
Annual Performance Report

Project/Programme title: Building Climate Resilience of Vulnerable Agricultural Livelihoods in Southern Zimbabwe (FP127)

Accredited Entity: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Date of Report submission: 16 April 2026

Version number V1.0



Contents

Section A	<u>PROJECT DATA</u>
Section B	<u>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</u>
Section C	<u>RESULTS AND IMPACTS</u>
Section D	<u>RISKS ASSESSMENT AND MANAGEMENT</u>
Section E	<u>FINANCIAL INFORMATION</u>
Section F	<u>ENVIRONMENTAL SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS & GENDER & INDIGENOUS PEOPLE</u>
Section G	<u>ANNEXES</u>

RATIONALE

This report layout is designed to support the drafting of a structured report that assesses, evaluates, documents, and communicates the progress on Funding Proposal (FP) implementation and on its associated Funded Activity Agreement (FAA). The layout aims to provide a clear and comprehensive understanding of key objectives, progress, and risks, drawing on project implementation related data provided by Accredited Entities (AEs). Considering the Green Climate Fund's (GCF) evolving strategic direction toward a Risk-Based Approach, the report is intended to:

- Track quantitative and qualitative progress of the project implementation.
- Highlight critical findings and emerging trends.
- Identify risks and propose actionable mitigation strategies.
- Support evidence-based decision-making.
- Promote transparency and accountability.
- Align with strategic and regulatory frameworks.
- Serve as a foundation for AE engagement on project performance

METHODOLOGY

The report's layout mirrors, to the extent possible, the structure of the Funding Proposal (FP) to maintain coherence with the presented information. However, the FP and the Report differ in scope and strategic intent; thus, while the FP serves a functional role in informing the Report, it does not dictate a strictly parallel structure.

A. PROJECT DATA (Prefilled where possible)

Should any information/data prefilled from Section A.1 to Section A.12 be incorrect or require updating, please inform GCF's Project Lead of appropriate corrective action.

A.1. Date of report submission		16 April 2026														
A.2. Project or programme	Project	A.3. Sector	Public													
A.4. Total Financing (GCF + Cofinance)	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>GCF Financing</td> <td>Mill. USD 26.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grants</td> <td>Mill. USD 26.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Co-Financing</td> <td>Mill. USD 21.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grants</td> <td>Mill. USD 15.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>InKind</td> <td>Mill. USD 5.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Financing</td> <td>Mill. USD 47.8</td> </tr> </table>				GCF Financing	Mill. USD 26.6	Grants	Mill. USD 26.6	Co-Financing	Mill. USD 21.2	Grants	Mill. USD 15.5	InKind	Mill. USD 5.8	Total Financing	Mill. USD 47.8
	GCF Financing	Mill. USD 26.6														
	Grants	Mill. USD 26.6														
	Co-Financing	Mill. USD 21.2														
	Grants	Mill. USD 15.5														
	InKind	Mill. USD 5.8														
	Total Financing	Mill. USD 47.8														
A.5. Total GCF funding disbursed to this date	NA (draft)															
A.6. Implementation period	From 1 June 2017 to 9 June 2027															
A.7. ESS Category (Refers to GCF revised <u>Environmental and Social Policy</u> and GCF ESS Standards to assess your FP category.)			Category B													
A.8. Executing Entity Information																
Full legal name	Country of registration (or, for intl orgs, country of HQ)	Entity type	Role in project	Focal Point(s) and email(s)												
Ministry of Lands Agriculture Water and Rural Resettlement	Zimbabwe	Public sector – Government	Government Coordinator	Simba Mupodyi - simbamupodyi@hotmail.com												

A.9. Co-Financier information

Full legal name	Country of registration (or, for intl orgs, country of HQ)	Focal Point(s) and email(s)	Ownership Type	Beneficial Owner(s)
UNDP (TRAC)	Zimbabwe	Ayodele Odusola	United Nations Agency	United Nations Agency
Ministry of Finance, Economic Development and Investment Promotion	Zimbabwe	Edzai Chinakidzwa edzailostance@gmail.com	Government Ministry	Government of Zimbabwe

A.10. Alignment with country NDCs & NAP <i>(NB Only populate if applicable, e.g., if your project/programme specifically contributes to a country's NDC or NAP target/s)</i>				
Country	Date of NDC/ NAP submission	NDC/ NAP objective	Brief description of project's alignment with NDC/ NAP objectives	Percentage of target met with proposed project.Beneficial owner(s)
Zimbabwe	14 April 2026	NA	NA	0%

A.11. Estimated duration of impact	
A.12 Report to be shared with NDA	Yes ☐ No ☐

B. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Should any information/data prefilled in Section “B” be incorrect or require updating, please inform GCF’s Project Lead for appropriate corrective action.

B.1. Summary

Zimbabwe faces mounting climate change risks driven by rising temperatures, increasingly erratic rainfall, and more frequent extreme weather events intensifying aridity, reduced soil moisture retention, and increased river runoff. Widespread crop failure threatens food security, income stability, and the long-term viability of rural livelihoods with women being disproportionately affected,

The project’s objective is to support the Government of Zimbabwe in strengthening the resilience of agricultural livelihoods of vulnerable communities, particularly women, in southern Zimbabwe to increasing climate risks and impacts. The GCF Fund level impacts are; increased resilience of vulnerable people and communities and health and well-being, and food and water security. The expected outcome of the project is strengthened adaptive capacity and reduced exposure to climate risks of vulnerable smallholder farmers. GCF resources and GoZ co-financing are leveraged to overcome technical, financial, institutional and capacity barriers, enabling smallholder farmers, especially women, to: 1) access sufficient, reliable sources of water to enhance the climate resilience of agricultural production; 2) adopt climate-resilient agricultural practices and cropping systems; and 3) access and utilize climate information to effectively manage climate risk in agricultural production. The project will benefit an estimated 2,302,120 people (543,620 directly and 1,758,500 indirectly) across Manicaland, Masvingo and Matabeleland South provinces.

Key interventions include climate proofing of irrigation schemes, scaling up climate resilient agriculture, peer-to-peer learning, improved access to resilient crop varieties, markets, and actionable climate advisories. Innovation Platforms will bring together farmers, value chain actors, and financial institutions to support transitioning to commercial oriented production and climate resilient agricultural livelihoods.

The project delivers environmental, social, and economic co-benefits, including sustainable land management, strengthened gender equality, privates sector participation, and improved food and income security. It aligns with Zimbabwe’s Nationally Determined Contributions and national climate policies, supporting improved water management, agricultural technologies, and strengthened meteorological services.

C. RESULTS AND IMPACTS

C.1. Overall Summary of the Project Progress

(This section provides a narrative report summarizing the overall progress of the implementation status of the funded activity progress during the reporting period. 1,500 words)

Outcome: Use of early warning weather information by communities and tools for responding to climate change effects is key in improving the adaptive capacity of communities. In 2025, 95 AGRITEX officers out of 155 scored at least 75% across four criteria using the scorecard indicating an increased use of climate information for informed decision making. About 43.5% of project direct beneficiaries reported to be using fund supported tools and instruments and strategies to respond to climate change thus contributing to strengthened adaptive capacity in 2025.

Output 1: An additional 273ha (796 of 1,786 ha-44.6%) of the targeted area was brought under climate proofed irrigation systems and 145% (110,223 of 75,900ha) additional targeted rain-fed area was brought under water harvesting and climate-resilient water management in 2025.

Output 2: Yields of critical crops improved significantly due to climate resilient agricultural (CRA) practices with maize and sorghum yields being 0.91 and 0.94 tonnes per hectare amounting to an increase of 78.43% and 36.23% respectively in 2025, exceeding the end of project target of 25% increase. Implementation of CRA practices were on track this year, to achieve the end of project targets of 60% with 44% of the beneficiary households scoring >75% on the scorecard.

Output 3: The project surpassed its targets of installing hydromet equipment in 2025, which includes 12 automatic weather stations, 10 low-cost weather stations and 14 river gauging stations. Overachievement on river gauging stations was due to parallel co-financing by the Government through ZINWA surpassing the project target of 32 monitoring stations. The number of people receiving tailored advisories and weather information through radio talk shows, bulk SMS and WhatsApp messages increased by 100% from 35109 to 71,528 Households (25,199 Male and 46,328 female) against a project target of 108724 households.

Activity 1.1: Site-specific design studies were completed for all the remaining three schemes. Six schemes were climate proofed in Masvingo and Manicaland, securing irrigation for an additional 273 ha cultivated by 828 households in 2025. Training on irrigation governance and O&M was done with 710 farmers and 17 DOI engineers participating. A two phased women's leadership in IMC programme reached 876 farmers (62% women) achieving major gains in inclusive decision making and visible improvements in scheme governance, alongside peer-learning events that engaged 371 farmers across 11 schemes.

Activity 1.2: Field-based training on (i) soil conservation and fertility improvement; (ii) rainwater harvesting design and layout, including contour pegging, basin spacing and depth, and infiltration pit design; and (iii) post-drought recovery and restoration of degraded plots using vegetative solutions reached 6,900 lead farmers across 230 FFS, cascading skills to 16,301 follower farmers (11,362 women; 4,939 men) and driving adoption of three or more water conservation practices to 50.7%. The project distributed 230 earth augers, reducing women's basin-preparation time by 84%, with 64% of 6,900 users being women, and doubling hectareage under conservation farming from 54284 Ha to 110223 ha. Community learning days which reached 16301 farmers across 230 FFS supported scale-up of climate-resilient practices, expanding rain-fed hectares under water-harvesting measures to 110,223 ha (2025).

Activity 2.1: The project strengthened five Innovation Platforms, supporting seed production, livestock genetics, horticulture and market engagement for 4,000+ farmers (2,535 female, 1,465 males). In 2025, sesame characterization was done as a process for selecting varieties for registration and 12,192 cattle semen straws were produced for artificial insemination. Inputs including livestock (1150 boschveld chicks and 21 sabi sheep), 720 tree seedlings and 1000kgs of climate-resilient seed were provided to farmers for promotion of climate adapted genetic resources. Private sector engagement linked 132 producer groups to 37 private sector companies. Financial inclusion advanced through capacity building of 35 financial intermediaries and farmers improving financial literacy among farmers.

Activity 2.2: The project reached 305 officers (160 females and 145 males) through training of trainers (ToT) on gender and financial leadership, cascading to 1,926 Gender Champions and 13,719 farmers, 9829 women. Capacity building reached 152 and 106 AGRITEX officers on soil analysis and cluster development respectively. Additionally, 3,633 (66.7%) lead farmers were reached through value chain development training. Livestock CSA adoption improved, with biomass feeding reaching 65.4%. Farmer-to-farmer learning expanded via 230 community open days, reaching 16,301 farmers (11,362 women and 4,939 men).

Activity 2.3: The project strengthened digital knowledge systems by training officers in GIS and Remote Sensing on the open source QGIS package (48 officers) and on relational databases using SQLite (17 officers), creating standardized spatial data tools and a unified Integrated Results Management Framework (IRMF) aligned database. A CSA Knowledge Management Strategy was developed and extensive media products enhanced national visibility of the project with more than 60+ additional media stories, 11 broadcast bulletins, and 18 audiovisual knowledge products in 2025.

Assessments—including PICSA, CIS, drone surveys and Post Treatment reviews—confirmed strong CRA adoption (97–99%) and major yield gains in maize (122%), sorghum (70%) and cowpea (51%) during the reporting year when compared to baseline.

Activity 3.1: All 12 AWS and 1 rainfall gauges were fully functional, improving national data, seasonal comparisons, and downscaled forecasts throughout the year. Two remaining water level stations were operationalized and an additional 4

were installed, enabling real time transmission to ZINWA. Satellite debiasing generated 73 virtual climate stations with 40-year corrected datasets. Capacity building trained 23 MSD/ZINWA officers in satellite correction and 94 (48 MSD/AGRITEX, 46 ZINWA) observers in hydromet equipment operation and maintenance, strengthening localized, reliable climate and water resource advisories for farmers.

Activity 3.2: District level 10 day forecasts, sub-seasonal and 2025 seasonal forecasts including new monthly temperature products were produced, translated, and shared across all 15 districts via WhatsApp, maps, and advisory bulletins. Hydromet data integration improved through Climsoft Web and ZedNet, training 70 MSD/ZINWA officers and enabling unified databases with real time data flows for modelling and water resource products. Dissemination expanded through 88 localized radio programmes reaching over 2,480,174 people, plus bulk SMS that reached 51368 households or (231156 people) and 100+ WhatsApp groups, ensuring timely, context-specific advisories for smallholder farmers.

Activity 3.3: The project generated localized climate products (start/end of season, dry spells, crop probabilities) using historical data for 15 districts, training 60+ experts, 250 extension officers, and reaching 58,000+ farmers through PICSA based interpretation and use in 2025. Training on satellite data debiasing strengthened MSD and ZINWA capacity to correct rainfall, temperature, soil moisture and evaporation datasets, with ongoing support to generate gridded virtual stations and improved climate products for PICSA and e-PICSA.

C.2. Performance against the Funding Proposal Logical Framework Indicators

For each of the indicators please report only the 'annual value' for the reporting year; this means reporting solely the values achieved from January 1st, 2025, to December 31st, 2025. The "cumulative value" will automatically be updated by the system by aggregating reported annual values since project FAA effectiveness.

Please ensure that targets are clearly defined and reported using the following categories:

- *Midterm Target: The results to be achieved by the midpoint of implementation.*
- *Final Target: The results to be achieved by the conclusion of project or programme implementation.*
- *Lifetime Target: The total results expected over the entire operational period of the project or programme.*

Note that the baseline, midterm, final and lifetime targets will be prefilled based on your previous Annual Performance Report and/or Funding Proposal. It is imperative that you carefully review, verify and update where relevant.

Should the project be Multicountry, please report the achievement by Country.

Lastly, avoid using commas or periods as thousand separators. Periods should only be used as decimal separators.

For REDD+ Results-Based Payment (RBP) projects, you are only required to report on the progress of activities.

Should any prefilled information/data in the Logical Framework be incorrect or require updating, please inform GCF's Project Lead for appropriate corrective action.

GCF Outcome Level: Standardized Indicators

PMF/IRMF Results Management Framework

No indicators/questions defined.

(PMF) A1 and A2 Total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries (IRMF) Core 2 Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached						
Provide the total number of direct beneficiaries (female/male) cumulatively receiving adaptation benefits from GCF-supported interventions, disaggregated by result area.						
Unit						No. of Beneficiaries
Disaggregation by: Result Areas (Adaptation)	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Livelihoods of people and communities	0	25,000	81,800	82,434	0	82,434



(PMF) A1 and A2 Total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries (IRMF) Core 2 Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached						
Provide the total number of indirect beneficiaries (female/male) cumulatively receiving adaptation benefits from GCF-supported interventions, disaggregated by Gender.						
Unit						No. of Beneficiaries
Disaggregation by: Gender	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Male	0	351,700	879,250	747,055	363,942	1,110,997
Female	0	351,700	879,250	839,049	407,115	1,246,164

No indicators/questions defined.

(PMF) A1.2 Number of males and females benefiting from the adoption of diversified, climate resilient livelihood options (including fisheries, agriculture, tourism, etc.) (IRMF) Supplementary 2.1 Beneficiaries (female/male) adopting improved and/or new climate-resilient livelihood options Provide the total number of direct beneficiaries (female/male) adopting diversified or strengthened climate-resilient livelihood strategies (including agriculture, fisheries, natural resource-based, and informal livelihoods), disaggregated by country.
--

Unit						Enter unit
Disaggregation by: Project Countries	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Zimbabwe	0	25,000	81,800	82,434	0	82,434

Health and well-being, and food & water security

No indicators/questions defined.

(PMF) A2.3 Number of males and females with year round access to reliable and safe water supply despite climate shocks and stresses (IRMF) Supplementary 2.3 Beneficiaries (female/male) with more climate-resilient water security						
Provide the total number of direct beneficiaries (female/male) with improved access to and adoption of climate-resilient and reliable water supply in climate-stressed areas, disaggregated by gender.						
Unit						No. of Beneficiaries
Disaggregation by: Gender	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Male	0	1,250	2,950	739	426	1,165
Female	0	1,250	2,950	534	417	951

(PMF) A2.3 Number of males and females with year round access to reliable and safe water supply despite climate shocks and stresses (IRMF) Supplementary 2.3 Beneficiaries (female/male) with more climate-resilient water security						
Provide the total number of direct beneficiaries (female/male) with improved access to and adoption of climate-resilient and reliable water supply in climate-stressed areas, disaggregated by country.						
Unit						Enter unit
Disaggregation by: Project Countries	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Zimbabwe	0	2,500	5,900	1,273	843	2,116

Project Specific Indicators							
Indicator	Unit	Baseline	Target		Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value (automatically calculated)
			Mid-term	Final target			
3.1 Numbers of operational monitoring stations in key catchments and VIS systems.	No. of Items	64	96	96	94	6	100
3.2 Number of smallholders receiving new advisories and warnings developed for both agriculture and water management and disseminated through media, including SMS and radio.	No. of Persons	0	180,000	543,620	193,497	186,538	380,035
1.1 No. of hectares under climate-proofed irrigation	Hectares	0	1,500	1,786	527	269	796
1.2 Number of rain-fed hectares exhibiting water harvesting and climate-resilient water management measures	Hectares	0	30,000	75,900	54,284	55,939	110,223
2.1 Average level of production increases (%) per	Tonnes per hectare	0	0	25	71	0	71

hectare in newly irrigated hectares (tons/ha)							
2.2 Number of smallholder farmers implementing climate-resilient agricultural practices/cropping systems	Percentage	0	30	60	41	8	49
A6.1 Use of climate information products/services in decision-making in climate-sensitive sectors	Percentage	25	100	100	56	6	62

Activities				
Activity Name	Implementation Progress (%)	Utilised GCF Budget	Allocated GCF Budget	% (Automatically calculated)
Activity 1.1 : Climate proofing irrigation infrastructure for enhanced water security in the face of climate change	64	9,325,336.25	10,180,993	91
Activity 1.2 Field-based training and technology investments for farmers on rain-fed farmlands for climate-resilient water management	85	777,173.24	1,496,914	51
Activity 2.1: Establish transformative multi-stakeholder innovation platforms for diversified climate-resilient agriculture and markets	90	1,972,594.03	2,540,096	77
Activity 2.2: Investments in inputs, technologies and field-based training to scale up the implementation of climate-resilient agricultural production in the face of increasing climate hazards (rain-fed and irrigated farms)	90	2,969,865.89	4,172,330	71
Activity 2.3 Enhance institutional coordination and knowledge management capacities for climate-resilient agricultural production in the face of increasing climate hazards	68	1,500,699.49	1,770,200	84
Activity 3.1: Installation and operationalization of weather/climate and hydrological observation networks	94	1,021,033.29	1,442,665	70
Activity 3.2: Develop, disseminate and build institutional capacities (MSD and AGRITEX) on tailored climate and weather information products	80	906,021.31	1,103,199	82
Activity 3.3: Capacity building for farmers and local institutional staff on effective use of climate and weather information and products	70	1,180,156.23	2,112,995	55

Activities				
Activity Name	Implementation Progress (%)	Utilised GCF Budget	Allocated GCF Budget	% (Automatically calculated)
for resilient water management and agricultural planning				
Activity 4.0: Project Management	60	1,110,928.48	1,940,160	57

C.2.1. Subprojects							
Where applicable, include information on sub-projects. For projects and programmes approved until B.31, the logical framework should focus on the mitigation and adaptation Performance Measurement Frameworks (PMF). For projects and programmes approved from B.32 onwards, the logical framework should reflect the Integrated Results Management Framework (IRMF).							
Title	Currency	GCF Funds	Co-Financing	Country	GHG Emissions Reduced	Direct Beneficiaries	Indirect Beneficiaries
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
C.3. Compliance with FAA covenants				Yes ☒ No ☐			
The project has complied with FAA covenants.							
C.4. Funded Activity Implementation Arrangements in the Following Year				Yes ☒ No ☐			
In the 2024 APR, the project reported a budget deficit that constrained the completion of irrigation schemes. While the original target was 21 schemes, a revision to 16 is under consideration, pending GCF Task Manager approval. This adjustment would lower both the hectares under irrigation and the number of beneficiary households. To address the shortfall, a budget optimisation exercise reallocated funds from activities that had already surpassed IRMF targets. As a result, the project is expected to reach 4,184 households (71% of target) and bring 1,343 hectares under irrigation (75% of target). Efficiencies were achieved by expanding areas within existing schemes, leveraging government-supported power connections instead of costly solar arrays, and reducing construction costs through community participation, improved designs, and innovative engineering solutions. These measures demonstrate adaptive management and resourcefulness in sustaining project impact despite financial constraints							

D. RISKS ASSESSMENT AND MANAGEMENT

D.1. Risk and mitigation measures

As stated in the Board-approved "Risk Appetite Statement," a cornerstone of the GCF's Risk Framework is proactive risk management. This includes risk identification, assessment, monitoring, reporting and appropriate mitigation to minimize and respond to risks, both directly and through partners implementing GCF's projects and programmes.

Risk Management Matrix

A risk is the probability of an event to adversely affect the achievement of the project Impact (its objectives, outcomes, and results). "Inherent risk" refers to the level of risk present before any of the mitigating measures are applied. "Residual risk" represents the level of risk after mitigating measures have been implemented.

Please update the project risk matrix by reviewing and revising information for all previously identified risks, and adding any new risks identified during implementation by selecting the adequate Risk Area in the drop-down menu. For each risk, ensure you provide a clear risk description, outline the potential negative consequences, specify the mitigating measures in place, and complete the severity scoring as required.

For the Integrity Risk Area, an annual reporting (and more frequent and prompt reporting if stated in the legal agreements with the GCF) is required for each of its 3 Risk Sub-areas, as GCF has zero tolerance for Prohibited Practices, for SEAH in Fund-related Activities, and for working with parties and engaging in activities subject to sanctions imposed by the United Nations Security Council. The AE reporting obligations under GCF's policies and in the legal agreement(s) with the GCF include but are not limited to requiring AEs to take action to identify, mitigate and promptly disclose to the GCF any real or perceived Conflict of Interest, any alleged or suspected Prohibited Practice, promptly notify the Fund of any material risks or other indications of money laundering and/or financing of terrorism in relation to the Project and promptly take remedial steps in consultation with the GCF.

The AE shall also provide updates on the risks and mitigating measures under the other Risk Areas when changes to already identified risks or new risks have been identified.

Risk scoring:

For likelihood, please rate on a scale from 1 to 5: 1. Unlikely, 2. Possible, 3. Likely, 4. Almost certain, 5. Certain

For impact, please rate on a scale from 1 to 5: 1. Close to none, 2. Low, 3. Medium, 4. High, 5. Catastrophic

The severity of each risk is automatically computed based on the likelihood and impact of the risk.

Risk 1	1. Revitalization and climate-proofing of irrigation infrastructure could experience delays given logistical and operational challenges of construction in relatively remote areas
Risk Origin	Project Related
Risk Area	Design and Implementation
Risk Sub-area	N/A
Description	The revitalization and climate proofing of irrigation infrastructure may face significant delays due to the logistical and operational challenges inherent in constructing and upgrading systems in remote rural areas. These locations often lack adequate road access, reliable transport networks, and readily available construction materials, increasing the time and cost of mobilising contractors and equipment. The complexity of climate-proofing measures—such as hydrological assessments, flood-resilient design, solar pumping installations, and bioengineering works—further extends implementation timelines, particularly where technical capacity is limited. Past experiences referenced in the project document show that extreme weather events, siltation, and infrastructure degradation already strain existing schemes, making rehabilitation more demanding. Institutional coordination across multiple agencies can also slow progress if responsibilities are unclear or overstretched. Collectively, these factors heighten the likelihood of delays, potentially reducing water security for smallholders and slowing climate resilient agriculture outcomes.
Consequences	Delays in revitalizing and climate-proofing irrigation infrastructure would significantly undermine the project's ability to deliver reliable water access to smallholder farmers in the targeted schemes. Prolonged construction timelines would leave communities exposed to persistent water insecurity, reduced irrigation efficiency, and heightened vulnerability to droughts, erratic rainfall, and mid-season dry spells. This would stall expected gains in agricultural productivity, jeopardize planned yield increases, and slow adoption of climate-resilient agricultural practices. Institutional capacities of Irrigation

	Management Committees would also weaken, affecting long-term operations and maintenance. Women—who form the majority of smallholders—would face disproportionate setbacks in income, food security, and participation in scheme management. Overall, delays would compromise climate-resilient livelihoods, reduce project impact across beneficiary populations, and hinder progress toward broader resilience and value-chain development objectives.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	This risk will be mitigated by carrying out site specific design studies building on the sub-assessments, studies and consultations during project preparation; clear, formal delineation of responsibilities and division of labor among collaborating institutions; rigorous vetting of bidding companies, and intensive planning beginning at project inception. The project implementation arrangements will emphasize inter-institutional coordination, and sufficient technically competent staff will be employed to ensure efficiency in irrigation revitalization and climate-proofing. These measures maintain this risk at Medium.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Comments	N/A		
Risk 2	2. Farmers may be reluctant to adopt climate-resilient agricultural practices due to perceived risk associated with application of new techniques and inputs.		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Design and Implementation		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	Farmers may be reluctant to adopt climate resilient agricultural practices because they often perceive new techniques, inputs, and technologies as risky, untested, or incompatible with their traditional farming systems. Many smallholders, especially in the drought prone districts targeted by the project, have limited access to reliable climate information, weak extension support, and constrained financial resources, making them hesitant to experiment with practices whose benefits may not be immediately visible. This reluctance is reinforced by past experiences of crop failures linked to climate variability, limited market access for diversified crops, and insufficient technical capacity within extension services to guide farmers through the transition. Gender specific barriers, such as women's limited access to land, finance/ inputs, and decision-making power, further reduce adoption rates. Without strong confidence building measures, participatory learning, and demonstration through Farmer Field Schools, adoption may remain low, undermining the project's ability to scale climate resilient agriculture across vulnerable communities.		
Consequences	If farmers are reluctant to adopt climate-resilient agricultural practices due to perceived risks associated with new techniques and inputs, the project's core adaptation outcomes may be significantly undermined. Reluctance would slow down the uptake of climate-resilient agricultural (CRA) packages promoted through Farmer Field Schools, reducing the number of farmers practicing improved soil, water, and crop management techniques. This would limit productivity gains, jeopardize the project's target of achieving stable or increased yields, and prolong farmers' vulnerability to droughts, mid-season dry spells, and erratic rainfall. Moreover, reduced adoption would weaken market-oriented value chain development, as buyers and private sector partners depend on consistent quality and volumes. Women farmers, who already face structural barriers, may be disproportionately affected, widening gender gaps in productivity and income. Overall, low adoption rates would impede the project's ability to build climate-resilient livelihoods at scale across southern Zimbabwe		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	Participatory action-research methodologies used in Farmer Field Schools will build on smallholder-identified needs and priorities, as well as their traditional knowledge of their agro-ecosystems. Lead farmers, both men and women, who are the most progressive and respected smallholders in a community will be identified for FFS training to take place over the course of at least two years. Smallholder organizations will be		

	represented on Innovation Platforms and will receive technical assistance and other support from the different institutional and private sector stakeholders to ensure climate-resilient crop and livestock production and commercialization. Given a long history of institutional support to smallholders in the region starting at the ward level, farmers have often been trained by AGRITEX staff and are accustomed to the FFS modality. The project is timely disseminating weather, climate and hydrological information for improved decision making by farmers. These measures maintain this risk at Medium.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood 2 - Possible	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 6 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood 2 - Possible	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 6 - Medium
Comments	N/A		
Risk 3	3. Irrigation Management Committees do not participate in revitalization of irrigation schemes and may take no responsibility for Operations and Maintenance.		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Design and Implementation		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	There is a risk that Irrigation Management Committees (IMCs) may not actively participate in the revitalization of irrigation schemes or assume responsibility for ongoing Operations and Maintenance (O&M). This reluctance can stem from weak organizational capacity, limited technical knowledge, and historically inconsistent performance of IMCs in managing communal irrigation systems. Many IMCs in older schemes have struggled with planning, financial management, conflict resolution, and climate-risk-informed decision-making. In some schemes, farmers have not fully understood their roles, lacked confidence in collective systems, or have been hesitant to contribute financially to O&M funds. Additionally, years of degraded infrastructure, climate-induced damage, and limited institutional support may lead IMC members to feel disengaged or doubtful about the sustainability of revitalized schemes. If IMCs do not take ownership, the long-term functionality and climate resilience of the irrigation systems are jeopardized, undermining reliable water access and project sustainability.		
Consequences	If Irrigation Management Committees (IMCs) do not actively participate in the revitalization of irrigation schemes or assume responsibility for Operations and Maintenance (O&M), the long-term sustainability and functionality of the irrigation systems would be severely compromised. Without IMC ownership, infrastructure upgraded through climate-proofing measures may deteriorate rapidly due to lack of routine maintenance, leading to equipment failures, reduced water delivery, and the eventual collapse of scheme operations. This would undermine water security for the smallholder farmers relying on these systems, limiting their ability to stabilize yields and reduce vulnerability to droughts and erratic rainfall. Weak IMC engagement would also erode the effectiveness of O&M Funds, disrupt collective rule-setting, and hinder peer-to-peer learning networks intended to strengthen scheme governance. Ultimately, the absence of IMC responsibility would jeopardize project outcomes, reduce climate-resilience gains, and threaten the long-term viability of community-managed irrigation infrastructure.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 3 - Likely	Impact 2 - Low	Severity 6 - Medium
Mitigation Measure(s)	Confirmation of the willingness of IMCs to participate in restoration of irrigation schemes and assume responsibility for O&M will be a key criterion for revitalization of their scheme by the project. The project will follow a participatory methodology in scheme revitalization with IMC members present and active from design to maintenance. Farmers are required to make a financial commitment to IMC O&M funds, and this will be closely monitored by DoI and AGRITEX staff. Proactive inclusion and strengthening of the governance component and contribution towards Revolving and O&M Funds by irrigation scheme farmers will be ensured. The development and implementation of a standardized IMC & Climate Smart O&M Manual including training of IMCs will also contribute to this effort. Given the essential importance of irrigation to rural livelihoods, the probability of the risk of IMC disinterest is considered low.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood 2 - Possible	Impact 2 - Low	Severity 4 - Medium

Current Residual Risk	Likelihood 2 - Possible	Impact 2 - Low	Severity 4 - Medium
Comments	N/A		
Risk 4	4. Elite farmers could capture the benefits of partnerships with the private sector		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Design and Implementation		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	There is a risk that elite or better resourced and well-connected farmers may capture the benefits of partnerships with private sector actors engaged through the project's Innovation Platforms and irrigation schemes. This risk arises because elite farmers often have greater access to land, inputs, capital, and market information compared to typical smallholders. As a result, they may be better positioned to meet private sector requirements for volume, quality, and timely delivery, enabling them to dominate contract farming opportunities, input supply arrangements, and commercialization pathways. Without careful safeguards, these farmers could monopolize technical assistance, improved seeds, irrigation benefits, and market linkages intended for broader community use. This dynamic may marginalize poorer households—particularly women farmers—by limiting their access to value chains, reducing their bargaining power, and exacerbating inequality within irrigation schemes and rainfed communities. Such elite capture would undermine the project's goals of inclusive climate resilient agriculture and equitable livelihood improvement.		
Consequences	If elite farmers capture the benefits of private sector partnerships, the project's inclusive, pro-poor objectives would be significantly undermined. Such capture would marginalize poorer and more vulnerable smallholders—particularly women—by limiting their access to inputs, extension services, contract farming opportunities, and market linkages that are central to scaling climate-resilient agriculture. This could lead to unequal distribution of improved seeds, technologies, and climate-resilient production support, weakening community-wide adoption of climate-smart practices. With private sector actors relying on elite farmers for consistent supply, smallholders may be excluded from value chains, reducing their income-earning potential and weakening incentives to adopt new practices. Elite capture also risks reinforcing existing power imbalances within irrigation schemes and farmer groups, potentially eroding trust and cooperation. Ultimately, these dynamics would reduce the project's overall impact, limit productivity gains across target districts, and hinder the development of resilient, inclusive agricultural markets.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 3 - Likely	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	Partnership agreements with the private sector – leveraged through multi-stakeholder Innovation Platforms – will involve smallholder organizations such as marketing clusters and cooperatives to ensure individual smallholder farmers are able to provide sufficient production volumes for adequate commercialization. The project will offer technical training to all community smallholders, provide timely technical assistance to smallholder organizations in regard to financial and post-harvest management, and ensure equal access to key inputs, including water and climate-resilient crop varieties. The government through the Business Development, Markets and Trade will also review agreements especially joint ventures with farmers to ensure that farmers are protected when entering into agreements. These measures maintain this risk at Medium.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood 3 - Likely	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 9 - Medium High
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood 3 - Likely	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 9 - Medium High
Comments	N/A		
Risk 5	5. Extreme weather events result in widespread erosion and sedimentation in irrigation infrastructure		
Risk Origin	External Factors		
Risk Area	Natural hazard		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	If extreme weather events lead to widespread erosion and sedimentation within irrigation infrastructure, the functionality and longevity of the revitalized schemes would be severely compromised. Heavy floods, increased storm intensity, and rapid runoff can		

	damage canals, intake structures, and storage facilities, while sediment deposition reduces water storage capacity and clogs conveyance systems. This directly lowers irrigation efficiency and disrupts water delivery to smallholder farmers, increasing their vulnerability to dry spells and drought-related crop failures. As maintenance needs escalate, O&M costs rise, placing additional strain on Irrigation Management Committees that may already have limited financial and technical capacity. Persistent infrastructure degradation would undermine climate-proofing investments, reduce agricultural productivity, and limit farmers' ability to adopt climate-resilient practices. Ultimately, erosion and siltation jeopardize the project's objectives of enhancing water security, stabilizing yields, and strengthening long-term climate resilience in vulnerable communities.		
Consequences	If extreme weather events trigger widespread erosion and sedimentation, the performance and durability of irrigation infrastructure will be significantly reduced. Floods, storm runoff, and increased rainfall intensity can deposit silt in canals, intake structures, and storage facilities, lowering water storage capacity and obstructing water flow. This reduces irrigation efficiency and disrupts reliable water delivery to farmers, undermining efforts to stabilize crop production under increasing climate variability. Over time, the accumulation of sediment and erosion damage escalates maintenance needs and costs, placing pressure on Irrigation Management Committees (IMCs) whose technical and financial capacities are already limited. Such degradation threatens the functionality of climate-proofed infrastructure and may reverse gains achieved through revitalization investments. Ultimately, persistent erosion and siltation increase farmers' vulnerability to droughts and mid-season dry spells, diminish productivity, and weaken long-term climate resilience across targeted irrigation schemes.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	4 - High	12 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	Design of irrigation infrastructure will take into account the worst-case scenario based on analysis of climate models as well as climate vulnerabilities of each selected irrigation scheme. While extreme weather events are expected to continue to occur and present high risks to irrigation infrastructure in general, climate-proofing using worst-case design parameters will maintain the probability of this risk occurring as medium. In addition, the project partners will work to mobilise resources and engage in partnerships for improved catchment management as a mitigation measure. The project will identify partners working on ecosystem resilience and collaborate for improved catchment management, for example IFAD, GEF7, and FAO.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Comments	N/A		
Risk 6	6. Private sector entrepreneurs decline to participate on Innovation Platforms as they perceive risks in terms of potential costs of time and effort to outweigh potential benefits		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Design and Implementation		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	There is a risk that private sector entrepreneurs may decline to participate in the project's Innovation Platforms because they perceive the time, coordination demands, and upfront engagement costs as outweighing potential commercial benefits. Many private actors require predictable supply volumes, consistent product quality, and reliable farmer engagement before committing resources—conditions that may not yet be fully established in vulnerable smallholder communities. Uncertainty about production capacity, climate-related disruptions, weak farmer organization, and limited financial readiness can further discourage participation. Additionally, past experiences with fragmented value chains, inconsistent market linkages, and limited risk-sharing mechanisms may heighten private sector hesitation. Without strong incentives and confidence-building measures, entrepreneurs may prioritize lower-risk commercial opportunities elsewhere. This reluctance threatens the project's ability to strengthen climate-resilient value chains, expand market access for smallholders, and foster		

	long-term, mutually beneficial partnerships that underpin the project's transformative outcomes.		
Consequences	If private sector entrepreneurs choose not to participate in the Innovation Platforms, the project's ability to establish strong, climate-resilient value chains would be significantly weakened. Without private sector engagement, smallholder farmers may lose critical opportunities for contract farming, access to reliable input and output markets, and partnerships that facilitate commercialization. This would reduce incentives for farmers to adopt climate-resilient agricultural practices, as market linkages are essential for sustaining production beyond subsistence levels. Limited private sector involvement would also hinder the development of multipartite agreements, financing mechanisms, and buyer-producer arrangements that the project relies on to reduce market uncertainty and strengthen value chains. As a result, farmers—especially women and resource-poor smallholders—could remain trapped in low-income, low-productivity cycles, reducing the overall impact and scalability of project interventions. Ultimately, the absence of private sector partners would undermine the project's goal of transforming local agricultural systems into resilient, market-driven livelihoods.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	Innovation Platforms bring together all actors along climate resilient crop and livestock value chains to build consensus and strengthen coordinated market systems. Private sector entrepreneurs benefit from more stable input and output markets supported by reliable production volumes. They have already shown interest, through stakeholder consultations, in partnering with smallholders to secure consistent supplies. Evidence from initiatives such as the Scaling Up Adaptation project and ZRBF consortia demonstrates that such collaborations can generate mutually beneficial outcomes. Through formal or semiformal agreements with smallholder organizations, supported by technical assistance providers, entrepreneurs can reduce uncertainties related to product quality and volume while enhancing returns on investment in production and post-harvest processes. Government agencies and NGOs further reduce risks by providing training, technical support, market analysis, climate advisories, research access, and credit linkages. Overall, Innovation Platforms lower risks for all stakeholders and leverage robust markets capable of absorbing increased production.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Comments	N/A		
Risk 7	7. Increase in community conflict and Gender Based Violence (GBV) due to challenging community gender norms and targeting women as equal beneficiaries of project interventions.		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Design and Implementation		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	There is a risk of increased community conflict and Gender Based Violence (GBV) as the project challenges entrenched gender norms by promoting women as equal beneficiaries and active participants in agricultural decision making. In many targeted communities, traditional beliefs dictate restrictive views on "appropriate work for women," and efforts to elevate women's roles in Irrigation Management Committees, Farmer Field Schools, and market-oriented activities may provoke resistance from male household members or community leaders. Such resistance can manifest as social tension, backlash, or even GBV, particularly where women's increased economic empowerment disrupts existing power dynamics. The project document notes that these risks are heightened in contexts where women have historically had limited access to land, inputs, and leadership spaces. Without deliberate mitigation, women may face intimidation, exclusion, or violence, reducing their ability to participate effectively and undermining the project's gender responsive climate resilience goals.		
Consequences	If efforts to promote women as equal beneficiaries trigger community conflict or Gender-Based Violence (GBV), the project's gender-responsive objectives and overall impact could be severely undermined. Heightened tensions may discourage women from participating in Farmer Field Schools, Irrigation Management Committees, and		

	market-oriented activities, reducing their access to skills, resources, and decision-making roles. Fear of backlash or violence could force women to withdraw from project interventions, limiting adoption of climate-resilient practices and weakening household resilience. Community conflict may also erode trust in project processes, disrupt collaboration between farmers and institutions, and slow implementation. In extreme cases, GBV incidents could overwhelm the grievance mechanisms and require diversion of project resources toward conflict resolution rather than capacity building. Ultimately, increased conflict and GBV would reinforce existing gender inequalities, reduce productivity gains, and compromise the project's ability to deliver inclusive, climate-resilient livelihoods across targeted districts.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	Gender equity is a core element, aimed at strengthening women's participation in agricultural production and markets through targeted skills development and enabling conditions. Restrictive social norms and risks of gender-based violence (GBV) will be addressed through continuous consultations, sensitisation, and equal participation of women and men in training, planning, and implementation. A gender-sensitive, two-tier grievance redress mechanism will enable safe reporting and management of grievances, including GBV, from community to project level. Innovation Platforms will promote balanced participation of women and men, while the national Resilience Building Platform will be supported by a gender focal point to guide gender-responsive learning and policy dialogue. The project builds on proven gender empowerment approaches, drawing from UNDP's Gender Transformative Approach, the FAO GALS methodology, and prior GEF/UNDP initiatives. Structured dialogues and Farmer Field Schools will serve as safe spaces to reduce GBV risks and strengthen women's empowerment, contributing to long-term project sustainability.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Comments	N/A		
Risk 8	8. Lack of community ownership and buy-in to irrigation scheme revitalization		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Design and Implementation		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	There is a risk that communities may not demonstrate sufficient ownership or buy in for the revitalization of irrigation schemes, which could undermine the sustainability and long-term functionality of the investments. Although irrigation is recognized as a vital livelihood asset, past challenges—such as weak organisation of Irrigation Management Committees (IMCs), limited technical capacity, and deteriorated infrastructure—may cause some community members to feel disengaged or doubtful about the benefits of revitalization. In some cases, farmers may not fully understand their roles in scheme governance, may associate previous failures with government or external actors, or may be reluctant to commit to Operations and Maintenance (O&M) responsibilities, including financial contributions. Social dynamics, competing priorities, or internal conflicts within IMCs can also weaken participation. Without strong ownership, schemes may fall into disrepair, reducing water reliability and compromising the project's climate-resilient agriculture objectives.		
Consequences	If communities do not demonstrate sufficient ownership or buy-in for irrigation scheme revitalization, the long-term sustainability and effectiveness of the upgraded infrastructure would be at serious risk. Without strong participation from farmers and Irrigation Management Committees (IMCs), Operations and Maintenance (O&M) responsibilities may be neglected, leading to rapid deterioration of newly climate-proofed systems, reduced water delivery efficiency, and eventual system failure. This would undermine the project's goal of providing reliable, year-round water access to smallholder farmers, directly affecting agricultural productivity and resilience to climate shocks. Weak ownership may also limit the establishment and capitalization of O&M funds, reduce adherence to scheme constitutions, and weaken peer-learning networks essential for sustained management. Ultimately, a lack of community commitment would		

	compromise climate-resilient livelihoods, delay expected yield improvements, and reduce the transformative impact anticipated across the 21 targeted irrigation schemes		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	The social support for irrigation scheme revitalization was assessed during project preparation. Given the underlying value of water availability and security to rural livelihoods, smallholders recognize the vital necessity of revitalization of their communal irrigation schemes. As the schemes represent a public good, communities have organized Irrigation Management Committees (IMCS) to operate and maintain their systems, including scheduling of irrigation and upgrading of field level equipment. While the IMCs have often suffered from organizational weaknesses that have impaired their abilities to adequately manage, resources, resolve conflicts, or plan for the future, this project will strengthen IMCs through participatory development of IMC constitutions delineating roles and responsibilities of participating smallholders; training in organizational management and planning; linking IMCs to government agencies and NGOs, as well as to each other across catchments; and assistance in establishing and implementing Operations and Maintenance Funds.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Comments	N/A		
Risk 9	9. Seasonal crop price fluctuations are a potential threat to smallholder adoption of market-dependent climate-resilient crops, as a fall in prices at an inopportune time could result in significant economic losses, thereby jeopardizing continued investment in resilience-enhancing inputs and technologies		
Risk Origin	External Factors		
Risk Area	Macro-economics		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	Seasonal crop price fluctuations pose a significant risk to smallholder farmers because many smallholders operate with minimal financial buffers, even short term declines in market prices can result in substantial income losses, discouraging continued investment in climate resilient inputs, technologies, and diversified cropping systems. The project document highlights that smallholders often rely on predictable returns to justify shifting from subsistence crops to higher value, climate resilient alternatives. When prices fall at critical points—such as immediately after harvest—farmers may abandon these practices, revert to low-risk, low-return traditional crops, or withdraw from value chain partnerships altogether. These fluctuations can also weaken trust in market actors, limit participation in Innovation Platforms, and reduce incentives for adopting improved agronomic practices promoted through Farmer Field Schools. Over time, this undermines the project’s goals of building resilient, market linked livelihoods and scaling climate resilient agricultural systems across vulnerable districts.		
Consequences	If seasonal crop price fluctuations occur at critical times, smallholders growing market-dependent crops may face significant income losses, undermining the financial viability of their investments. Such losses can quickly erode farmers’ confidence in shifting to higher-value, climate-resilient crops, discouraging continued adoption of improved practices and inputs. Without predictable earnings, farmers may reduce or stop purchasing resilience-enhancing technologies, abandon diversified cropping strategies, or revert to traditional subsistence crops with lower market risk but also lower climate resilience. This decreases overall productivity gains expected under the project and weakens farmers’ ability to cope with increasing climate variability. Additionally, fluctuating prices can destabilize value-chain partnerships fostered through the Innovation Platforms, limiting private sector engagement and reducing market incentives for smallholders. Ultimately, persistent price instability threatens the project’s goal of enabling climate-resilient, market-driven agricultural livelihoods across vulnerable districts		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	This risk will be mitigated by including monitoring and analysis of crop price fluctuations as part of regular Innovation Platform discussions in tandem with training in farming as a		

	business for AGRITEX staff and farmers. The Innovation Platforms will draw on the ZRBF and MLAWRR/ Dept of Economics and Markets systems for monitoring crop price fluctuations to support profit planning. These measures maintain the probability of the risk at medium.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Comments	N/A		
Risk 10	10. Women are restricted from participating fully in agricultural production, market linkages and value chain development.		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Environmental and Social		
Risk Sub-area	Gender & SEAH		
Description	There is a significant risk that women may be restricted from fully participating in agricultural production, market linkages, and value-chain development due to entrenched gender norms and structural inequalities within the targeted communities. The project document highlights that women—despite being the majority of smallholder farmers—often have limited access to land, agricultural inputs, finance, and decision-making spaces, which constrains their ability to benefit from climate-resilient agriculture initiatives. Social beliefs about “appropriate work for women,” coupled with unequal household responsibilities/distribution and mobility constraints, may prevent women from attending Farmer Field Schools, joining Irrigation Management Committees, or engaging with private-sector partners. These restrictions can also heighten their vulnerability to exclusion from value-added activities and income-generating opportunities. Without deliberate and very targeted interventions, such gender barriers may undermine the inclusivity of project outcomes, reduce adoption of climate-resilient practices, and limit the transformative impact intended across communities.		
Consequences	If women are restricted from fully participating in agricultural production, market linkages, and value-chain development, the project’s gender-responsive and climate-resilience objectives will be significantly undermined. Women constitute the majority of smallholder farmers in the target areas, and limiting their participation would reduce overall adoption of climate-resilient agricultural practices, weaken productivity gains, and diminish household food security. Restricted access to training, inputs, and decision-making platforms—such as Farmer Field Schools, Innovation Platforms, and Irrigation Management Committees—would prevent women from benefiting from skills development, climate advisories, and market opportunities. This exclusion would reinforce existing gender inequalities, limit income diversification, and reduce the effectiveness of value-chain partnerships intended to support commercialization. And economically empower women. Ultimately, failure to integrate women fully into project interventions would erode community-wide resilience, weaken the transformative impact of climate-resilient agriculture, and impede long-term sustainability of the project’s outcomes.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	The project directly addresses restrictions on women’s participation in agriculture by providing gender-responsive training tailored to women’s needs, including flexible scheduling and the use of female trainers. To shift community social norms, male household members will receive awareness training on the social and economic benefits of women’s empowerment, and male “gender champions” will be identified to support change. Women will be explicitly represented on Innovation Platforms and prioritized in value chains traditionally considered “women’s work,” such as goats and sesame. Innovation Platform coordinators and public-sector partners will actively link women’s production groups with private-sector buyers, processors, and exporters. Women smallholders will also be trained in negotiation, financial management, and market access through Farmer Field Schools. The project will collect gender-disaggregated data and apply lessons learned to refine interventions continuously. Regular consultations with women will ensure their concerns shape implementation. These combined measures maintain the risk at a Medium level.		

Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Comments	N/A		
Risk 11	NA-1		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	Money Laundering (ML) & Terrorist Financing (TF)		
Description	NA		
Consequences	NA		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low
Mitigation Measure(s)	NA		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low
Comments	N/A		
Risk 12	NA-2		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	Sanctions		
Description	NA		
Consequences	NA		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low
Mitigation Measure(s)	NA		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low
Comments	N/A		
Risk 13	NA-3		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	Fraud / Bribery & Corruption / Collusion and any other prohibited practice		
Description	NA		
Consequences	NA		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low
Mitigation Measure(s)	NA		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low
Comments	N/A		
Risk 14	NA-4		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	Conflict of interest		
Description	NA		
Consequences	NA		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low

Mitigation Measure(s)	NA		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low
Comments	N/A		

D.2. Report risk incidents

If any risk (previously identified or not) has materialized, please capture it here as a risk incident.

(this section is confidential)

E. FINANCIAL INFORMATION

E.1. GCF financing

In addition to the financial report in the annex, update the table with relevant GCF financial data for each country and instrument, including amounts and allocation percentages.

Country	Instrument	Currency (as per FAA)	Committed Amount	Disbursed Amount	Expenditure (reporting year)	Cumulative Expenditure	Mitigation	Adaptation
Zimbabwe	Grants	USD	26,574,567	23,245,589	4,532,899.65	19,781,151.45	0%	100%
Total		USD	26,574,567	23,245,589	4,532,899.65	19,781,151.45	N/A	N/A

E.2. Co-financing

Please populate the table with relevant Co-financing data for each Co-financier and instrument, including amounts and allocation percentages.

Co-financier	Instrument	Currency (as per FAA)	Committed Amount	Disbursed Amount	Expenditure (reporting year)	Cumulative Expenditure	Mitigation	Adaptation
Government Ministry of Finance, Zimbabwe	Grants	USD	20,038,820	15,340,155.03	633,165.59	15,340,155.03	0%	100%
Nations Development Programme	Grants	USD	1,205,000	712,256.1	126,337.34	712,256.1	0%	100%
Total		USD	21,243,820	16,052,411.13	759,502.93	16,052,411.13	N/A	N/A

E.3. Additional Finance Mobilised Beyond Approved Co-financing

Report the realised (cumulative value) and/or expected volume (Final Target) of private/public finance leveraged as a result of GCF involvement in the investment, in addition to and beyond any co-financing originally committed at approval. This datapoint shall be reported separately from official co-financing figures and is intended to capture the catalytic effect of GCF investments and support institutional learning.

GCF Policy: <https://www.greenclimate.fund/sites/default/files/document/policy-cofinancing.pdf>

No additional finance mobilized information provided.

File Name: PIMS 5853_APR_2025_Grant-Financial Progress Detail_cleared by QM.xlsx

F. ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS, GENDER, and INDIGENOUS PEOPLES	
<i>This section provides an update against the ESS standards agreed as part of the Environmental and Social Action Plan (ESAP) and Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), as well as Environmental and Social Management System (ESMS), Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA), Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP), Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP), Indigenous Peoples Plan Framework (IPPF), Resettlement Action Plan (RAP), Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) when applicable.</i>	
F.1. progress on key challenges and updates regarding Environmental and Social Safeguards	
Key Environmental and Social Changes <i>Have there been any changes in the key environmental and social risks and impacts? If you tick 'Yes,' please provide further information.</i>	Yes ☐ No ☒
Environmental and Social Safeguarding Updates <i>Have there been any change/update on environmental and social safeguarding? you tick 'Yes,' please provide further information.</i>	Yes ☒ No ☐
As reported in the 2024 Annual Progress Report (APR), the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) was revised from a two-tier to a four-tier system following input from stakeholder consultations at local, district and provincial level within the project landscape. Through these consultations, it was agreed that the GRM should integrate traditional grievance resolution practices by establishing Grievance Management Committees (GMCs), which were not part of the original two-tier structure presented in the project ESMF. Consequently, the four-tier system was adopted. Audits of the GRM conducted in June 2025 across project implementation sites assessed its accessibility, effectiveness, transparency, responsiveness, timeliness, fairness, and legitimacy. The findings confirmed that GMCs, which form an integral part of the four-tier system, have been the most effective grievance uptake points among all channels established by the project. The audits further indicated that the GRM is both functional and accessible, with over 80 percent of users including vulnerable groups demonstrating awareness of its structure and procedures. Stakeholders expressed high levels of satisfaction with the responsiveness of the mechanism, with most grievances resolved within 30 days. At most sites, the grievance resolution rate remained at 100 percent, reflecting strong performance in timely and fair resolution.	
F.2. Compliance with laws and regulations applicable to ESS. Gender and Indigenous Peoples.	
Have there been any changes or updates regarding compliance with applicable laws and regulations of the country, as well as the relevant conditions or covenants under the FAA?	Yes ☐ No ☒
F.3. ESS standards implementation progress	
Does this reporting period include any ESS standards-related activities or updates?	Yes ☒ No ☐
<i>If you tick 'Yes', please provide further information to report on the progress made in complying with the requirements of the relevant ESS standards that were triggered during the approval of the funding proposal and during the reporting period, if any; and the GCF Indigenous Peoples Policy, if relevant, describing achievement and specifying details outlined in the tables below.</i>	
Activities implemented during the reporting period, including monitoring	

The project made notable strides in implementing Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) across irrigation schemes. Orientation trainings were delivered by the PMU and UNDP SES experts to contractors in Lots 2 and 3 on 10 January and 17 June 2025, strengthening their grasp of Environmental, Social, Health and Safety (ESHS) requirements in ESMPs. These sessions emphasized occupational safety, waste management, pollution prevention, and incident reporting. Contractors submitted monthly ESMP implementation reports, while environmental and social audits were conducted for four Lot 3 schemes—Farai, Musirizwi, Mhakwe, and Vimbanayi—between 12 and 27 June 2025. Compliance was satisfactory, with nonconformances addressed through Preventive and Corrective Action Plans. Completion audits for twelve schemes across Lots 1–3 (June–October 2025) confirmed compliance but flagged delayed revegetation and gully reclamation at Midlo and Musirizwi. A joint action plan with EMA, the Forestry Commission, and the Department of Agricultural Engineering was developed for accelerated implementation in 2026. At Rusununguko, GRM rollout sensitized 64 farmers, established a community committee, and trained members. An internal GRM audit found mechanisms functional, though ICT limitations, poor connectivity, and governance issues—particularly external interference at Musirizwi—require attention. To mitigate elite capture risks, a beneficiary selection exercise was conducted at Farai and Musirizwi (27–30 August 2025), ensuring inclusivity. Environmental and social studies for Mwerahari–Nyashanu and Mzinyathini schemes were completed, with the latter’s ESMP approved by the GCF. Preparation of the Gororo 2 ESMP advanced to drafting and analysis, underscoring continued commitment to safeguard compliance and equitable benefit distribution
Outputs during the reporting period
Environmental and Social Assessment (ESA) studies were finalized for the Mwerahari and Mzinyathini irrigation schemes, resulting in site-specific ESMPs. Compliance audits during construction and at completion for twelve schemes across Lots 1 and 3 confirmed satisfactory adherence to Environment, Social, Health and Safety (ESHS) requirements, with audit reports generated. A GRM audit for Lot 3 schemes in June 2025 highlighted strong performance, particularly in gender mainstreaming, and produced a GRM audit report. Orientation training on ESMP implementation was conducted for the Rusununguko contractor, ensuring awareness of safeguard obligations, with a training report prepared. Five schemes constructed in 2025 had cleared ESMPs, with Mzinyathini approved by the GCF and Mwerahari pending feedback. Gororo 2 ESMP preparation advanced, while revegetation and gully reclamation at Midlo, Musirizwi, and Zvinyaningwe showed delays. An action plan was developed with EMA, Rural District Councils, and the Forestry Commission to accelerate progress in 2026. Beneficiary selection and validation exercises at Farai, Musirizwi, and Rusununguko strengthened fairness and transparency, with reports generated. Water abstraction permits were secured for all operational schemes except Farai, under review, and Rural District Councils endorsed ESMPs, ensuring alignment with governance and land-use requirements.
Key environmental, social and gender issues, risks and impacts addressed during implementation
The civil works contractors, the PMU, and the RPs implemented a comprehensive set of mitigation measures to address the environmental and social risks outlined in the ESMPs. Key risks included occupational health and safety hazards, community safety concerns, biodiversity loss, soil erosion, soil and water contamination, water resource depletion, excessive noise and vibration, gender discrimination, gender based violence (GBV), sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH), elite capture, and forced or child labour. To manage these risks effectively, the project applied a combination of strategies, including targeted training and awareness programmes, environmentally appropriate site selection, adherence to permitting and regulatory requirements, and implementation of construction standards, beneficiary selection guidelines and design criteria consistent with ESMP provisions. Environmental and social audits conducted in 2025, as well as ESMP implementation progress reports, confirmed that no additional or unanticipated risks have emerged. Furthermore, the two proposed irrigation schemes (Mwerahari and Mzinyathini), whose construction is expected to commence in 2026 were assessed for environmental and social risks. The Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) study for the proposed Gororo 2 scheme commenced in 2025 and is expected to be completed in Q1 of 2026. The results of these studies indicate that the development of these schemes will not trigger any new risks beyond those already identified during screening. The overall anticipated environmental and social risks for these schemes remain moderate. Therefore, the overall environmental and social risk profile of the Project continues to be classified as moderate.
Any pending key environmental, social and gender issues needing accredited entity's actions and GCF attention
There are no pending environmental, social and gender issues needing accredited entity's actions and GCF attention
Remarks/Notes

F.4. Sub-projects information	
Have any subprojects been implemented?	Yes ☐ No ☒
N/A	N/A

F.5. Implementation of the stakeholder engagement plan	
Were any actions undertaken to increase engagement of relevant stakeholders in the project, particularly regarding environmental, social, and gender elements?	Yes ☒ No ☐
Activities implemented during the reporting period	
Stakeholder validation processes for the Mzinyathini and Mwerahari Irrigation Scheme Feasibility Studies, including ESMPs, were successfully conducted through structured workshops at scheme, district, and provincial levels. For Mzinyathini, two workshops held on 10–11 July 2025 engaged 108 participants, resulting in adoption of the ESMP, approval of a hybrid irrigation system for 38 hectares, endorsement of a cooperative company management model, and strengthened IMC participation in water governance. Similarly, Mwerahari workshops held from 15–17 September 2025 brought together 92 participants, confirming project viability and endorsing the centre-pivot irrigation system and site ESMP. Broader consultations for ESMP preparation across Mwerahari, Mzinyathini, and Gororo 2 schemes were conducted between January and October 2025, engaging 348 participants including land donors, community members, traditional leaders, and government officials. Key issues raised—such as prioritizing local labour recruitment and ensuring fair compensation for land donors—informed a participatory compensation framework. Across 12 irrigation schemes, 16 ESMP audit meetings between June and October 2025 engaged 218 participants to review safeguards implementation. GRM audits held 23–26 June 2025 confirmed functionality but identified governance challenges at Musirizwi, where influential land donors undermined the Grievance Management Committee’s authority. The PMU convened an urgent meeting with the Rural District Council and District Development Coordinator’s Office, reaffirming the GMC’s legitimacy and autonomy. This intervention reduced power imbalances and restored effective functioning of the GRM, reinforcing transparency and accountability in project safeguard systems.	
Dates and venues of engagement activities	
Extensive stakeholder engagement across multiple irrigation schemes were held in 2025. Scheme level and combined district/provincial validation workshops were held at Mzinyathini on 10–11 July 2025 at Esigodini Agricultural College. For the Mwerahari, scheme level validation took place on 15 September 2025 at Kwarire Primary School, followed by a provincial workshop on 16–17 September 2025 at Murambinda Growth Point. Broader ESMP consultations for Mwerahari, Mzinyathini, and Gororo 2 were held between January and October 2025 across Buhera, Umzingwane, and Chivi districts. ESMP audit consultations were also conducted from 23–26 June 2025 at Farai, Mhakwe, Musirizwi, and Vimbanayi irrigation schemes.	
Sex-disaggregated data on stakeholder engagement participants (male + female = total)	
Stakeholder validation for the Mzinyathini Irrigation Scheme Feasibility Study, including the ESMP - A total of 108 (57 Males, 51 Females) participants attended the Workshop. Stakeholder validation for the Mwerahari Irrigation Scheme Feasibility Study including the ESMP - Scheme level (Males =22; Female = 19, total = 41), Provincial level (Males=32, Females =19, total = 51). Stakeholder consultations were conducted during field work preparation of an ESMP for Mwerahari, Mzinyathini and Gororo 2 irrigation scheme - (Male = 147, Female = 201, total =348). Stakeholder consultation during the ESMP audits for all Lot 1, 2 and 3 schemes - (Male = 125, Female = 93, total = 218).	

Stakeholder consultation during the assessment of the functionality of the GRM at Lot 3 irrigation schemes- (Males = 29, Females = 39, total = 68).	
Information shared with stakeholders	
Stakeholder validation meetings for Mzinyathini and Mwerahari Irrigation Scheme Feasibility Study resulted in the following discussions; Water resources availability, land use and agronomic practices, engineering designs, Irrigation scheme management models and anticipated environmental and social risks and the related management measures. Stakeholder consultation during the ESMP audits for all Lot 1, 2 and 3 schemes resulted in the discussions around Project ESHS risks, and adequacy and efficacy of management measures including performance of the GRM. Stakeholder consultation for assessment of functionality of the GRM at Lot 3 irrigation schemes: Discussions were held with stakeholders to assess functionality of the GRM based on principles such as accessibility, transparency, responsiveness, legitimacy, timeliness and legitimacy. Insights were drawn from the World Bank GRM Assessment tool.	
Outputs including issues raised and addressed during the reporting period	
Stakeholder validation for the Mzinyathini Irrigation Scheme Feasibility Study: Workshop validation reports Key resolutions from the workshops included: • Adoption of the ESMP • Adoption of a hybrid pivot/sprinkler/drip system covering an area of 45ha. • Adoption of co-operative company management model • Strengthening IMC participation in multi-sector water re-source management platforms. Stakeholder validation for the Mzinyathini Irrigation Scheme Feasibility Study Workshop validation reports • The validation exercise participants unanimously agreed that the project can proceed as it is anticipated that reasonable returns will be obtained. • The proposed centre pivot design was adopted. • The ESMP was adopted Stakeholder consultations were conducted during field work preparation of an ESMP for Mwerahari, Mzinyathini and Gororo 2 irrigation scheme: Main output is the ESMP Main concerns raised by stakeholders are: • Local community members must be prioritised in terms of employment opportunities during the construction of the scheme • Land donors must be adequately compensated Stakeholder consultation during the ESMP audits for all Lot 1, 2 and 3 schemes. Key resolutions • The project should design a compensation scheme for the land donors with full participation of the affected persons, local leadership and district stakeholder. Stakeholder consultation during the assessment of the functionality of the GRM at Lot 3 irrigation schemes. Key outputs include the ESMP compliance audit reports (Construction phase) and Environmental and social completion audit reports (Completion Phase). • Main output is the GRM Audit report. • The GRM was considered satisfactory. However, key challenges identified include limited ICT infra-structure, poor internet connectivity, and governance issues—particularly at Musirizwi, where external interference undermines the autonomy of the local GRM committees.	
Remarks/Notes	
Annex 6 has been added to this APR to provide an update on the SES issues followed up by the GCF in the 2024 APR.	

F.6. ESS forward planning and lessons learned	
Are there any planned ESS activities for the next reporting period or lessons learned to share from this period?	Yes ☒ No ☐
Provide planned activities on environmental and social safeguards for the next reporting period	

The project has outlined a robust set of Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) activities for 2026 to ensure compliance with the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), UNDP Social and Environmental Standards (SES), and Good International Industry Practice. A key priority in Q1 2026 is the finalisation of the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for the Gororo Irrigation Scheme, which will guide safe construction, operations, gully reclamation, and revegetation. This process will involve stakeholder engagement at local, district, and provincial levels. To strengthen implementation capacity, orientation training on ESMP monitoring and reporting will be delivered to contractors working on Mwerahari, Mzinyathini, and Gororo 2 schemes in Q1 2026. In Q2, the project will roll out the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) for all three schemes, supported by back-to-office reporting. Environmental and social compliance audits will cover construction and closure phases, complemented by GRM audits and refresher awareness sessions across interventions such as Farmer Field Schools and Innovation Platforms. A cumulative impact assessment across irrigation schemes within shared catchments is planned for Q2 2026 to strengthen understanding of landscape-level risks and inform integrated catchment management strategies. Toward Q4 2026, the project will develop a community-level safeguards capacity building plan and conduct a risk analysis of emerging risks in irrigation schemes and surrounding rainfed farmlands. By year-end, a SES status report and a comprehensive safeguards handover plan will be produced, ensuring long-term compliance and sustainability by IMCs and government institutions beyond project closure.

Provide any success stories, good practices, or challenges, including those related to the engagement of Indigenous peoples and local communities, promoting Indigenous knowledge and benefits to Indigenous peoples and local communities

Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) and the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) are vital to ensuring irrigation projects protect people, land, and trust. For communities, infrastructure is not just about pipes and canals—it represents dignity, fairness, and voice. As one farmer expressed, “Water brings life to our fields, but respect and safety bring life to our community.” In 2026, safeguards are being systematically embedded across implementation. This includes strict compliance with labor standards, occupational health and safety requirements, and community protection measures. Land donors are recognized as primary beneficiaries, preventing displacement and safeguarding livelihoods. Environmental measures emphasize responsible water abstraction, soil conservation, erosion control, and ecosystem protection, ensuring irrigation development enhances rather than depletes natural resources. Contractors are mandated to provide personal protective equipment, maintain safe working environments, and raise awareness on public health risks such as HIV/AIDS, sexual exploitation and abuse, and gender-based violence. These actions are improving daily conditions for workers, who report feeling safer and more valued. As Mary Mavhiza from Bwanya irrigation scheme noted, “We feel safer now because safety rules are explained and followed. It shows that our lives matter, not just the work.”

F.7. Grievance Redress Mechanism - confirmation & grievances

Please indicate whether the project can confirm the following statement:

Fully functional and operational Grievance Redress Mechanisms are in place, have been communicated to and are accessible by all stakeholders applicable to this project

☒ The accredited entity confirms the statement above at project-level, AE-level, and GCF-level grievance mechanisms.

☐ The accredited entity does not confirm the statement above

Have there been any grievances received during the reporting period?

Yes ☒ No ☐

During the reporting period, several grievances were effectively addressed through the project's Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM). At Musirizwi Irrigation Scheme, farmers reported interference by a land donor who sought to influence IMC and GMC leadership and secure additional shares for relatives. The issue was escalated to Agritex and the PMU, which reaffirmed the legitimacy of the committees and engaged district authorities to institute a transparent beneficiary selection process. An independent Beneficiary Selection Committee was formed, and after rigorous assessment, 106 beneficiaries were confirmed, restoring confidence in governance. The contractor raised concerns about uncontrolled community movement through active construction zones, posing safety risks. The GMC and village leadership issued directives prohibiting trespassing, resolving the matter. Another grievance involved subcontractor trucks speeding and generating dust hazards; the contractor introduced speed limits, installed signage, and conducted safety briefings. Additionally, a community member reported livestock loss in an open trench. While compensation was declined, enhanced safety measures were implemented, including daily inspections, barricading active work areas, limiting excavation, and sensitizing the community. These actions closed the grievance and strengthened safeguards.

F.8. Implementation of activities and actions agreed in the Gender Action Plan

The Gender Action Plan is structured around three outputs, each designed to strengthen women's leadership, participation, and equitable access to climate-resilient resources. Under Output 1, activities focus on climate-proofing irrigation infrastructure across 21 schemes while promoting gender parity in IMC governance. Women were deliberately included in training on climate-adapted O&M and monitoring, supported by DOI technical assistance.

Knowledge-exchange workshops and field-based training for rainfed farmers amplified women's voices, reaching 16,301 follower farmers (11,362 female, 4,939 male) through 230 Farmer Field School sites. Gender-sensitive technologies and farmer-to-farmer learning platforms enabled women to demonstrate leadership, share innovations, and actively influence climate-resilient agricultural development.

Output 2 established five district Innovation Platforms and a national platform to ensure women's equal participation in value-chain coordination. Activities addressed gendered barriers by challenging restrictive social norms, strengthening public-private partnerships, and providing legal, technical, and business training to enhance women's entrepreneurship and access to finance. AGRITEX ToTs and 251 FFS further supported women farmers to lead climate-smart practices.

Output 3 integrated gender transformation strategies into climate-information systems. Training female farmers and intermediaries improved access to localized forecasts, while ICT, GIS, and database enhancements promoted inclusive knowledge sharing across institutions. Women positioned as agents of change in climate-resilient agriculture.

Are there GAP implementation activities or progress to report for this period?

Yes ☒ No ☐

Summary on Activities and Actions agreed in the Gender Action Plan (max. 200 words)

Provide a progress report on the gender action plan developed during project preparation stage for the reporting period. This will primarily be a report on activities undertaken and results achieved because of completion of an activity. Further, it should also indicate if the project is on track to achieving the intended outcome(s). The reporting should be done for activities, targets and indicators already set in the action plan including on vulnerable groups (youth, poor, female heads of households, etc.) as would have been identified in the gender analysis and action plan. If activities or targets are not achieved as per plan, reasons should be provided, and recourse action should be proposed. Please include reporting on any changes or deviations. Include a Report on implementation challenges and lessons learnt and how these will inform on-going actions and what action will be taken by when to address the challenges faced. Incorporate both quantitative data and qualitative reports on the performance of such actions, and on progress on actions identified.

GAP Activity

1.1.1 Climate-proofing and revitalizing existing irrigation infrastructure and equipment in 21 irrigation

Indicator

1.1.2 (i): Increased % of women's membership in irrigation management committees

Rating of Indicator

GREEN (on track to be met)

Baseline

26

Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable

30

Annual progress update (Reporting Period)

There were no changes to the committees that were formed in 2023 when the activity started. The project implemented a two-phase Women's IMC Leadership Empowerment Programme across 16 schemes, training over 800 farmers and strengthening women's confidence and leadership skills in traditionally male-dominated roles. The programme delivered measurable improvements in inclusive decision making, governance, and practical scheme-level results, supported by participatory training, Training of Trainers, and growing male allyship. 49.1% of the IMC members are women and 48.7% of the strategic positions are occupied by females.

Cumulative progress update (Entire period)

Women's representation in Irrigation Management Committees (IMCs) stands at 49.1%, surpassing the 30% target. Additionally, 48.7% of strategic IMC positions are held by women, reflecting strong gender inclusion in leadership. No

new committees were formed in the reporting period since the structures created in 2023 remain active. The Women in IMC Empowerment Programme rolled out in the reporting period reached over 800 farmers.	
Budget	36,878
Currency	USD
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	31 December 2026
Responsibility	
DOI, AGRITEX & MWACSMED	
Remarks/Notes	
Progress remains on track. Women's representation in Irrigation Management Committees (IMCs) stands at 49.1%, surpassing the 30% target. Additionally, 48.7% of strategic IMC positions are held by women, reflecting strong gender inclusion in leadership. No new committees were formed in the reporting period since the structures created in 2023 remain active. The Women in IMC Empowerment Programme rolled out in the reporting period reached over 800 farmers. Women constituted above the 60% target of trainees respectively, and improvements are expected as training outcomes translate into practice.	
GAP Activity	
1.1.2 Training of 21 irrigation management committees (IMCs) in climate-adapted O&M and monitoring, and establishment of O&M funds, ensuring equal opportunities for	
Indicator	
1.1.2 (ii): Number of women in strategic leadership positions in IMCs;	
Rating of Indicator	GREEN (on track to be met)
Baseline	26
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	50
Annual progress update (Reporting Period)	
48.7% of the strategic positions are occupied by females	
Cumulative progress update (Entire period)	
48.7% of the strategic positions are occupied by females	
Budget	0
Currency	USD
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	31 December 2026
Responsibility	
DOI, AGRITEX & MWACSMED	

Remarks/Notes	
48.7% of the strategic positions are occupied by females	
F.9. Gender Action Plan implementation review	
Is the gender expert for the project/programme engaged to support the implementation of the gender action plan? If engaged previously, please advise if the gender expert has been retained by the project/programme, including plans to engage another expert if a previously engaged expert has left the project/programme.	Yes ☒ No ☐
<i>The project engaged a gender officer to support the implementation of the GAP. in view of the irrigation schemes coming on-line, the up scaling of PICSA to all project districts (additional 12) and the roll out of the IP strategies. The gender expert, a UNV, also supports the gender responsive dissemination strategy for Output 3 (climate information services). The gender officer will be retained until project end to ensure alignment of sustainability interventions and plans to the Gender action plan. Additionally gender oversight continues to be provided by UNDP Gender Specialist</i>	
Has the implementation of gender action plan/s being implemented according to Funding Activity Agreements and GCF's Updated Gender Policy? Please ensure that the budget is included in the reporting above if it was indicated in the approved or updated gender action plan.	Yes ☒ No ☐
<i>Implementation of the Gender Action Plan (GAP) for FP127 has advanced in line with the Funding Activity Agreement (FAA) and the GCF Updated Gender Policy, which require gender-responsive standards throughout the project cycle. The FAA stipulates that the GAP must be fully resourced, implemented as approved, and not modified without GCF's prior consent, ensuring compliance with GCF gender requirements. Across all three outputs, gender-responsive actions have been delivered as outlined in the GAP, cumulatively contributing to gender transformation. Under Output 1 (Irrigation and Water Management), progress includes improved gender parity within Irrigation Management Committees (IMCs), increased representation of women in leadership roles, and strengthened gender-responsive irrigation governance. Training and peer learning initiatives have reached substantial numbers of women farmers, with irrigation schemes now demonstrating enhanced women's participation in strategic decision-making. Under Output 2 (Climate-Resilient Agricultural Production and Markets), the project has strengthened women's financial literacy, access to finance, and leadership in value chains. Farmer Field Schools, Innovation Platforms, and business development programs have enabled greater adoption of climate-resilient practices by women, improved access to markets and inputs, and increased engagement with financial intermediaries. Output 3 (Climate Information Services) has expanded women's access to tailored climate and weather information through radio, SMS, WhatsApp, and simplified community dissemination. Training of women community observers, intermediaries, and extension officers has improved localized climate services. Evidence from the 2025 APR confirms that GAP implementation is on track, compliant with FAA obligations and the GCF Updated Gender Policy, with gender-responsive activities delivering tangible benefits for women farmers and female-headed households. The associated budget has been fully integrated into project reporting, ensuring sustainability and accountability.</i>	
Are the planned activities, targets, indicators, timelines, etc. on track during the reporting period?	Yes ☒ No ☐
<i>The project sustained strong progress in implementing the Gender Action Plan (GAP), meeting planned activities, targets, and timelines while advancing women's leadership, economic empowerment, and equitable access to climate information. Representation of women in irrigation governance reached 49.1% in IMCs and 48.7% in strategic leadership roles, supported by a two-phase Women in IMC Leadership Empowerment Programme. Over 800 farmers, 62% of them women, strengthened governance, conflict management, and inclusive decision-making skills, boosting confidence and accountability across schemes. Open learning days engaged 13,800 farmers, 74% of whom were women, while the distribution of 230 earth augers benefited 7,122 female and 4,532 male farmers, reducing labor time for planting basins by 84%. Gender mainstreaming ToT training reached 305 officers (160 female, 145 male), cascading to 13,719 farmers (9,829 female, 3,890 male), reinforcing inclusive financial and market practices. Women comprised 78% of VS&L group members, with 93% of 344 groups making consistent monthly contributions. Average savings per group reached USD 1,647.07, with USD 672.75 in interest earnings, totaling USD 328,347.32 saved in 2025. Eleven financial institutions were trained on gender-sensitive financial products. Tailored climate information advisories reached 35,109 households, benefiting 186,538 people (97,709 female, 88,829 male). Institutional capacities improved through specialized training for ZINWA, MSD, and district officers, while gender-responsive PICSA training enabled 57.5% of beneficiaries to consistently use climate information</i>	
Were there any revisions of the approved GAP during the reporting period? Please submit the updated GAP in Annex section of this APR and ensure that the updated GAP has details on each change.	Yes ☒ No ☐

The Gender Action Plan (GAP) was revised to better reflect realities observed during implementation and to integrate more targeted, gender-responsive measures. The updates transformed the GAP from a participation-focused framework into a gender-transformative model that addresses systemic barriers faced by women in irrigation schemes, rainfed agriculture, value chains, and climate information services. Key changes include the introduction of refined gender indicators, such as tracking women's leadership roles in IMCs, women-led O&M fund management, participation in innovation platforms, and gender-sensitive value chain strategies. Specific targets were added for women farmers, particularly from female-headed households, across all outputs. Notably, GAP indicator 1.1.3 was revised from "Number and length of IMC meetings signifying efficiency (30% reduction)" to "Number of IMC meetings held to discuss O&M issues (at least one per quarter)," ensuring more practical monitoring. The revision also incorporates mandatory gender clauses in governance structures, expanded mentorship for female leaders, and strengthened requirements for gender integration in climate information products, training, and knowledge systems. Overall, the updated GAP shifts emphasis from numeric participation toward systemic empowerment, accountability, and institutionalization of gender-responsive practices across project components, ensuring sustainability and deeper transformation.

Are the reported results on track to contribute to meeting the sex-disaggregated targets for the direct beneficiaries in the funding proposal, if applicable?

Yes ☒ No ☐

The project is on track and has surpassed the 50% target of female direct beneficiaries reached. Cumulatively the project has reached 229414 females and 208568 males implying 52.38% female direct beneficiaries reach. The project is on track to exceed the disaggregated targets for direct beneficiaries.

Has the project/programme experienced any implementation challenges that affect gender-related activities? If yes, please include lessons learnt and how they are informing ongoing actions.

Yes ☐ No ☒

There have been no implementation challenges that affect gender-related activities

Were there any best practices identified, or case studies prepared on benefits/activities undertaken as agents of action by women and the female heads of households during the reporting period? Please share any case studies in the text boxes or in the Annex section of the APR.

Yes ☒ No ☐

The Women in IMC Leadership Empowerment Programme has significantly strengthened women's confidence, skills, and participation in irrigation governance. Previously, many women were reluctant to take up leadership roles due to limited capacity and low confidence, resulting in their exclusion from key decision-making processes. Post-programme assessments indicate a 20–35% increase in women's confidence and leadership competencies, enabling more active participation and influence in scheme management. Women are now proposing innovations, engaging meaningfully in governance, and assuming strategic IMC roles, including chairperson and treasurer. A notable success is Musirizwi Irrigation Scheme, where a female IMC chairperson led the expansion of irrigated land from 2.4 to 16 hectares and coordinated post-Cyclone Idai rehabilitation efforts, demonstrating improved governance and scheme performance. Similarly, the integration of a young female leader into the Chizumba IMC highlights the programme's role in nurturing emerging leadership. To ensure sustainability, the initiative is being embedded within government systems. Collaboration with the Ministry of Lands, Agriculture, Fisheries, Water and Rural Development, the Ministry of Women Affairs, and AGRITEX has strengthened policy alignment, joint planning, mentorship, and capacity-building, creating an enabling environment for sustained women's leadership in irrigation management.

Provide planned activities on gender elements for the next reporting period

1.1.2 Conduct refresher training for 16 IMCs on climate-adapted O&M monitoring, with a focus on women's leadership, equal participation, and decision-making roles. 1.1.2 Engage the University of Zimbabwe to integrate gender considerations in the analysis of irrigation scheme models and performance. 1.1.3 Conduct field visits and technical advisory support by DoI to IMCs to strengthen gender-inclusive governance and accountability structures. 1.1.4 Facilitate learning and knowledge-exchange workshops across IMCs, ensuring at least 50% women representation. 2.1.2 Update and implement gender-sensitive crop production and market strategies, ensuring women's voices guide planning and decision-making. 2.1.3 Provide technical and legal assistance to farmer organizations to formalize public-private partnerships across climate-resilient value chains. 2.1.4 Expand business planning, management, and financial empowerment training for women smallholder farmers through ward-based transformative gender action learning

programmes. 2.2.2 Operationalize 251 Farmer Field Schools to promote climate -resilient and gender-responsive agriculture. 3.2.4 Disseminate gender-sensitive climate information via mobile phones, community radio, meetings, posters, and bulletins. 3.3.1 Train DoI, ZiNWA, and CC staff in gender-responsive data analysis and information products. 3.3.2 Conduct participatory training for farmers and intermediaries on gender-sensitive interpretation and use of climate and weather information.

G. ANNEXES (UPLOADED)
Annex 1: GHG emission reduction calculation methodology (for projects reporting GHG emission reductions) and details on the calculations of the annual and cumulative value.
No annexes provided.
Annex 2: Communication and visibility material
File Name: Annex 2_Communication and visibility material_FP127_PIMS5853.docx
Annex 3: List of grievances received
File Name: Annex 3_List of grievances received_FP127_PIMS5853.docx
Annex 4: Procurement information
No annexes provided.
Annex 5: Updated implementation timetable for the Funded Activity for the following year
File Name: Annex 5_FP127_PIMS5853 Implementation timetable 2026.xlsx
Annex 6: Updated Gender Assessment and/or Action Plan
File Name: Annex 6_Responses to 2024 APR SES Section Follow Up questions.docx File Name: GENDER ACTION PLAN FP127-Annex XIII (c)_2025 revision_v2.docx
Additional Annexes (if applicable)
File Name: Annex 7_Project Indicator reporting Notes.docx File Name: FP127_PIMS 5853 Zimbabwe APR (new template) 2025 _v6_clean.docx

