advisory role of 15%, 20%, 25% time over three years to support synergies and shared resilience approach (where possible) between the ZRBF and the proposed GCF project. To be financed by proposed GCF project. Accountability for project financial management and results lies with GCF project coordinator. Expected advisory / technical exchange between other technical experts of ZRBF and GCF PMU. - ZRBF M&E specialist 100% on ZRBF. Need to budget for an M&E specialist for proposed GCF project.		
Partnerships	The validation meeting sought clarity on how the project featured the complementarity between the WFP/MEWC USD$9million GCF project; IFAD irrigation support; and the IPFA Feed the Future Programme for example. In response it was clarified how WFP project would complement the proposed GCF project Output 3 through PICSA in two additional districts, that the two projects were strongly leveraged as WFP would be engaged a service provider on implementation of PICSA in the proposed UNDP/MEWC GCF project to coordinate and ensure synergies. In addition, the two projects will coordinate and complement each other on activities related to the seasonal rainfall and hydrological forecasting. WFP proposed an elaboration of how the PICSA component would be implemented and a		Coordination and consultation with IFAD, USAID (feed the future) and WFP is mentioned in the E5.3 WFP aspect elaborated below

Matters raised	Discussion/Response	Action required	Status
	possible review to the implementation arrangement in this regard. It was highlighted that consultations had been done with IFAD, where synergies had been discussed and coordination had been done to avoid overlaps of targeted irrigation schemes. It was also noted that there was need to establish knowledge exchange platforms with other projects and to consider climate proofing some of the irrigation rehabilitation investments of other stakeholders in a future phase of the project.		
WFP comments	• In line with what I mentioned below in the previous email, it would be beneficial to show clearly in the diagrams where WFP would be in terms of the coordination management structure and in the implementation structure. This would clarify to GCF, as well as to WFP itself, how we will work together (the Zambia UNDP GFC project provides a good example on this). • It would also be useful to show WFP in the flow of funds from the GCF/UNDP (again, Zambia is a good example). The mention that the funds will be transferred to WFP through an UN-to-UN agreement will also show that we have a clear idea on how the transfer will be done. • For the sake of clarity, it would be beneficial to spell out that the PICSA approach will not be rolled out over 15 districts, but just over three. • In general, I think there is an opportunity to highlight better the complementarities between this proposal and the WFP GCF proposal on Climate Services. The fact that we have two complementary proposals should be seen as a strong point. In particular it would be worth: ✓ highlighting the fact that WFP will focus on improving seasonal forecast related to rainfall, while UNDP		Revised C7 and C3, activity 3.2

Matters raised	Discussion/Response	Action required	Status
	will focus more on the hydrological impacts on the ground. ✓ Reinforcing the mention of WFP coordinating the PICSA component. • Related to this, in the Application of Best Practices section, the experience of WFP in managing PICSA, and the good results obtained in other countries, such as Malawi, should be highlighted. PICSA as an approach is a good one, but it also necessitates optimal supervision and logistical capacity for the rollout. Uni. of Reading has the knowledge, while WFP provides the necessary coordination.		
CRIDF comments from meeting 18.06.2018	The proposal must refer to the deliberately phased approach for subsequent implementation of the other climate resilient irrigation projects across climate vulnerable catchments (e.g. Save Basin in Mozambique) and also mainstreaming of climate proofing of irrigation schemes across Zimbabwe (being rehabilitated by other actors)		The focus on mainstreaming climate proofing of irrigation schemes in policy is mentioned in E.2.4. See highlighted text on page 44.
DFID comments	i) CSA practices to be promoted: The idea of a pre-screened package of CSA practices sounds a bit too prescriptive and potentially unhelpful to the overall objective of resilience building. How will this affect the empowerment of smallholders? How will it affect their learning and capacity for innovation? And how will it affect their ability to apply a set of principles to determine context-specific practices? I would suggest that farmers and extension workers be trained in the principles of	Revise Text of Full Proposal where appropriate.	i) Please see highlighted text in first paragraph under Output 2 on page 21.

Matters raised	Discussion/Response	Action required	Status
	agroecology and in options for climate-resilient practices, but not restricted to a package of pre-screened options. That said, the list of agronomic practices looks sound as a starting point and the feasibility study's value chain analysis looks to be a very well-done piece of work. However, I think there is still value to be had in leaving open the door to new practices and approaches to be included in those that this GCF project will train farmers in. For one reason, the group of institutions that was consulted is not sufficiently inclusive - there is a lot of expertise in other NGOs, CSOs and universities, and these experts may well propose different, possibly more resilient and sustainable agricultural and natural resource management practices. Furthermore, it should be noted that the Vuna study was limited to VCA and hence unsurprisingly does not seem to say too much about landscape approaches, integrated farming systems, integrated food-energy systems, and incorporation of biodiversity within agroecosystems. All of these are critical elements of resilient farming and natural resource management and to a thorough application of the broad CSA framework. I therefore suggest further consultation (particularly of experts in agroecology and integrated approaches to addressing the food-energy-water-ecosystems nexus) is built into the project and the "package" of CSA practices is not closed going into the project. ii) Irrigation/water management practices to be implemented:		Please see top of page 24 for additional highlighted text. ii) Please see highlighted text on pages 17 and 20.

Matters raised	Discussion/Response	Action required	Status
	Continuing my previous point, I do not see evidence that technologies such as sand abstraction and sand dams, which have been implemented successfully (it appears) in Matabeleland (by the Dabane Trust and partners) have been considered and will be included among the options to be assessed for appropriateness in this project. I strongly recommend that these practices be explicitly included for implementation where appropriate. iii) Watershed level assessment of priorities for water use: Continuing in a similar vein, I do not see sufficient clarity on the need for inclusive, evidence-based watershed level assessment of water use priorities. In particular, the choices about whether/how much water is used for food, non-food agriculture, energy, and natural ecosystems is critical to sustainable natural resource management yet does not seem to be part of this project proposal. iv) Governance of water resource management Connected with the afore-mentioned decision-making, is the governance of it. Here I pose a question: what is the role of the provincial, district and ward water and sanitation committees, in particular vis-à-vis that of the (sub-)catchment councils, and why are these committees not mentioned in the project proposal? More generally, it seems that a specific component on strengthening the governance of water from village to national levels should be included		iii) See highlighted text on page 17. iv) Please see additional highlighted text on page 17 See highlighted text on page 17. v) Corrected

Matters raised	Discussion/Response	Action required	Status
	unless this is foreseen in some other initiative, since unless the governance structure is right, the project interventions may not achieve the impact they might. There is mention of the (sub-)catchment councils, but the focus of the project in terms of governance structures seems to be on irrigation management committees (IMCs). My concern would be that if you only focus on IMCs, the bigger picture in terms of what agriculture should be done in a watershed, what are the priorities for the community in terms of food, energy, water, and which are the technologies that can deliver best against these priorities will be missed. for this reason, I suggest assessing whether the IMCs should be integrated into broader governance structures, such as the water and sanitation committees and/or producer associations at the watershed level or (where these are deemed useful) for specific value chains. v) There is rather a large error in the DFID contribution to ZRBF: the document states £3.5m whereas it is in fact £25m. vi) Innovation platforms: Note this is almost entirely the same approach as the ZRBF market development and financial inclusion call, soon to issue. So, care should be taken not to duplicate this work in overlapping areas, but rather to build on the inclusive business (or productive) partnerships (I don't like the rather generic term innovation platform, but we seem to be speaking about the same thing) established under ZRBF.		vi) Please see yellow highlighted text at bottom of page 21. vii) This is a valid concern and we assume that it refers to the MOSAICC set of models used to evaluate the impact of climate change on climate, crops, hydrology, forests and the economy. The proposed work under this project will not model the impacts of climate change on agriculture but rather focusses on better using the information coming from monitoring stations, weather and seasonal forecasts, for daily/seasonal

Matters raised	Discussion/Response	Action required	Status
	vii) Climate impact assessments/models: This is the area where the risk of duplicating FAO work may be highest: FAO have already developed models for assessing the impacts of climate change on water availability and thereby on crop yields (MOSAICC integrated model system and AMICAF project), as well as for assessing the impacts of climate change on AEZs. I would like assurances from UNDP that there is a strong case for not using FAO to train the Zimbabwean government and stakeholders to implement these models. The PICSA methodology sounds great but does not have specific models for such assessments, so it seems feasible to combine the two. viii) Climate insurance for smallholders: The background study on financial services/inclusion analyses the appropriateness of climate insurance for smallholders. The evidence reported in this		agricultural and related water management decisions. The PICSA approach is not tied to a particular model or set of models, rather it concentrates on building capacity within communities to understand and appropriately use weather and seasonal forecasts, as well as train AGRITEX and other extension agents to further train other communities (ToT approach) to be able to use this information. viii) Climate insurance will not be pursed as part of this proposal.

Matters raised	Discussion/Response	Action required	Status
	analysis all points against such use of microinsurance. However, the conclusion then remarks that farmers need to be educated about insurance. This is a typical response and seems extremely condescending. A more accurate conclusion – from evidence across the globe – seems to be that actually rather than smallholders' lack of financial literacy, the main problem is that suitable microinsurance products that address climate risks for smallholders in an accessible, affordable and cost-effective manner that supports rather than undermines resilience building have not been developed. Therefore, if this project is to get into insurance, it should be through exploring possibilities at the meso level – i.e. for risk aggregators such as large agribusinesses or financial institutions who are working with smallholders on contract farming or more innovative, equitable partnerships. The other angle that seems to come through from your analysis is exploring the possibility of self-managed institutions such as cooperatives, producer associations or federated ISALs running their own insurance schemes for members where any profits are put back into the common pot.		