



## REQUEST FOR: CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: SCCF

For more information about GEF, visit [TheGEF.org](http://TheGEF.org)

### PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Scaling up Adaptation in Zimbabwe, with a focus on Rural Livelihoods			
Country(ies):	Zimbabwe	GEF Project ID: <sup>1</sup>	4960
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4713
Other Executing Partner(s):	Oxfam in Zimbabwe	Submission Date:	05 August 2014
GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change	Project Duration(Months)	48 months
Name of Parent Program (if applicable): ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/>	n/a	Agency Fee (\$):	398,000

### A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK<sup>2</sup>

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
CCA-1	<b>Outcome 1.3:</b> Diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income for vulnerable people in targeted areas	<b>Output 1.3.1:</b> Targeted individual and community livelihood strategies strengthened in relation to climate change impacts, including variability	SCCF	2,618,900	9,200,000
CCA-2	<b>Outcome 2.1:</b> Increased knowledge and understanding of climate variability and change-induced risks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas	<b>Output 2.1.2:</b> Systems in place to disseminate timely risk information	SCCF	269,400	1,500,000
CCA-2	<b>Outcome 2.3:</b> Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes at local level	<b>Output 2.3.1:</b> Targeted population groups participating in adaptation and risk reduction activities	SCCF	695,000	2,000,000
M & E & PMC			SCCF	396,700	-
<b>Total project costs</b>				3,980,000	12,700,000

<sup>1</sup> Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

<sup>2</sup> Refer to the [Focal Area/LDCF/SCCF Results Framework](#) when completing Table A.

## B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

**Project Objective:** To scale up adaptation measures and reduce the vulnerability of rural communities, particularly women to climate variability and change in the project area of Buhera, Chimanimani and Chiredzi Districts (Natural Region V) in Zimbabwe

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
<b>Component 1:</b> Investing in building the adaptive capacity of smallholder farmers	INV	<b>Outcome 1:</b> Diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income for vulnerable smallholder farmers in project area	<b>Output 1.1:</b> Livelihood strategies of 7000 women and 3100 male/ child headed households, youths and the disabled in three targeted districts strengthened and diversified in relation to climate change impacts, including variability.  <b>Output 1.2:</b> Inclusive Financial services that support climate risk management, livelihood diversification & autonomous adaptation, implemented to benefit at least 4,000 women headed households in three target districts.  <b>Output 1.3:</b> Market linkages and at least 3 short value chains that support adaptation by women farmers developed and scaled up in three target districts.  <b>Output 1.4:</b> Experimental Impact Assessment designed and implemented in order to generate robust results data.	SCCF	3,313,900	11,200,000
	TA	<b>Outcome 2:</b> Increased knowledge and understanding of climate variability and change-induced risks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas	<b>Output 2.1:</b> Tailored climate early warning system developed to cover at least 70% of farmers in target districts and scaled up.	SCCF	269,400	1,500,000
	(select)			(select)		

(select)		(select)	
	Subtotal		3,583,300
	Monitoring and Evaluation		113,500
	Project management Cost (PMC) <sup>3</sup>		283,200
	<b>Total project costs</b>		<b>3,980,000</b>
			<b>12,700,000</b>

### C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
GEF Agency	UNDP Trac	Cash	400,000
National Government	Environmental Management Agency	Cash	100,000
CSO	World Vision Zimbabwe	Investment	9,000,000
CSO	Plan International	Investment	2,500,000
Others	Beneficiary Communities	In-kind	200,000
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>12,200,00</b>

### D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY<sup>1</sup>

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>2</sup>	Total c=a+b
UNDP	SCCF	Climate Change	Zimbabwe	3,980,000	398,000	4,378,000
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>				<b>3,980,000</b>	<b>398,000</b>	<b>4,378,000</b>

<sup>1</sup> In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

<sup>2</sup> Indicate fees related to this project.

### F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	10,500		10,500
National/Local Consultants*	202,000		202,000

### G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

## PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

<sup>3</sup> PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

## **A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF<sup>4</sup>**

1. GEF Council feedback on the PPG document requested the following changes be made to the PIF: :
    - NGO implementation of the SCCF grant, benefitting communities directly;
    - The SCCF project is designed on the basis of NGO-implemented baseline investments;
    - The project is designed in a manner sensitive to conflict issues.
  2. Therefore the changes to the project framework for the SCCF grant are as follows:
    - Change in the objective statement to reflect the total allocation of the grant to communities.
    - Deletion of Outcome 1 and Outcome 3.
    - Modification of Outcome 2 statement with an expanded set of outputs.
  3. Details on the above now follow.
- Project Design:**
4. Implementation arrangements: In the PIF, a National Implementation Modality (NIM) had been proposed wherein the Ministry of Environment, Water and Climate was to be the project Implementing Partner. In the project document a UNDP NGO/CSO implementation modality is used for the SCCF grant. Oxfam in Zimbabwe has been identified as the NGO Implementing Partner in line with PIF comments. The Organization is already a recipient of other UN Grants and has been micro-assessed. This change in project implementation arrangements will result in the SCCF funds directly benefiting the targeted communities.
  5. Baseline Investments: In the PIF, the project design was based on baseline investments made by Government, UNDP and other bilateral arrangements with government programs being more prominent. The SCCF grant will be implemented in collaboration with baseline investments made by the USAID supported multimillion dollar *Enhancing Nutrition Stepping Up Resilience and Enterprise* (ENSURE) programme being implemented through World Vision Zimbabwe across a number of districts, including two of those targeted by the SCCF project, AusAid supported Food Security and Livelihoods programme being implemented in one of the targeted districts by Plan International. In addition, UNDP and Oxfam will be supporting a project on capacity development for adaptation planning which provides further co-financing. This will promote the continuity of good adaptation practice post SCCF-grant by strengthening the conditions for feeding in information on the results achieved and lessons learned in the implementation of the SCCF grant into policy development. This linkage is noted in the Theory of Change, Figure 1.9 in the prodoc.
  6. Results Framework: The project framework in the PIF has been recast to take into account the change in orientation towards rural communities. Outcome 2 in the PIF (*Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risks reduced at local level*) has been replaced with Outcome 1.1 (*Diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income for vulnerable people in targeted areas*) with a set of expanded outputs and Outcome 2.1 (*Increased knowledge and understanding of climate variability and change-induced risks and in targeted vulnerable areas*). The new outcomes are better aligned to the project goal of reducing vulnerability to climate change, including variability. The whole SCCF grant is channeled towards these two outcomes.
  7. Consistent with these changes, the objective statement has also been simplified. The revised project title is “*Scaling up adaptation in Zimbabwe, with a focus on Rural Livelihoods*”. The term by “*strengthening integrated planning systems*” has been dropped.
  8. Conflict sensitivity: Conflict sensitivity will be considered at all stages of the project cycle. During the PPG phase potential conflict generating issues were identified. Competing demands for scarce water resources in water catchment

<sup>4</sup> For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question

areas was identified as a major potential source of conflict. Where water and irrigation schemes have been constructed, it is also common for conflicts to be encountered among beneficiaries and between beneficiaries and those upstream. Conflict has been identified as a risk and integrated in the project results framework with mitigation strategies proposed. Conflict generating issues will be further analysed before the start of work in each district, capacity building on conflict sensitive development will be implemented for project teams and participatory monitoring and evaluation of project results will also help to identify potential conflict situations.

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NAPs national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.

9. The national strategies, plans, reports or assessments presented in the original PIF included: the Medium Term Plan (2011-2015), Second National Communications to the UNFCCC (2012), ZUNDAF (2012-2015), CAADP and SADC CCA strategy.

10. In the project document the following additional national strategies, plans, reports and assessments are cited:

- Zimbabwe Agenda for Sustainable Socio-Economic Transformation (ZimASSET) (2013 to 2018)
- Draft National Climate Change Response Strategy
- Draft Agriculture Policy
- Food and Nutrition security policy
- National Environmental Policy
- National water policy
- Microfinance policy
- Disaster risk reduction policy
- Technology Transfer Needs Assessment
- National Capacity Self Assessment
- PPG vulnerability assessment report

11. Justification for the change: During the PPG phase, a new government took office and launched a new economic development framework ZimASSET (2013-2014). The project objectives had to be aligned with the national priorities presented in ZimASSET particularly that on Food and Nutrition Security. Stakeholder consultations and the vulnerability assessment report prepared during the PPG phase assisted in identifying further national policies that the SCCF project took into account in its design.

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities. N/A

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage: N/A

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

12. The principal problem to be addressed by this SCCF project is that increasing climate variability is worsening the problem of poverty, food insecurity and malnutrition among rural households in semi-arid regions of Zimbabwe. Future climate change is set to worsen these problems, with women and children in semi-arid regions of the country being the most vulnerable. This problem has not changed from the original PIF. However, following comments received on the PIF and stakeholder consultations during the PPG phase, the baseline projects and the problem that SCCF financing seeks to address have undergone some changes.

13. The original PIF identified the following baseline investments: Medium Term Plan (2011-2015); UN Development Assistance Framework (2012-2015) and UNDP Country Program; Irrigation Rehabilitation, expansion and development Program; Zimbabwe Protracted Relief Program (DFID supported) and CDKN-Zimbabwe project.

14. In the project document the baseline projects have changed to the following: “Enhancing Nutrition, Stepping up Resilience and Enterprise” (ENSURE) which is a USAID supported program being implemented in six districts in Manicaland and Masvingo provinces over the period 2013 to 2018 and Food Security and Livelihood program which is an AusAid supported program being implemented through Plan International in Chiredzi District over the period 2013 to 2018. Oxfam in Zimbabwe is implementing a Food and Climate Justice program over the period 2014 to 2017.

15. Justification for changes: The GEF Council requested that the project be implemented by NGOs on the basis of bilateral, multilateral or NGO implemented baseline investments. Two baseline projects were identified for the SCCF grant.

16. The USAID is supporting a five year (2013-2018) programme “*Enhanced Nutrition Stepping up Resilience and Enterprise (ENSURE)*” being implemented in Buhera and Chimanimani Districts among other districts, through a number of NGOs including CARE, SNV, SAFIRE and ICRISAT under the coordination of World Vision Zimbabwe (WVZ). In Chiredzi District, Plan International is implementing a *Food Security and Livelihoods Programme* (2013 - 2018) with financial support from AusAID. The two programs give a total of about \$11.5 million in baseline investments in the three targeted districts. The two programs were selected for the following reasons:

- Both WVZ and Plan International’s programs aim to reduce the problem of chronic food insecurity and under-nutrition and to decrease the number of Zimbabweans requiring emergency food assistance through: (i) increasing household and micro-enterprise productivity and income through market-orientated approaches; (ii) improving nutrition among women of reproductive age, pregnant and lactating women, and children under five; (iii) increasing household resilience to shocks in selected vulnerable areas of the targeted districts. Whereas the proposed interventions under the baseline investments are important in addressing food insecurity, none of the interventions are designed with explicit current and future climate change considerations. For example, flood irrigation schemes that are a key intervention in the baseline investments are not climate proofed and could be vulnerable to increasing water scarcity and siltation of canals from heavy rainfall events induced soil erosion. The disaster management plans proposed in the baseline investments could benefit from the tailored climate forecast tools developed in the first SCCF.
- Both the WVZ and Plan International implemented programs are in their early stages and present good opportunities for the SCCF project to adapt the baseline projects. In Chiredzi District for example, Plan International is rehabilitating most of the smallholder flood irrigation schemes. Integrated microwatershed management in the SCCF project will address some of the climate issues affecting those irrigation schemes such as increasing water scarcity, whereas tailored climate information will also enhance adaptive management.

A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

The baseline projects into which the SCCF project will be integrating adaptation measures include the WVZ implemented ENSURE program and Plan International implemented Food and Livelihoods program as described in A.4. The baseline- adaptation rationale is as follows:

## 17. Baseline

18. The USAID is supporting a five year (2013-2018) programme “*Enhanced Nutrition Stepping up Resilience and Enterprise (ENSURE)*” being implemented in Buhera and Chimanimani Districts among other districts, through a number of NGOs including CARE, SNV, SAFIRE and ICRISAT under the coordination of World Vision Zimbabwe. The ENSURE program aims to reduce chronic food insecurity and under-nutrition and to decrease the number of Zimbabweans requiring emergency food assistance. The program development objective is to sustainably increase food security among vulnerable populations in Zimbabwe. The program focus areas include: (1) increasing household and micro-enterprise productivity and income through market-orientated approaches; (2) improving nutrition among women of reproductive age, pregnant and lactating women, and children under five; and (3) increasing household resilience to

shocks in selected WARDs and districts in vulnerable areas of Manicaland and Masvingo Provinces. The measures proposed for building resilience to shocks include developing disaster preparedness plans and transformative capacity building of communities. In Manicaland Province the programme targets the NR V WARDs in Buhera and Chimanimani Districts. Activities under this programme include increasing nutrition of mothers and children in their first 10 years of life through: food assistance; increasing local farming production; creating market linkages between communities and regional food suppliers; post-harvest handling/technology; and increasing household assets through agricultural assistance. The five year programme has a budget of about US\$9 million for Buhera and Chimanimani Districts and seeks to benefit 21% and 37% of the households in the targeted WARDs of the two districts respectively.

19. Following a combination of successive droughts and low agricultural production that has resulted in severe food shortages countrywide, Plan International Zimbabwe is scaling up food security and livelihood programmes in Chiredzi District with financial support from AusAID. The programme has a budget of about US\$2.5 million over the period 2013 to 2018 and its broad aim is to reduce the number of Zimbabweans requiring emergency food aid. The programme seeks to achieve its development objective through promoting small grains and crop diversification, conservation agriculture, group saving and lending, drought preparedness, livestock farming as a business, rehabilitation of irrigation schemes and food relief. The programme targets those households that have been receiving food handouts for a long time. In Chiredzi District the programme is targeting 70% female headed households (2,500) in WARDs 1, 2, 5, 9, 10, 11, 13 and 15. Plan's programmes are designed to promote the realization and fulfillment of children's rights.

20. Both WVZ and Plan International Zimbabwe implemented baseline interventions are not designed with future climate change adaptation considerations in mind. The component on building community resilience to food insecurity focuses on developing community disaster preparedness plans, natural resources management and management of public infrastructure that is important for disaster risk management. Both programmes seek to increase agricultural productivity by focusing on improving agricultural practices, access to productive assets and financial services. The vulnerability of communities, infrastructure and value chains to future climate change are currently not considered in the baseline investment. For example the rehabilitation of irrigation schemes based on flood irrigation systems could be a maladaptation under the projected future climate change scenarios for the project area. The proposed disaster preparedness plans are not supported by the development of a tailored early warning system for the targeted districts, which could lead to ineffective disaster preparedness. Similarly, the resilience of some of the value chains being promoted under the two programmes have not been critically examined under future climate change scenarios for the targeted districts.

## **21. Adaptation alternative**

22. This SCCF project will build up on the baseline investments in Buhera and Chimanimani Districts, particularly the ENSURE programme and those in Chiredzi District particularly Plan International's Food Security and Livelihoods programme to deliver on the project development objective. SCCF support will be used to strengthen participatory integrated micro-catchment planning to produce micro-catchment level Climate Change Adaptation investment plans, adapt planned baseline investments and implement concrete adaptation measures that diversify and drought proof rainfed agriculture and other smallholder farmers' livelihood strategies; increase the productive potential and sustainability of semi-arid lands through various micro-watershed interventions focusing mostly on land and water management practices, and create a sustainable natural resource base that assists in buffering climatic extremes particularly droughts, floods and heavy rainfall events at community level. The capacity of smallholder farmers, particularly women to manage productive assets and climate risk within their micro-catchment will also be enhanced.

23. The SCCF financing will address the problems of overgrazing, inappropriate agricultural practices and control damaging runoff from heavy rainfall events thereby conserving soil and water for more efficient and sustained production and livelihoods. Increased infiltration of rainwater will enhance fodder and underground water recharge. The project will focus on one or two micro-watersheds in each of the targeted districts that affect at least 5 villages where possible and do not exceed 1000 ha. SCCF support will be used to diversify livelihoods and demonstrate practical adaptation measures which could include crop and livelihoods diversification, integrated soil fertility management,

drought resistant varieties, moisture and water conservation practices, agro-forestry and livestock, poultry, horticulture and climate resilient non-agricultural income sources. The final selection of adaptation measures will be developed through community participatory approaches that take into account current and future climate change considerations. Collaboration between local stakeholders, technical experts, existing catchment management structures, civil society, recognized user groups, unions, associations, cooperatives, local authority, line agencies, NGOs and private companies will be fostered.

24. It is assumed that self directed climate resilient rural development occurs and vulnerability is reduced within the household and community when loans, savings, insurance, and pensions help to protect livelihoods; contribute to income diversification; smooth incomes for consumption; and provide a safety net in times of need, including crises within the household or community<sup>5</sup>. This SCCF project will support the development of Community Owned Rural Finance Model (Self Help Groups) and/or Managed Savings and Credit Cooperatives to leverage existing Micro Finance Institutes (MFI) management and financial resources for sustainability. SCCF resources will be used for community mobilisation, capacity building, setting up basic infrastructure where necessary, insurance, capacity building and initial management fees.

25. The SCCF resources will also be put to use to work with a few high impact value chains of potentially climate resilient dryland products to remove institutional constraints and barriers to the interplay of economic relations among value chain actors. The core assumption behind ‘pro-poor’ value chain interventions is that vulnerable upstream agents (such as smallholder farmers) can be ‘pulled’ into specific markets, and therefore successfully integrated into economic dynamics to which they were hitherto excluded, or, at best, only participated under very unfavourable conditions<sup>6</sup>. An integrated value chain approach will identify the most effective and appropriate entry points for support, to address climate related sustainability pressure points along and between value chains. The value chain interventions will work closely with the other outputs under component 2 to stimulate improved adaptation practices on the ground and avoid environmental degradation. Assistance will be provided towards formation of Farmer Groups wherein small-scale grain, livestock (particularly cattle) or Fresh Fruit and Vegetable producer-farmers are grouped together to aggregate their produce into larger volumes and linking/integrating them to private sector buyers/purchasers for ensuring better returns and improve production techniques adapted to a variable and changing climate. SCCF support will also help farmers and buyers identify and develop sustainable partnerships that are outside the traditional marketing systems using facilitated value chain analysis.

26. Ongoing learning, analysis, planning and adjustment are required to respond to an evolving context and changing risks. To do this effectively requires availability of appropriate, timely and locally-relevant climate information such as weather forecasts, seasonal forecasts and early warnings for climate hazards. It also requires that this information is made accessible to the people and institutions that need it, including women. The project seeks to scale up a seasonal climate forecast system tailored to smallholder farmers in NR V that was developed in the SCCF I project.

27. Finally, a monitoring system to measure the causal pathways and results will be designed in order to explore whether the assumptions made with regards to the theory of change are credible. An experimental impact assessment will be designed and implemented with counterfactual analyses of the adaptation impact of integrated watershed management interventions (*Output 1.1.1*) and tailored climate early warning systems (*Output 1.2.1*). The internal rate of return for the adaptation measures will be calculated. The monitoring system will track the climate baseline in order to attribute the benefits identified to the project.

---

<sup>5</sup> Anderson-Saito, Katrine, Arunima Dhar, and Eija Pehu. 2004. “GENRD Operationa lNotes for Task Managers to Integrate Gender into Rural Projects.” Operational Note 4, Gender and Rural Finance,World Bank,Washington, DC.

<sup>6</sup> Piet Visser, Marc Steen, Juergen Greiling, Timoteos Hayesso, Rem Neefjes and Heinz Greijn (Eds.) (2012) *Pro-Poor Value Chain Development: Private Sector-Led Innovative Practices in Ethiopia*, SNV Netherlands Development Organisation, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

28. The SCCF grant has leveraged additional finance from the UNDP and Oxfam to address policy and institutional barriers to scaling up climate change adaptation. The UNDP/Oxfam project (Annex 7) will build institutional capacity within government institutions and other relevant stakeholders to mainstream climate change adaptation in national and district level development frameworks thereby enhancing project impact and sustainability. The results from the SCCF projects will be used to promote learning among policy makers within the Food and Nutrition Cluster on climate change adaptation interventions undertaken with financing from the SCCF.

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

29. A detailed risk assessment was conducted during the PPG phase. In addition to those risks identified at PIF stage, Table 1 presents a summary of the key risks identified and mitigation strategies proposed.

	<b>Description of risk</b>	<b>Risk Category</b>	<b>Risk Level</b>	<b>Risk management strategies</b>
1	Fiduciary risk. This risk factor has been highlighted by some of the major donors during the PIF review.	Financial	Low	SCCF funds for Outcome 2 will be channelled through Oxfam. The organisation has received UN funding in the recent past and is still currently receiving UN funding. A UN assessment of the country's public financial management system (macro-assessment) in 2013 concluded that Oxfam's management and control over cash and procurement is adequate and comprehensive.
2	Implementation risk by Implementing Partners with no experience implementing UNDP/GEF supported projects	Organizational	Medium	The performance of the PMU unit will be reviewed regularly by the UNDP CO and RTA in liaison with the IP
3	Poor communication between partner organizations.	Organizational	High	In addition to written agreement between partner organizations setting out terms and conditions for joint working accountabilities, there will be regular internal project team meetings.
4	Staff turnover in implementing agencies	Organizational	M	The project will take necessary steps to ensure that the Results Framework and methodology (output delivery) are clearly understood by project staff. Key members from partner organizations will be fully engaged in all key project processes.
5	Host government may make macro or micro political decisions that may prove to have adverse effects on project objectives. Political risks may also stem from NGOs and other groups pursuing political objectives. ZUNDAF (2012-2015) also identify change in government priorities as a potential risk.	Political	M	To mitigate this risk the project will maintain dialogue with all levels of government to track developments and identify possible shifts in attitude toward certain elements of the project. Adaptive management strategies will be used to manage micro level risks as they emerge. Macro-level risks, such as drastic changes in currency policy or if civil strife in neighbouring country spills over into the project area may leave the project with very few options.
6	Limited capacity of local service providers and implementation	Operational	M	This project recognizes the possibility of limited capacity of actors in government, civil society, private sector and community level to understand and assess climate risks, and to assist communities to

	partners to provide high quality services in relation to the implementation of the specific outputs of the SCCF and climate change adaptation activities.			respond. To mitigate this risk, the selection of service providers will be subject to rigorous selection processes. Furthermore, the project will provide adequate allocations for Technical Assistance to ensure that the specific technical adaptation aspects benefit from further local or international technical support to minimize risk and consolidate project interventions. See procurement plan.
7	There is the likelihood that output from the project may have limited market demand and fail to generate enough revenue to cover investment and operating costs because of poor macroeconomic conditions. This risk could affect value chains and microfinance services.	Economic	M	The projects could be insulated from movements in the market price of its products or services by helping project beneficiaries to negotiate and enter into a long-term contract with potential output purchasers.
8	Extreme drought or floods may reduce the effectiveness of some of the adaptation strategies or non climatic stressors may overshadow climatic stress during project implementation.	Environmental	L	The vulnerability assessment undertaken during the PPG phase provided climatic hazard profiles of the project area and selected adaptation measures took the extremes into account. The risk of surprises is therefore low. However, the project manager will be responsible for environmental scanning and making relevant adjustments of the project strategy ahead of time, in line with the principle of adaptive management.
9	There is the risk that proposed technologies or production practices may fail to address the challenge	Technical	L	This risk will be mitigated through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monitoring of project environment with actions towards adaptive management.</li> <li>- Identify and address capacity development needs of partners.</li> <li>- Clear ToRs for procurements</li> <li>- Competitive procurement procedures applied to secure best available and cost effective technology.</li> </ul>
10	There is the risk that the project could be seen as benefiting one group over another and reinforcing existing conflict or becoming a source of conflict	Political	M	This risk will be mitigated through the use of participatory approaches during project design to identify conflict generating issues. At project implementation the risk will be mitigated through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Broadening participation of stakeholders in key activities,</li> <li>- Training project teams in conflict sensitive development,</li> <li>- Participatory monitoring and evaluation</li> </ul>

#### A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives:

30. This SCCF project draws on the following lessons from SGP:

- **Sustainable solutions to climate change problems are those that are owned by the community.**

Experiences from SGP projects show that sustainable solutions to climate change problems most often emerge from within the affected community. Communities routinely invent or improve and adapt existing, practices or technologies to fit their own situations and meet their most pressing needs.

- **Capacity development promotes integration and sustainability.** For climate change mitigation SGP required capacity development at the technical level. However, SGP recognized the importance of capacity development at different levels for project success. For example, at societal level, the affected community may need to understand better the linkages between effective management of local water catchment areas and their livelihood activities, and be able and willing to adapt their daily activities and traditions to protect them. At the institutional and system levels, issues relate to policy and legislative change, ownership structures, strategies and inter-organizational cooperation. An integrated approach to capacity development, which strengthens the relationships and dialogue between villagers and their self appointed leadership structures, local and national institutions, civil society, the media and the private sector was found to be the most effective.
- **Complementary partnerships are crucial for effectiveness.** CCA is a multi-sectoral process, requiring the support of different development sectors, including water, agriculture and micro-finance, among others. Partnerships also play an important role in sustaining project activities or the impacts of a project after external funding ends.
- **Adapting technologies to suit local conditions is a process.** Before new technologies are introduced to communities, it is essential that an assessment be carried out to gauge existing capacity and understand what is needed to adapt to the proposed changes. Tailored climate early systems in the SCCF project will be a new technology to the targeted communities and will need to suit local conditions.
- **Financing options should fit the scale and scope of community objectives.** The sustainability of SGP projects depended strongly upon matching financing options with the specific circumstances of a community. The options preferred by SGP climate change projects included micro-credit, revolving funds, micro-financing including loans that are pegged against community income regimes (such as crop harvesting cycles) and normal conventional loans which are financed by cooperatives that give better repayment terms than conventional banks.
- **To develop new markets and products, build a critical mass of purchasers and users.** The sustainability of climate change initiatives with commercial objectives is enhanced when the capacity of a community to produce products is balanced by a critical mass of potential users (or buyers) of the product. Supporting the entire value chain from consumers to manufacturers and producers to providers of goods and/or services is therefore essential.
- **Learning by doing" enhances management and ownership.** "Learning by doing" depends on the capacity of project partners to collect, analyze and store information at every stage of project implementation, and to manage and share the knowledge generated in the process. An effective participatory monitoring, evaluation and learning framework is therefore critical.
- **Communication is the lifeblood of a project.** Climate change projects involve a long-term process of change. To be effective, a project needs to be participatory, integrative and interactive. Experiences from SGP suggest that a range of partners (including government, community, civil society and private sector representatives) must establish relationships and communicate to discuss challenges, identify problems and correct courses of action.
- **Community climate change projects can be scaled up.** SGP's climate change projects offer excellent lessons for scaling up as they occur in very diverse cultural, social, economic and geographic settings. They are often small in size, time-bound, flexible, highly interactive and participatory. Since they are also usually low budget pilot projects, there is space for "trial and error", which make SGP projects potentially easier to learn from than larger projects that are more risk-averse and bureaucratic.

31. In addition, this SCCF project will have synergies with Zimbabwe's Third National Communication (TNC). Two components of the TNC that will have synergies with the proposed project include: (ii) impact and vulnerability assessment of key economic sectors to the impacts of climate change in Zimbabwe, and (iv) elaboration of programmes including measures aimed at facilitating adequate adaptation to the adverse impacts of climate change. The NCs also

aim at increasing awareness on climate change and information exchange across a range of stakeholders including government, private sector, civil society, general public, research and academia.

**B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:**

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

32. The project design reflects the complexity of climate change, the needs of stakeholders across different sectors and the need for multi-disciplinary integrated response. The project promotes the collaborative involvement of smallholder farmers, NGOs, the private sector, government entities, as well as research entities in all project efforts to support the adaptation of smallholder farmers in semi-arid areas of Zimbabwe.

33. The project will be delivered by Oxfam in Zimbabwe. Oxfam will contract other relevant international and local NGOs (particularly those with requisite capacity and already present in the targeted districts) and research institutes with requisite capacity and comparative advantage to implement some of the outputs under outcomes 1 and 2. NGOs with requisite capacity will be contracted to work with communities and other relevant stakeholders in targeted microwatersheds to develop and implement gender and conflict sensitive integrated microwatershed climate change adaptation investment plans that strengthen and diversify rural livelihoods in ways that build climate resilience. Relevant NGOs or research institutes will also be contracted to assist in implementing inclusive rural financial services, develop market linkages and selected short value chains, adapt and scale up a tailored climate information system for the targeted districts and develop a participatory monitoring and evaluation system.

34. The total number of beneficiaries targeted through the SCCF grant is 10,100 households of which 70% are female headed. The other 30% include male/child headed, youths and the disabled. The project will interface with policy makers through the participatory monitoring and evaluation mechanism that will be established by the project and taken forward by the UNDP/Oxfam project on mainstreaming climate change. The technical working group of the Food and Nutrition Cluster (Ministry of Agriculture, Mechanisation and Irrigation Development; Ministry of Environment, Water and Climate; Ministry of Lands and Ministry of Health and Child Care) will be the project's entry point to influence policy.

35. Some of the key activities that be used to stimulate stakeholder engagement in project implementation include: project inception workshop, where a number of stakeholders from government, NGOs/CSOs, private sector and donors will be invited; district working groups which will be established to foster project ownership and participatory monitoring and evaluation. Results from the project will be disseminated through policy and decision makers' workshops and advocacy activities undertaken by the UNDP CC mainstreaming project so as to scale up adaptation.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

36. Overall, this project will contribute towards reduction in the vulnerability of about 10,100 households in vulnerable areas of NR V to impacts of climate change, including variability. The benefits will be at different levels as described in the sub-sections that follow:

- Macro level: This SCCF project will contribute towards attainment particularly of Goal 1 (halving the proportion of people living in extreme poverty and hunger by 2015) and Goal 7 (ensuring environmental sustainability). By reducing the vulnerability of communities and food-production systems to changes in mean climatic conditions and climatic variability; and enhancing the ability of individuals, communities and institutions to plan for and respond to the impacts of climate change, including variability the project will contribute significantly towards MDG 1 for Zimbabwe's dryland communities.
- Micro level: At the micro or individual farmer level, there will be benefits deriving from 10,100 households having more secure access to livelihood assets from the adaptive capacity building activities such as: the introduction of a

mix of climate risk reducing technologies and livelihood options, integrated micro-watershed management, access to finance and markets, early warning systems and improved understanding of climate change risks, vulnerabilities and management options. Better climate risk management will result in reduced economic losses associated with climate variability and change and consequently improved rural livelihoods.

- Economic benefits: The project is expected to lead to reduced economic losses from extreme climate/weather events and increased income of the rural poor in the targeted districts in NR V. Benefits will derive from: Increase in income of family farmers from improved agricultural production and increase in value added of agricultural produce; spur in local employment opportunities; inclusion of small-scale farmers in local market system; stimulation of local economy; improved crop and livestock productivity and production among small-scale family farmers through introduction of climate risk reducing management practices and technologies and improved access to financial credit.
- Social Benefits: Social benefits from this SCCF project will derive from improvements in human capacity from access to technical support, and improvements in social capital will come about through the process of developing participatory action plans; the process of participatory monitoring of changes and the participatory approach to developing improved climate forecasts. These participatory processes of decision-making and developing awareness are expected to stimulate internal learning processes which are necessary to promote autonomous adaptation and innovation.

#### B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

37. Two alternative interventions for achieving the project development were assessed, irrigation development and Community Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM), but jettisoned in favour of watershed rehabilitation and management.

i). Irrigation development. Estimated rehabilitation costs for six smallholder irrigation schemes covering about 400 ha and benefiting 911 people came to about US\$3,500.00 per hectare. Developing a new irrigation scheme would cost much more. Under the right conditions and in the right places, irrigation pays and could be the best adaptation option in semi-arid regions. However, given the negative Gross Margins that characterize most smallholder irrigation schemes and the available SCCF budget, this rehabilitation cost makes it impossible to scale up irrigation development without sustained government or donor support.

ii). Community Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM). A number of studies suggest that wildlife is better adapted in terms of water conservation and heat stress under semi-arid and arid areas. An economic assessment carried out in Chiredzi District under the first SCCF project showed that the cost of developing water infrastructure for wildlife management over an area of about 7,000 km<sup>2</sup> was in excess of US\$110,000 and the financial returns from sport hunting have been on the decline largely because of the poor economic environment and declining popularity of sport hunting. Whereas ecotourism is gaining in popularity, it costs a lot more to develop the requisite infrastructure, business skills and to build appropriate private sector partnerships. Another drawback of wildlife management as an alternative landuse system was that it worked well only in sparsely populated areas. Wildlife management has to be extensive to be feasible which means it requires a lot of land. Most communal areas in Zimbabwe do not have excess land to accommodate wildlife, livestock and crops.

38. The SCCF project builds on baseline rural livelihood investment programs in Buhera, Chimanimani and Chiredzi Districts amounting to more than US\$11.5m. These baseline initiatives have already collected some baseline data that could be used by the SCCF project. They have also worked on three value chains including beans, chickens and goats which the SCCF project will not have to cover. The baseline investments are also working on disaster plans and strengthening selected public infrastructure in the context of disaster management. In some areas the baseline investments also intend to try a different model of rural financial services, which will create opportunities for building a larger knowledge base. The economic impact of the project's activities related to these baseline projects is, therefore, potentially much higher than its initial investment. Furthermore, by promoting policy linkages between the results achieved with the SCCF project and feeding of the information into the UNDP climate change mainstreaming project the potential impact of the project will be quite high for the investment. For example

the Zimbabwe Agricultural Investment Plan has a budget of US\$4,69 billion over the period 2013 to 2017 which needs to be secured against climate related risks.

39. During the PPG phase, the cost effectiveness of similar interventions was reviewed and revealed the following:

The total number of beneficiaries is more than 10,000, which if broken down per output provides the following cost per beneficiaries:

Output 1.1.1 budget: \$2,518,900. 10,100 beneficiaries = \$249/pp/4 years

Output 1.1.2 budget: \$224,000. 3000 beneficiaries = \$74/pp/years

Output 1.1.3 budget: \$471,000. 3000 beneficiaries = \$157/pp/4 years.

- A DFID-funded project in Malawi supporting crop diversification, soil and water conservation, and provision of drought-resistant livestock, yielded Benefit Cost Ratios (BCR) of between 24.30 and 37.32:1 depending on the underlying assumptions.
- The DFID-funded Protracted Relief Programme (PRP) in Zimbabwe has shown that small scale projects (conservation farming; seeds, fertilisers and small stock distribution; crop diversification) which aimed to increase food security showed a benefit cost ratio of between 1.6 and 17.2:1 depending on the intervention;
- A small water-shed project in Rajasthan assessed by Sahu (2008) showed a benefit cost ratio of 2.14:1
- Cost Benefit analysis of a DFID Pro-poor Growth Programme in Zimbabwe supporting access to micro-finance (Zimbabwe Wholesale Microfinance Facility), development of agricultural value chains and market linkages (African Enterprise Challenge Fund) in rural areas showed a high Return on Investment of over 1000%, Benefit Cost Ratio of about 11:1 and Internal Rate of Return of 193 to 234%. Even under a less optimistic scenario such as assuming a high failure rate of 50% in the Challenge Fund and in the Microfinance facility the number of recipients who register an increase in income was reduced from 70% to 50% the benefits from both options remained high.
- World Bank (2010) in their comprehensive report of natural hazards conclude that:
  - o In an Indonesia seasonal climate forecasting case study, the indicative value of each seasonal forecast was USD 1.5 million per season (currently in 50 districts. The actual one-time investment to produce this forecast is not more than USD 0.25 million, with a marginal recurring cost of USD 0.05 million per year.
  - o In the Philippines, the total value of a single seasonal forecast, even if farmers had used the forecast for planting decision only is estimated USD 20 million.
  - o A cost benefit analysis of a 2007 Flood case study in Thailand revealed that over a ten-year period, for every US\$ 1 invested in Early Warning Systems, there is a low return of US\$ 176 in benefits.
  - o Meteorological Services in Mozambique were estimated to have a benefit cost ratio of 70:1(World Bank 2008).
  - o An assessment of the economic value of seasonal forecasts for smallholder farmers in Zimbabwe showed that the willingness to pay from improved or downscaled seasonal climate forecasts was highest (\$0.85) in Natural Regions IV and V compared with Natural Region II (\$0.44).

40. Actual context specific adaptation measures will be selected through a stakeholder participatory process after detailed integrated micro-watershed assessments during the project's inception phase. Selected adaptation measures will be appraised for economic viability under three different climate change scenarios (worst case, median and best case). Adaptation measures with the highest benefit cost ratios will be prioritized for scaling up. During implementation, the Internal Rate of Return of the adaptation measures will be tracked. Improving resilience to climate change in rural Zimbabwe should improve the resilience of both women and men to climate related shocks, and create opportunities for building resilient livelihoods. Given women's often particular vulnerabilities (e.g. limited livelihood options, restricted access to education and information services, and insufficient means to recoup assets) to climate shocks and other climate change effects it is important to focus on women. 70% of the households

in the project area (Buhera and Chimanimani Districts as well as in Chiredzi District) are headed by women and therefore they will be a majority of the direct beneficiaries of this project. It is critical to ensure that their roles, needs, priorities and contributions are explicitly taken into account in climate change responses. Engaging in both the informal and formal sectors, women also play a key role in their communities as entrepreneurs and community networkers. As such, they play a critical role in helping reduce and respond to climate change effects. Evidence has shown that women's involvement in diversifying livelihoods has greatly contributed to the success of project outcomes.

41. In summary, after considering the cost/benefit and feasibility of the two alternatives, appraising the performance of similar interventions from elsewhere and assessing the cost-benefit of the proposed interventions as well as the savings that will be made by working in geographical locations already covered by well funded baseline projects it was concluded that the proposed project strategy was feasible and cost effective.

### **C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:**

42. The Project Results Framework (Annex A) will provide the basis for Monitoring and Evaluation. The M&E framework is aligned with the AMAT and UNDP M&E frameworks. The budget for the M&E plan is presented in Section 6 of the Project Document. The M&E system will consist of the following:

- Regular reports and process monitoring by the PMU
- Participatory monitoring by selected groups involved in the project and those with a stake in the project
- External reviews
- Counterfactual analyses for impact evaluation

43. The project will be monitored through the following M& E activities:

44. Project start: A Project Inception Workshop will be held within 3 months of project start and the establishment of the PMU. The Inception Workshop will involve a range of stakeholders particularly those from the project area, those with assigned roles in the project organization structure, government entities, UNDP country office and where appropriate/feasible regional technical and project advisors. The Inception Workshop is crucial to building ownership for the project processes and results, and gather further inputs to refine the first year annual work plan in line the latest socio-economic context of Zimbabwe.

45. The Inception Workshop should address a number of key issues including:

- Assisting all partners to fully understand and take ownership of the project. Detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP CO and RCU staff vis-à-vis the project team. Discuss the roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference for project staff will be discussed again as needed.
- Based on the project results framework and the SCCF related AMAT set out in the Project Results Framework in Section III of this project document, and finalize the first annual work plan. Review and agree on the indicators, targets and their means of verification, and recheck assumptions and risks.
- Provide a detailed overview of reporting, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements. The Monitoring and Evaluation work plan and budget should be agreed and scheduled.
- Discuss financial reporting procedures and obligations, and arrangements for annual audit.
- Plan and schedule PB meetings. Roles and responsibilities of all project organisation structures should be clarified and meetings planned. The first PB meeting should be held within the first 12 months following the inception workshop.

46. An Inception Workshop report is a key reference document and must be prepared and shared with participants to formalize various agreements and plans decided during the meeting.

47. Quarterly:

- Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management (ERBM) Platform.
- Based on the initial risk analysis submitted, the risk log shall be regularly updated in ATLAS. Risks become critical when the impact and probability are high.
- Based on the information recorded in Atlas, a Project Progress Report (PPR) can be generated in the Executive Snapshot.
- Other ATLAS logs will be used to monitor issues and lessons learned. The use of these functions is a key indicator in the UNDP Executive Balanced Scorecard.

48. Annually: Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR): This key report is prepared to monitor progress made since project start and in particular for the previous reporting period (30 June to 1 July). The APR/PIR combines both UNDP and GEF reporting requirements.

49. The APR/PIR includes, but is not limited to, reporting on the following:

- Progress made toward project objective and project outcomes - each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative)
- Project outputs delivered per project outcome (annual).
- Lesson learned/good practice.
- AWP and other expenditure reports
- Risk and adaptive management
- ATLAS QPR
- Portfolio level indicators (i.e. GEF focal area tracking tools) are used by most focal areas on an annual basis as well.

50. Periodic Monitoring through site visits: UNDP CO and the UNDP-GEF region-based staff will conduct visits to project sites based on the agreed schedule in the project's Inception Report/Annual Work Plan to assess first hand project progress. Other members of the Project Board may also join these visits. A Field Visit Report/BTOR will be prepared by the CO and UNDP RCU and will be circulated no less than one month after the visit to the project team and Project Board members.

51. Mid-term of project cycle: The project will undergo an independent Mid-Term Review (MTR) at the mid-point of project implementation (expected to be in 2016). The MTR will determine progress being made toward the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term. The organization, terms of reference and timing of the mid-term review will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The Terms of Reference for this Mid-term review will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on UNDP Head-Quarters' guidance. The LDFC/SCCF AMAT as set out in the Project Results Framework in Section III of this project document) will also be completed during the mid-term evaluation cycle.

52. End of Project: An independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) will take place three months prior to the final PB meeting and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP-GEF guidance. The TE will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term review, if any such correction took place). The TE will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on UNDP Head-Quarters' guidance. The LDFC/SCCF AMAT as set out in the Project Results Framework in Section III of this project document) will also be completed during the TE cycle.

53. The TE should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response, which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center (ERC).

54. During the last three months, the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will summarize the results achieved (objectives, outcomes, outputs), lessons learned, problems met and areas where

results may not have been achieved. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project's results.

**55. Participatory monitoring:** Participatory monitoring will be introduced to the targeted project communities including policy makers under the Food and Nutrition Cluster to enable them to assess progress with implementation of integrated micro-watershed management and tailored climate early warning system in particular and to identify issues for discussion and resolution. Impact indicators to be monitored will address, among other issues: a) equitable access to and distribution of benefits, b) institutional arrangements including local collective action, c) social outcomes including social capital and community capacity developed, conflict reduced, and changes in household well-being, d) changes in climate risk management practices, e) ecological outcomes including changes in primary production, vegetation cover, erosion, and hydrologic function, and other changes as determined by the group. Participatory M&E meetings will be planned for 6 monthly intervals. Results will be analyzed through the implementation of an experimental impact assessment, see paragraph 59 for details. Results will be disseminated through policy and decision makers' workshops, including policy briefs.

56. The project will identify, analyze, and share lessons learned from the project that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of national, sector and district level development frameworks under the UNDP/Oxfam project so as to scale up adaptation.

57. There will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects of a similar focus in NR V.

**58. Performance monitoring:** Successful adaptation will be measured by how well different measures contribute to effectively reducing vulnerability and building resilience. Currently the evidence base on the impact of climate change interventions is almost non-existent and there is a need for wider application of rigorous impact evaluation in the field. The project will contract an appropriate institution to assist in establishing an appropriate M&E system with counterfactual analyses of the adaptation impact of integrated micro-watershed management interventions (*Output 1.1.1*) and tailored climate early warning systems (*Output 1.2.1*). The estimated impact of the intervention is calculated as the difference in mean outcomes between a 'treatment group' (those receiving the intervention) and a 'control group' (those who don't). The M & E officer working closely with the Responsible Party for Output 1.1.1 will use appropriate approaches to determine an appropriate control group for counterfactual analysis. The M & E officer will define the critical indicators, data collection and analysis methodologies and the agencies involved. The M&E officer would be trained in the utilization of the M&E system, the analysis of data and the appropriate reporting.

**59. Audit:** Project will be audited in accordance with UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules and applicable audit policies.

**60. Responsibilities:** Overall responsibility for M&E rests with the PMU assisted by a Service Provider who will be contracted for a few weeks per year for the duration of the project.

**PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)**

**A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):** :  
(Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Mr I.D Kunene	GEF Operational Focal Point	ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES	13 APRIL 2012

**B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION**

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu Executive Coordinator and Director a.i., UNDP/GEF		August 13, 2014	Benjamin Larroquette	+251936636877	Benjamin.larroquette@undp.org

**ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK** (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Targets End of Project</b>	<b>Source of verification</b>	<b>Risks and Assumptions</b>
<b>Project Objective<sup>7</sup></b>	Vulnerability Reduction Perception Index	High Vulnerability (Score of 8 or more on an index from 1 to 10)	Low vulnerability (Score of 4 or less, on an index from 1 to 10)	\Vulnerability Reduction Assessment	<b>Assumptions:</b> - Macro-economic stability continues - Extreme events are sufficiently mitigated by introduced measures
<b>Outcomes</b>					
Outcome 1.1:  Diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income for vulnerable people in targeted areas.	1.1 Households and communities have more secure livelihood asset base (5 point rating) disaggregated by gender	1.1 Households in project area have poor access (rating 2) to livelihood assets.	1.1 Percentage of households with a rating of 4 on scale: Secure access to livelihood assets, increased by at least 20%.	- Survey of target and control group - Baseline and completion impact surveys - ZIMSTAT periodic Surveys	<b>Assumptions:</b> - Political and social stability prevails - There is sustained economic recovery to stimulate demand and viable commodity prices - Financial services sector remains stable - Climatic shocks that may occur are sufficiently mitigated by introduced measures
	1.2 Increase in agricultural income	1.2 tbd	1.2 50% of targeted smallholder farmers (by gender) have increased their agricultural income by at least 25%.		
	1.3 Number of financial transactions per Self Help	1.3 tbd	1.3 At least 50% of female headed households in each		<b>Risks:</b>

<sup>7</sup> Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR

	Group increase		Self Help Group complete at least two financial transactions		- Deterioration in the economic and business environment - Cost of adaptation measures beyond the farmers' means - Conflict arising from project being seen as benefiting one group at the expense of another
	1.2 Volume of targeted locally produced commodities that are processed/value added and marketed by smallholder farmers increase	1.4 tbd	1.4 At least 25% of targeted locally produced commodities in the three districts have value added and marketed by smallholder farmers		
Outcome 1.2:  Increased knowledge and understanding of climate variability and change-induced risks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas	2.1 Relevant risk information disseminated to stakeholders	2.1 Target districts do not have access to regular localised climate forecasts and protocols for effective use in risk management	2.1 70% of smallholder farmers in the project area have access to localised climate forecasts		
	2.2 Climate information routinely and effectively used in making climate sensitive decisions	2.2 Climate information not routinely used by stakeholders in the targeted districts	2.2 Climate information being routinely and effectively used by at least 50% of smallholder farmers (by gender) to make climate sensitive decisions.		

**ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS** (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Comment on PIF	PD Response
<p>1. The PIF lacks an analysis of how the current deficits in the governance situation of Zimbabwe influence the planned activities of the project..... The risks for the project that go along with the current governance situation need to be taken account in the project design and appropriate measures to mitigate these risks need to be developed.</p>	<p>The entire SCCF grant will be spent at community level to benefit rural communities directly. The Outcome we are committed to reach is as follows: <i>Diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income for vulnerable people in targeted areas</i>". Outputs under this outcome have also been revised following extensive stakeholder consultations.</p> <p>To mitigate the Fiduciary risk that was raised at PIF stage, the project design is using the UNDP NGO/CSO implementation modality for the SCCF grant. Oxfam in Zimbabwe will administer the SCCF grant. The Organization is already a recipient of other UN Grants and has been micro-assessed. Its assessment report is included in the Annexes to the project document. Project risks will be re-assessed during the baseline survey and annual reviews and appropriate mitigation strategies adopted. The PPG phase has also considered risks identified by the World Vision Zimbabwe (WVZ) and Plan International Programs, including those identified under ZUNDAF (2012-2015).</p> <p>Both WVZ and Plan International identify "climatic conditions resulting in prolonged or severe drought and/or flooding in program areas" as a risk. In their programs the two organizations propose humanitarian assistance as a mitigation strategy. In the SCCF project this risk is mitigated through selection of adaptation measures that take into account climatic extremes. Another risk identified in the WVZ baseline project is that "program activities might expose women to greater risks (Gender Based Violence), responsibilities, workloads and/or reduce voice". In the SCCF project this risk is mitigated through conflict sensitive development and has been included in the risk log and project results matrix including mitigation measures. ZUNDAF (2012-2015) identifies "Change in government priorities" as a risk. During the PPG phase indeed government launched a new economic development framework, ZimASSET (2013-2018). This SCCF project is aligned with the new national development framework.</p>
<p>2. The Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources Management (Environmental Management Agency) is foreseen as the main Implementing Partner. However there is evidence that fundamental principles of good governance and rule of law have not been adhered to by this institution (e. g. expropriation without proper rule of law). We regard it as necessary that the project does not lead to any financial flows from the SCCF project budget to the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources Management (Environmental</p>	<p>These concerns have been addressed by assigning Oxfam as Implementing Partner for the management of the SCCF grant. This means that the funds transferred to the implementing entity are the total responsibility of that entity which assumes the responsibility for mobilizing and applying effectively the required inputs in order to reach the expected outputs. Oxfam is part of an international NGO that has received UN funding in the recent past and is still currently receiving UN funding. A Harmonised Approach to Cash Transfers (HACT) assessment and previous audit reports for</p>

<p>Management Agency). The role of the Implementing Partner needs to be assigned to an institution that is independent from the Government of Zimbabwe.</p>	<p>Oxfam meet UNDP requirements financial responsibility and accountability Oxfam is registered as a welfare Organization in Zimbabwe under the Welfare Organization Act (Chapter 93). Its registration number is PVO 2/2003 and it was registered on 11 February 2003.</p>
<p>3. The alignment with the District Development Fund (DDF) is not appropriate as the DDF is largely dysfunctional and suffers from the same governance problems as the ministerial level.</p>	<p>The SCCF is not flowing through or to government institutions.</p>
<p>4. The financial management at the district level in Zimbabwe does not fulfil basic standards. Financial transfers from the central government to the district level have been inoperative for several years. In this regard it is not appropriate to undertake a climate adaptation expenditure analysis.</p>	<p>The SCCF is not flowing through or to government institutions.</p>
<p>5. The indicative co-financing of US\$ 30 million to be provided by the different levels of the Government of Zimbabwe is unrealistic if the current fiscal situation in Zimbabwe is taken into account.</p>	<p>Co-financing for the SCCF grant is now \$12.2 million, broken down as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- World Vision (USAID supported) - \$9m</li> <li>- Plan International (Australia supported) - \$2.5m</li> <li>- Communities (in-kind) - \$200,000</li> <li>- Environmental Management Agency (Cash) - \$100,000</li> <li>- UNDP (Cash) - \$400,000</li> </ul>
<p>6. One of the main activities of the project would be development of climate resilient agriculture in natural region V. The PIF does not take into account that there is already an international donor initiative existent in this natural region (as well as in the other natural regions, coordinated by FAO). Germany provides assistance in the regions Chiredzi, Beitbridge and Gwanda, which are mentioned in the PIF as regions to be covered by SCCF/UNDP activities. We request that the activities planned by UNDP are fully coordinated with those of other donors in order to avoid duplication of efforts.</p>	<p>The PPG phase made it possible to identify target districts, based on a vulnerability assessment, and to scope out baseline relevant initiatives in the targeted districts. The targeted districts in the Prodoc are Buhera, Chimanimani and Chiredzi with a focus on those WARDs that fall under NR V. The two existing NGO initiatives in the project Districts will be used as baseline investments for the SCCF project. The project design is such that the SCCF project adapts the baseline investments to be climate resilient. For example, the baseline investments in all the three targeted districts have flood irrigation schemes rehabilitation as one of the main interventions. Whereas irrigation is important for livelihoods in NR V the design has to take into account increasing water scarcity and potential siltation of canals from heavy rainfall events. Several discussions were held with the baseline projects to identify gaps and the value added by the SCCF. Mechanisms for coordination will be discussed during project implementation.</p> <p>The GIZ supported initiatives were scoped out during the PPG. The Food Security and Agriculture Project (2013 – 2015) which is being implemented with technical support from Sustainable Agriculture Technology (SAT) is particularly relevant to this project in the Chiredzi District which is also targeted by the SCCF project. The prodoc captures this initiative in the Annexes. Details for collaboration will be worked out during project implementation.</p>
<p>7. The project design should incorporate a conflict sensitive approach and should consider involving</p>	<p>This suggestion has been considered in the project design and conflict sensitivity will be considered at all</p>

	<p>groups of farmers with a Lead Farmer in the planned activities in order to reduce the conflict potential in rural areas.</p>
8. Germany appreciates the consideration of the gender dimension of climate change. Germany recommends clarifying how concrete measures addressing the gender dimension of climate change are being implemented, how results will be measured and how good experiences will be shared with relevant stakeholders.	<p>stages of the project cycle. During the PPG phase conflict generating issues were identified and these will further be analyzed before the start of work in each district. Conflict sensitivity has been integrated in the project Results Framework and project risk log. The integrated micro-watershed planning to develop climate change adaptation investment plans uses participatory approaches to ensure that proposed adaptation measures captures the interests of all stakeholders in the micro-catchment as much as possible whilst contributing towards improved livelihoods that are less vulnerable to climate change including variability. Project teams will also receive capacity building on conflict sensitive development at project start. Participatory monitoring mechanisms that will be established by the project will include a broad range of stakeholders including those who may be outside the project but could affect or be affected by the project.</p> <p>The project document has been designed in such a way that 70% of the beneficiaries in the target areas will be women or women headed households. A stakeholder validation workshop conducted from 12-13 March 2014 confirmed this as an appropriate target to ensure that concrete adaptation measures addressing the gender-dimension of climate change are implemented. A participatory monitoring and knowledge management mechanism will be established with the assistance of an independent Service Provider as part of the project M&amp;E plan. This will enable smallholder farmers in the targeted micro-watersheds to monitor their progress in implementing climate change adaptation investment plans that are gender sensitive. Results will be shared through different channels including study visits for farmers from similar environments, interactions between farmers and policymakers, workshops and a number of knowledge products. One of the priorities for the project's knowledge management strategy will be to create conditions for replication, scaling-up and sustainability.</p>



**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS<sup>8</sup>**

A. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY:

B. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: <b>\$100,000</b>			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent Todate</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Stakeholder Ownership of the Project	40,000	42,222	3,800
Vulnerability and Adaptation Assessment	20,000	18,059	0
Technical and Institutional Content	40,000	34,963	956
<b>Total</b>	100,000	95,244	4,756.00

<sup>8</sup> If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

**ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS** (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)