



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/PPRC.38/21/Add.1
10 September 2026

Adaptation Fund Board
Project and Programme Review Committee
Thirty eighth Meeting
Bonn, Germany, 19-23 October 2026

Agenda Item 4 (r)

PROJECT FORMULATION GRANT FOR ZIMBABWE

I. Background

1. The Board at its eleventh meeting discussed the document “Funding for Project Formulation Costs” (AFB/11/6) and agreed, in its Decision B.11/18, that:

- i. project formulation grants (PFG) should be given once a project concept has been approved
- ii. consideration should be given in terms of differentiating between NIEs and MIEs, since some NIEs might have financial difficulties in trying to formulate project or programme proposals;
- iii. a flat rate should be given for project formulation costs;
- iv. a list of eligible activities and items still needed to be prepared; v. the grant should be additional to the project cost; and
- v. the fate of funds if the final project document was rejected should be determined.

2. There was consensus that a three-tiered system should be considered for project formulation grants: endorse a project concept with a PFG amount, endorse a project concept without a PFG amount, or reject the project concept.

3. Following the discussion, the Board decided:

To request the secretariat to reformulate the document, to include a comparison of eligible activities provided by other funds for project formulation grants, to take into account guidance provided by the Board at the present meeting, and to submit the document to the Board at its twelfth meeting, through the EFC. The EFC should review and finalize the process and policy of the project formulation grant focusing, in particular, on: the issue of unspent project funds; the procedures followed by other funds in that regard; and the determination of a flat-rate.

4. A document was prepared by the secretariat in response to the above mandate and presented at the third EFC meeting, which made specific recommendations to the Board at its twelfth meeting. Having considered the recommendation of the Ethics and Finance Committee, the Board, in its Decision B.12/28, decided that:

(a) Project Formulation Grants (PFGs) will only be made available for projects submitted through NIEs. The Board would continue reviewing the question of PFGs for projects submitted through MIEs and would solicit comments from members and alternate members by February 14, 2011; the views would be compiled by the secretariat for presentation to the Board at its March 2011 meeting;

(b) If a country required a project formulation grant, a request should be made at the same time as the submission of a project concept to the secretariat. The secretariat will review and forward it to the PPRC for a final recommendation to the Board. A PFG could only be awarded when a project concept was presented and endorsed;

(c) A PFG form, reproduced in Annex V, should be submitted;

- (d) Only activities related to country costs would be eligible for PFG funding;*
 - (e) A flat rate of up to US\$30,000 shall be provided, inclusive of the management fee, which cannot exceed 8.5 per cent of the grant amount. The flat fee would be reviewed by the Board at its thirteenth and all subsequent meetings;*
 - (f) If the final project document is rejected, any unused funds shall be returned to the Adaptation Fund Trust Fund;*
 - (g) Once a project/programme formulation grant is disbursed, a fully developed project document should come to the Board for approval within 12 months. No additional grants for project preparation can be received by a country until the fully developed project/programme document has been submitted to the Board; and*
 - (h) The Trustee was instructed to remove the set-aside of US\$100,000 for project preparation that had been decided at the June 2010 meeting, as project preparation would be approved on a project-by-project basis.*
5. In its twenty-fourth meeting, the Board had initiated steps to launch a pilot programme on regional projects and programmes, not to exceed US\$ 30 million and had requested the secretariat to prepare for the consideration of the Board a proposal for such a pilot programme (Decision B.24/30). In its twenty-fifth meeting, the secretariat submitted such document and the Board decided to:
- (a) Approve the pilot programme on regional projects and programmes, as contained in document AFB/B.25/6/Rev.2;*
 - (b) Set a cap of US\$ 30 million for the programme;*
 - (c) Request the secretariat to issue a call for regional project and programme proposals for consideration by the Board in its twenty-sixth meeting; and*
 - (d) Request the secretariat to continue discussions with the Climate Technology Center and Network (CTCN) towards operationalizing, during the implementation of the pilot programme on regional projects and programmes, the Synergy Option 2 on knowledge management proposed by CTCN and included in Annex III of the document AFB/B.25/6/Rev.2.*
- (Decision B.25/28)*
6. The approved document AFB/B.25/6/Rev.2 contained provisions for the approval of project formulated grants for regional project and programme proposals, at different development stages, as follows:
- "It is proposed that the Board open a structured call for MIEs and RIEs to submit pre-concepts for regional projects and programmes. The optional pre-concepts would be very brief proposals of maximum 5 pages that would explain the proposed regional adaptation project/programme. The pre-concepts would be screened and technically reviewed by the*

secretariat, and subsequently reviewed by the PPRC. Together with the pre-concept, the proponent could submit a Phase I PFG request, up to the maximum level of US\$ 20,000. While endorsing the pre-concept, the Board could also approve the Phase I PFG request. The endorsement of the pre-concept would not create an obligation for the Board for later funding. As the next step, the proponent would submit a concept, and with it the proponent could submit a Phase II PFG request. The maximum AFB/PPRC.18/25/Add.1 level of the Phase II PFG would be US\$ 80,000 for proposals that had been previously granted Phase I PFG, and US\$ 100,000 for proposals that bypassed the optional pre-concept stage. While endorsing the concept, the Board could also approve the Phase II PFG request. The endorsement of the concept would not create an obligation for the Board for later funding, as it is the case for the national projects. The final stage of the proposal process would be the submission of the fully-developed regional project document”.

II. The Project Formulation Grant Request

7. This addendum to the document AFB/PPRC.38/21 “Proposal for Zimbabwe” includes a request for a Project Formulation Grant, requesting a budget of US\$ 150,000, which was received by the secretariat along with the concept for the project AF00000513 “Zimbabwe Adaptation for Drought and Agro-Production Transformation in Semi-arid Regions (Z-ADAPT)”. This proposal was submitted by International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), which is a Multilateral Implementing Entity of the Adaptation Fund, in time for consideration by the Adaptation Fund Board at its forty-seventh Board meeting.

8. In accordance with Decision B.12/28, paragraph (b), the secretariat carried out an initial review of the PFG request and found that the document provided detailed information on the use of the requested funds. The proposed activities were aligned with the goal of the project and would support Stakeholder consultations and participatory design; technical, climate risk and feasibility assessments; Environmental and social safeguards studies; and full proposal development.

9. Therefore, the PPRC may want to consider and recommend to the Board to approve the PFG Request, provided that the related concept proposal is endorsed.



ADAPTATION FUND

ADAPTATION FUND BOARD SECRETARIAT
TECHNICAL REVIEW OF PROJECT PROPOSAL FOR
"ZIMBABWE ADAPTATION FOR DROUGHT AND AGRO-PRODUCTION TRANSFORMATION
IN SEMI-ARID REGIONS (Z-ADAPT)"

Project Title	Zimbabwe Adaptation for Drought and Agro-Production Transformation in Semi-arid Regions (Z-ADAPT)
Project ID	AF00000513
Category	Regular size project (over \$1 million)
Type	Single country project
Stage	Concept
Country	Zimbabwe
Implementing Entity	IFAD
Financing Requested	USD 12,000,000.00
Reviewer	Gisela Ferrari

Co-reviewer(s)

IE Contact Person

Clarissa Conte,Claus Reiner ,Fanny Minjauw,Francesco Rispoli,Pierre Yves Guedez,Wietse Michiels,Zira Mavunganidze

Secretariat's Overall Comment

The project “Zimbabwe Adaptation for Drought and Agro-Production Transformation in Semi-arid Regions (Z-ADAPT)” aims to address climatic change impacts, in particular drought, water scarcity, and rising temperatures, in the project area or targeted districts. It addresses climate extremes in Zimbabwe's most vulnerable semi-arid districts by enhancing resilience in agriculture and water management.

The proposals includes a PFG request of 150,000 USD.

The initial technical review raises several issues, such as more details in the Theory of Change, quantitative data for the Economic benefits, tracking and analysis of experiences, Alignment with the AF Results Framework and screening of environmental and social impacts, as is discussed in the number of Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Requests (CARs) raised in the review.

The second technical review finds that most of the issues raised in the initial review have been addressed, however, some issues persist, such as details on financial literacy in one of the activities, Alignment with the AF Results Framework, and Screening of environmental and social impacts, as is discussed in the Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Requests (CARs) raised in the review.

The third technical review finds that most of the issues raised in the second technical review have been addressed with the exception of the Alignment with the AF Results Framework, as well as addressing timeline and naming of executing entities as is discussed in the two outstanding Corrective Action Request (CAR) raised in this review.

The fourth technical review finds that most comments raised in the third review have been addressed, with the exception of the required adjustment of component numbers, names, and amounts throughout the proposal and their accurate reflection in the portal as reflected in the Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Requests (CARs).

The fifth technical review finds that all the comments raised have been fully addressed.

Country Eligibility

Is the country party to the Kyoto Protocol, or the Paris Agreement?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

The country has ratified both the Kyoto Protocol (30 December 1998) and the Paris Agreement (07 August 2017).

Is the country a developing country particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

The country is a developing country which is vulnerable to the adverse climate change effects of recurrent droughts, rising temperatures and intra seasonal rainfall variability causing direct losses to agricultural production, water availability and rural livelihoods, particularly in the semi-arid western and southern provinces.

March 3 2026

Project Eligibility

Has the designated government authority for the Adaptation Fund endorsed the project/programme?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

As per the Endorsement letter dated December 18, 2025.

March 3 2026

Does the length of the proposal amount to no more than Fifty pages for the project/programme concept, including its annexes?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

The proposal, including annexes, amounts to 50 pages.

CR1: Please use rounded and full figures throughout the proposal. For example, in paragraph 107, instead of "USD 5.90", use "USD 5,900,000".

March 3, 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR1: Cleared

Rounded and full figures used throughout the proposal.

May 14, 2026

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: Yes however amendments are required to address:

CAR1 (NEW):

1. On the cover page please only list EEs. If the agencies that work "in collaboration with" the named EE are not also EEs they should be removed.
2. The terminal evaluation date should reflect 9 months after closure and should therefore be in Q3. Please amend.
3. In the re-submission please update the component names, numbers and amounts in the portal to reflect the updated proposal document being submitted.

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CR1 (reopened): Not cleared. All financial figures are now rounded and presented in full throughout the proposal. However, the document currently totals 58 pages. Please reduce it to a maximum of 50 pages.

CAR1 (new):

1. Cleared. The EE is correctly listed.
2. Cleared. The terminal evaluation milestone has been moved to Q3 2033, in line with the nine-month post-closure timeframe.
3. Not cleared. Please update the component numbers, names, and amounts throughout the proposal including annexes, and ensure they are accurately reflected in the portal.
4. Please correct the total amount of components (excluding IE and EE fees) to USD 10,100,373 (paragraph 128).

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR1 (reopened): Cleared. The proposal has now been revised to 50 pages

CAR1 (new): Cleared as per revisions across the proposal including Para 128 etc., to ensure consistency across the proposal.

Does the project / programme support concrete adaptation actions to assist the country in addressing adaptive capacity to the adverse effects of climate change and build in climate resilience?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

However, some additional information is required.

Part II.A (para 49 – 67) describe the project components, outcomes, outputs and activities. The project activities are well suited to addressing the climate change impacts and are not a “business-as-usual” development project. The activities lead to tangible and substantial outcomes, and they generally align well with the overall goal and objectives of the project. A Theory of Change narrative and diagram is included to explain the vertical logic of the intervention. However, some amendments are required in the component’s description as well as in the Theory of Change.

CAR1: A number activities as presented should not form part of project components but actions to be taken by the IE or EE and should be costed under the IE and EE costs. Specifically, 3.1.2.1; 3.1.2.2.;3.1.2.4;3.1.3.1; 3.1.3.2;3.1.3.3.

Please note that the AF requires that ‘learning and knowledge management’ can form part of components but

not ESP and gender actions unless it is that a gender officer (staff) is being supported to cover some actions across the project components. Please refer to the costs and fees page of the AF website <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/generic/costs-and-fees/>.

CAR2: Please note that an ESMP (costed) including to cover USPs, a full gender analysis and Gender Action Plan (costed) as well as grievance mechanism are required for the fully developed proposal stage. Consequently please revise the activities under output 3.1.2 and 3.1.3 to reflect this. It is noted that the current PFG includes the ESMP development. It is therefore not clear why it is being included in the project document as an activity. The GAP and grievance work can also be considered under the PFG grant.

CAR3: Based on Activity 1.1.1.1 and activity 1.1.2.1 the project would contain USPs. Please refer to the guidance at Guidance Document for Project/Programme with Unidentified Sub-Projects and amend the proposal under these activities to indicate how the USPs will be addressed as well as under Part II, section K.

CR2: Activity 2.1.3.3: Financial literacy and facilitated linkages to existing finance/insurance seeks to “Deliver targeted financial literacy modules (costing, savings, risk management, basic business planning) and facilitate matchmaking/linkages to existing savings groups, micro-insurance and financial institutions (where available and appropriate)”. What happens if the farmers who do not access to such institutions?

CR3: Please consider reformulating the general objective of the proposed project. Currently, the proposal only includes what the project will address from a very general perspective.

CR4: Kindly ensure that the Theory of Change (narrative and diagram) includes the following elements:

- (i) the main problem.
- (ii) the overall objective.
- (iii) outcomes, outputs, and activities.
- (iv) Components as the solutions to contribute to the main problem.
- (v) assumptions and risks, as transversal elements across all the above. These should be specific rather than generic.

CR5: Please revise and amend all outcomes and outputs, considering that outcomes are the expected results (e.g., strengthened institutional capacity) while outputs are the direct, tangible products (e.g., trainings held). Please include a target for each output.

March 3, 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR1: Cleared

Revisions with respect to the activities are reflected in the following sections:

- Table 2 (Project Components, Outcomes and Outputs)
- Paragraphs 53 (Component structure)
- Paragraphs 99 (Component 3 description)
- Output descriptions under Sections 104-110

CAR2: Cleared

The CN has been revised to clarify that environmental and social safeguards and gender-related instruments will be prepared during the Full Proposal stage (para 104 – 110). Paragraph 110 further clarifies that these instruments will be developed through the Project Formulation Grant (PFG) and incorporated into the full proposal. The PFG has been revised accordingly.

CAR3: Cleared

USPs under Activity 1.1.1.1 and Activity 1.1.2.1 involve site-specific investments whose exact locations will be confirmed during implementation following hydrological assessments and community consultations. Para 63 and 70 and Part II, Section K (para 168) have been revised to describe how these USPs will be addressed.

CR2: Not cleared

While Activity 2.1.3.3 has been revised to clarify that financial inclusion will not depend solely on access to formal financial institutions (para 98), it does not provide sufficient details on how these arrangements will be

strengthened. There is no mention, for example of training protocols, governance structures, risk management tools, or monitoring frameworks for the savings groups. Please include some more details of how the arrangements will be strengthened through the Activity.

CR3: Cleared

The General Objective has been revised and reformulated to articulate adaptation outcome and target beneficiaries. (see Para 42 – 48).

CR4: Cleared

ToC narrative and diagram have been revised to strengthen the articulation of the project's causal pathways and vertical logic. Risks and Assumptions have also been included. (See Paragraphs 41-48 and Figure 6)

CR5: Cleared

Table 2 and Part II A (54-110) have been revised to ensure clear distinctions between outputs, outcomes consistent with AF results framework.

May 14 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR2: Cleared

Paragraph 100 has been further strengthened to clarify how community-based savings and lending mechanisms will be supported in areas without access to formal financial institutions. The revised text specifies governance arrangements, including group constitutions, leadership structures, record-keeping systems and transparent financial management procedures. The activity further includes structured training modules covering financial literacy, climate-risk management, business planning and savings mobilization. Risk management measures include internal audits, emergency savings mechanisms and climate contingency reserves. Monitoring indicators such as savings mobilized, loan repayment rates, membership retention and investments in climate-resilient livelihood activities will be tracked throughout implementation.

June 26, 2026

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CR2 (new): Not cleared. While Paragraph 100 has been strengthened, the section contains duplicated content. The second bullet repeats elements already described above and should be revised to consolidate or streamline the text to enhance clarity.

CR4 (new): Not cleared. The ToC narrative and diagram have been revised and risks and assumptions have been included. However, please revise the long-term impact box in Figure 6: “Institutional capacity gaps” and “market and economic shocks” should appear only under the risk section rather than being listed as long-term impacts. In addition, please explicitly indicate the indirect contribution to AF Outcomes 2 and 5 in paragraph 54, ensuring consistency with paragraph 183 and Table 10.

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR2 (new) – Cleared. para 99 is now consolidated to removed duplicate information.

CR4 (new) - Cleared. Theory of Change diagram (Figure 6) and narrative (para 44-48) revised.

Does the project / programme provide economic, social and environmental benefits, particularly to vulnerable communities, including gender considerations, while avoiding or mitigating negative impacts,

in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Fund?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

However, additional information is required.

Part II.B (para 68 to 70) provides information on the economic, social and environmental benefits to be provided. The proposal also includes information on the number of households and farmers who will benefit from the capacity building. To avoid social harm and exclusion, it is proposed that there will be no planned physical resettlement, and targeting will be transparent and criteria-based, including quotas/targets for women-headed households, youth groups and other vulnerable households. An initial gender assessment was conducted in compliance with Gender Policy requirements, and the findings of that assessment are provided in paragraphs 39 and 40 and Annex 4.

However, quantitative information is required as well as how the benefits will be equitably distributed, among other issues.

CR6: Please provide additional information on the criteria which will be used to select the target groups in the selected areas.

CAR4: Please include quantitative data for the project economic, social and environmental benefits based on its planned interventions. If exact figures are not available, kindly include estimation proxies.

CR7: Please clarify whether the project interventions pose any risk of negative development or maladaptation that could increase the vulnerability of beneficiaries or non-beneficiaries or reduce their capacity to adapt to climate change.

CAR5:

1. Please include the overall project beneficiaries (direct and Indirect), gender disaggregated, and identify the specific vulnerable groups (e.g., women, indigenous peoples) that will benefit from the project.
2. Please also, outline how the benefits will be equitably distributed.

March 3 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR6: Cleared

Additional information has been incorporated in Part II.B (Targeting and Selection Criteria) (para 119) as well as Paragraph 37.

CAR4: Cleared

Quantitative estimates have been included in Paragraph 111 and Table 4.

CR7: Not cleared

Part II A. (Project Justification) (para 57) explains that the project interventions are designed to minimize risks of maladaptation or negative development impacts. However, it does not fully demonstrate that all potential negative development or maladaptation risks have been identified and mitigated. Please include a more comprehensive list of possible risks of negative development or maladaptation (e.g. inequitable access, groundwater depletion, perverse incentives and dependency, to name a few and the interventions which the project will implement to address them.

CAR5: Cleared

The overall project beneficiaries (direct and Indirect), gender disaggregated, and identification of the specific vulnerable groups (e.g., women, indigenous peoples) who will benefit from the project and how the benefits will be equitable distributed have been included in Part II.B (Economic, Social and Environmental Benefits) (para 118 - 119)

May 14 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR7: Cleared

Paragraph 58 has been substantially expanded to identify and address potential maladaptation and negative development risks associated with project interventions. These include groundwater depletion from irrigation abstraction, inequitable access to project-supported infrastructure, dependency on project support, environmental degradation arising from inappropriate land use practices, and conflicts over water allocation. For each identified risk, corresponding mitigation measures have been incorporated, including hydrogeological assessments, transparent targeting mechanisms, water governance arrangements, environmental and social screening procedures, ecosystem restoration measures and ongoing monitoring of environmental and social outcomes.

June 26, 2026

Is the project / programme cost effective?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

However, additional information is required.

Part II.C (para 71 – 74) and Table 4. The proposal describes the approach used by the project to maximize cost-effectiveness by targeting investments in the most drought- and heat-vulnerable, food-insecure districts (Natural Regions IV–V), prioritizing low-lifecycle-cost, community-maintainable measures, and leveraging existing IFAD/GoZ systems (e.g., HEEP, DATES, RDCs) to fund only incremental climate-resilience needs rather than broad rural development. Table 4 also compares the cost-effectiveness of each component by looking at the benefits generated or losses averted compared to alternatives to the project.

CAR6: Please provide information on the cost-effectiveness from the sustainability point of view.

CAR8: Where possible, please include quantitative estimates of cost-effectiveness. Otherwise, please include proxy estimates.

March 3 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR6: Cleared

The explanation on cost effectiveness from a sustainability point of view is provided in Para 121.

CAR8: Cleared

Quantitative estimates provided in para 122 and Table 5.

May 14 2026

Is the project / programme consistent with national or sub-national sustainable development strategies, national or sub-national development plans, poverty reduction strategies, national communications and adaptation programs of action and other relevant instruments?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

As per the information provided in Part II.D (para 75 – 81). The proposal lists a number of national and sectoral development plans, adaptation programmes, including Vision 2030, NDC, NAP, agriculture and food security, water, drought and disaster risk management, inter alia, showing the alignment with the various components of the project.

March 3, 2026

Does the project / programme meet the relevant national technical standards, where applicable, in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy of the Fund?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

However, some details are needed.

Part II.E (para 82 to 91) and Table 5. The proposal describes how the project/programme meets relevant national technical standards, including inter alia standards for environmental assessment, construction, land use and public health. Table 5 also summarizes for the relevant project activity, the applicable standard, compliance requirement and responsible agency. However, more details are needed.

CR9: Please include in Table 5, in the case that compliance is required, the main steps needed to comply with it.

CR10: Please ensure that the table listing is comprehensive, including rural and local standards. Applicable standards may include any other sector-specific related regulations relevant to the project interventions.

March 3 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR9: Cleared

Steps for compliance have been incorporated in to Table 6 (Part II E para 141 (pp 139 – 140)

CR10: Cleared

Rural and local standards incorporated in Part II.E Table 6 (para 141)

May 14 2026

Is there duplication of project / programme with other funding sources?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: No.

However, further information is required.

Part II.F (para 92 – 95) and Table 6. The proposal describes 6 projects and one general to refer to other resilience and food security programmes. Table 6 presents information on on-going and past projects, summarizing their objectives, areas of synergy and non-duplication. However, some details in Table 6 are needed to include.

CR11: Please check if there are also relevant regional projects of which Zimbabwe is a beneficiary, which may be included in Table 6.

CR12: Please revise Table 6 and identify other related ongoing or completed projects and include them in the table. For each, please include:

- (i) Project title, Timeline and specific Location within the country,
- (ii) Main project interventions, and Target population,
- (iii) Implementing entity,
- (iv) Lessons learned, how they are considered/ reflected in the proposed project design,
- (v) Overlaps and synergies with the proposed project.

Please avoid using a group of projects, each line should be one identified project.

CR13: The no duplication statement should be clearly justified (e.g. by indicating the distinct geographic locations and/or types of interventions) for each related project identified.

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR11: Not cleared

Table 7 (pp 41 – 43) has been updated to include the information requested, however for the first programme listed in the table - SADC Climate Services Centre (CSC) and Southern Africa Regional Climate Outlook Forum – the dates are not provided. Please include at least the start date if the programme is still on-going.

CR12: Cleared

Table revised accordingly (See Table 7 pp 41 – 43)

CR13: Cleared

Clear justification provided in Table 7 for no duplication.

May 14 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR11: Cleared

The Timeline entry for the SADC CSC / SARCOF row in Table 7 has been revised to include start dates: Ongoing (SARCOF est. 1997; SADC CSC est. 2011; ongoing regional programme).

June 26 2026

Does the project / programme have a learning and knowledge management component to capture and feedback lessons?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

However, additional information is required.

Part II.G (para 96 – 98) describes how the project proposes to capture and disseminate lessons learnt. Methods to be used include systematic field mechanisms like Farmer Field Schools, Water User Committees, Local Adaptation Plans, partner reflection sessions (DATES, MSD, EMA, RDCs, financial institutions, HEEP), and gender-sensitive tools such as seasonal learning logs and outcome stories from women/youth on workloads, incomes, and risks. Component 3 is dedicated to knowledge management and proposes to disseminate information and lessons learned via user-friendly products such as technical briefs/guides and community co-produced case studies/resilience stories emphasizing gender/youth.

However, the proposal does not include information on how it proposes to periodically track and analyse the experiences gained to determine the effectiveness of the methods used and how the methods used can be improved.

CAR7: Please include information of how the project will track and analyse experiences to enrich the global, national and local knowledge on climate adaptation and to accelerate understanding about what kinds of interventions work. Please consider the aspects of CAR 1 in reframing and responding to CAR7 and CAR8 below.

CAR8: Kindly include the following details:

1. Provide additional details on the Learning and Knowledge Management activities, including the institutions involved and the specific actions to be undertaken.
2. Explain how the knowledge generated will be maintained once the project concludes and describe the institutional or operational arrangements required to ensure its long term sustainability.
3. Specify what feedback mechanisms are in place to assess and refine the training materials and capacity building activities, ensuring they become increasingly effective and impactful over time.

March 3 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR7: Cleared

Part II.G has been revised to strengthen the description of the Learning and Knowledge Management system. Specifically paragraphs 147 and 149 and 150 describe how the project will track and analyze experiences to enrich knowledge at all levels – global, nation and local.

CAR8: Cleared

Requested details have been included in the Part II G (see para 146 – 150)

May 14 2026

Has a consultative process taken place, and has it involved all key stakeholders, and vulnerable groups, including gender considerations in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Fund?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

However, additional information is required.

Part II.H (para 99 – 105) and Annexes 2, 3 y 4. The proposal describes the consultative process, including the overall approach used, the different levels of consultations, key findings, validation of project components and geographic targeting, as well as gender-responsive and youth-focused consultations. More than 118 participants took part in the provincial stakeholder consultations. The proposal also explains how the consultation findings were incorporated into the project design, for example, climate-resilient financial instruments in Component 2 and inclusive Local Adaptation Plans in Component 3.

However, more details about all consultations are needed.

CAR9: Please include in the Table in Annex 2, the following:

- (i) consulted entity/ group, especially if they correspond to gender organizations. They should be specifically named,
- (ii) number of participants disaggregated by gender,
- (iii) expand on the key issues raised and how they were considered in project design (name specific outputs and outcomes currently in the proposal),
- (iv) background information to verify whether marginalized and vulnerable groups have been consulted,
- (v) Moreover, please indicate if further future consultations will be conducted.

CAR10: Please refer to Annex 4. The information provided should inform and guide the identification of women's specific needs.

March 3 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR9: Cleared

Part II H and Annex 2 have been revised to include the information requested (see Para 152 – 153 and Annex 2 on page 61)

CAR10: Cleared

Part II H (para 152- 153 and 160) have been revised to include the information provided in Annex 4

May 14 2026

Is the requested financing justified on the basis of full cost of adaptation reasoning?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

However, additional information is required.

Part II.I (para 106 – 107) provides a justification for the requested funding, indicating that the project will finance the full incremental cost of climate adaptation in the drought prone regions of the country, focusing on those investments that directly address current and projected climate risks and are not business as usual.

Table 7 compares two scenarios for each of three project's components: (i) business-as-usual scenario, and (ii) with the Adaptation Fund Additionality.

CAR11: Please clarify if the project has co-financing and that the AF project would be able to deliver its outcomes and outputs regardless of the other funding sources.

CR14 Please provide a detailed logical narrative on how the proposed project's objective will be achieved in terms of adaptation for each component as and the overall project. This may be included in Table 7.

March 3 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR11: Cleared

Part II.I (para 161 and 162) has been revised to clarify that the project does not rely on external co-financing to deliver its core adaptation outcomes and that Adaptation Fund resources will finance the essential investments and activities required to achieve the project's objective.

CR14: Cleared

Detailed narrative provided in revised Part II.I (para 161 and 162) and Table 8.

May 14 2026

Is the project / program aligned with AF's results framework?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

However, amendments are required.

Part III (para 119) and Table 9. The alignment of the project with the Adaptation Fund Results Framework is presented, considering outcomes and outputs for each component. However, some amendments are required.

CAR12: Please revise Table 9 and amend according to the instructions and utilize the template provided in Results Framework Alignment Table (Nov 2025). Please ensure the following:

CAR13: Please ensure consistency that all the Fund Outcomes associated with the listed Fund outputs in the lower section of the table are reflected in the upper section of the table. Also, all wording of AF indicators should be consistent with Results Framework Alignment Table (Nov 2025).

CR15: Please ensure that all project's outputs and outcomes indicators are SMART.

March 3 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR12: Not cleared

There is a discrepancy between Tables 2 and 10 in the wording of the Overall Objective of the project (para 49) and that Overall Objective in Table 10.

The wording of AF Outcome Indicator 2.1 in Table 10 is not consistent with the Results Framework Alignment Table.

CAR13: Not cleared

In the lower part of Table 10, for Outcome 3.1, the AF fund output is listed for Output 1.2 but Outcome 1 is not listed in the upper part of the table. Please ensure that Fund outputs in the lower section of the table are reflected in the upper section of the table.

CR15: Cleared

All outputs in Table 10 have been revised to ensure quantitative indicators are SMART

May 14 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR 12: Cleared

Two corrections have been made to Table 10: : The Overall Project Objective has been harmonized across all sections of the proposal, including Paragraph 50, Table 10, the Theory of Change and the Results Framework. The objective statement now appears verbatim throughout the proposal to ensure consistency between the adaptation logic, project outcomes and AF Results Framework reporting requirements

CAR13: Not cleared

Although a new row has been added to the upper section of Table 10 for AF Outcome 1 (Reduced exposure to climate-related hazards and threats), linked to Project Outcome 3.1 (climate-informed decision making and early warning services) the relevant AF Outcome Indicator should be 1. (Relevant threat and hazard information generated and disseminated to stakeholders on a timely basis) not AF Fund Output 1.2 (Targeted population groups covered by adequate risk reduction systems) as is indicated in the table. Please change the Outcome indicator to Outcome indicator 1.

June 26, 2026

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CAR13: Not addressed:

Please update the alignment table to ensure that outcome indicator 1.2 grant amount is separated from outcome indicator 3.2 grant amount and that the lump sum \$1,000,003 is divided based on the appropriate allocation for each. Please note that in the bottom part of the table presented Output indicator 1.2.1 associated with output 1.2 is allocated \$520,000.

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR13: Cleared.

Table 10 has been revised, and the lump sum has now been allocated across the relevant lines as appropriate.

Has the sustainability of the project/programme outcomes been taken into account when designing the project?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

However, additional information is required.

Part II.J (para 108 – 112) provides a comprehensive description of sustainability across all key dimensions: (i) institutional and policy foundation; (ii) financial and economic feasibility; (iii) technical resilience and operation and maintenance (O&M); (iv) environmental coherence; and (v) social, gender, and youth engagement.

However, more specific details are needed for all identified dimensions.

CAR14: Please provide more details for each sustainability dimension following this guidance:

(i) All arrangements are clearly described. For example, under financial and economic sustainability, how will it

be ensured that the community-agreed tariff will be sufficient to cover O&M and minor repairs?

(ii) Are there any pre-arrangements already signed or under preparation?

(iii) What will be the main responsible institutions involved?

CAR15: Please include information on how the adaptation benefits would enable replication and scaling up after the project has ended.

March 3 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR14: Not cleared

While Part II J (para 163 – 165) has been revised to provide more details on the arrangements to be put in place under financial and economic sustainability as well as the main responsible institutions involved. However, it does not adequately explain how the tariff will be tested or calibrated to ensure it is sufficient for O&M and minor repairs. It also mentions transparent financial procedures and community willingness to contribute, yet there is no explicit mechanism such as cost-based tariff analysis, periodic tariff review, reserve funds, or affordability-versus-cost balancing.

It also does not indicate whether there are any pre-arrangements already signed or under preparation.

Please provide more details on how it will be ensured that the tariffs will be sufficient and on whether there are any pre-arrangements already signed or under preparation.

CAR15: Cleared

Part II J (para 163 – 167) sustainability section has been strengthened to include information on how the adaptation benefits would enable replication and scaling up – i.e. by making the project's approaches into replicable models, documenting and disseminating lessons and technical guidance, and integrating successful approaches into national extension systems, government programmes, and development partner platforms.

May 14 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR14: Cleared

Para 170: The sustainability section has been strengthened to clarify long-term financing arrangements for project-supported infrastructure. The revised text explains the role of Water User Associations and irrigation management committees in establishing operation and maintenance plans, tariff systems, financial management procedures and dedicated maintenance funds. District authorities will provide technical oversight and support to ensure long-term functionality of project investments beyond project completion.

June 26 2026

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CAR14 (new): Not cleared.

Although the sustainability section has been strengthened, there is duplicated content on financial and O&M sustainability; recommend removing or consolidating to avoid redundancy and improve clarity (paragraph 170).

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR14: Cleared as per the streamlined information on para 171, page 43.

Does the project / programme provide an overview of environmental and social impacts / risks identified, in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Fund?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

However, additional information is required.

Part II.K (para 113 – 118), including Table 8. The CN provides an overview of the environmental and social impacts and risks in compliance with the AF ESP and Gender Policy. It lists the potential environmental and social risks, as well as the risk management instruments which will be prepared at the Full Project Stage. The project is classified as Category B. Risk have been identified against each of the 15 ESP principles. An Initial Gender Assessment is included in Annex 4.

However, the screening process does not indicate that it covers all direct, indirect, transboundary and cumulative impacts and risks that could result from the proposed project.

CAR16: Refer to the Initial Gender Assessment and include a summary of the opportunities and challenges/risks for men and women. The information provided should inform and guide the identification of women's specific needs and risks.

CAR17: Please revise Table 8 to:

1. Describe all potential impacts (direct, indirect, transboundary and cumulative) and risks that could result from the project.
2. Revise the magnitude of the risks and impacts (low, moderate, high). Risks should describe as: "There is a risk" and should be accompanied by mitigation plans as: "Mitigation measures are" or "To mitigate this risk, the project"
3. Kindly leave a check mark in the second column 'No further assessment required for compliance' if no further assessment is needed and leave blank if an assessment is to be conducted. No text should be included in the second column.
4. If no risk is identified for a given principle, a sound justification must be provided.
5. Please note that AF Principles 1, 4 and 6 always apply. For more information, please visit: AF's ESP guidance and Environmental and Social Policy . If USPs will be part of the project, please address in a brief explanation under Part II.K.

March 3 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR16: Cleared

Part II K has been revised to include a summary of the opportunities, challenges and risks outlined in the Gender Assessment (Annex 4) See

Paragraphs 175-176

CAR17: Not cleared

Part II K (para 168 – 176) and Table 9 have been revised. However, it is noted that no check mark has been included in Column 2 of the table, indicating that further assessment is to be conducted for all principles. Is this correct? Please clarify

May 14 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR17: Cleared

A footnote has been added to Table 9 explaining why Column 2 in Table 9 has been intentionally left blank, indicating that at concept stage, the exact locations of civil works infrastructure (SPIS, sand and sub-surface dams, EbA measures) are not confirmed, As such, sites will be finalised during early implementation following hydro-geological assessments, social screening and community consultations and that the column will be completed at the Full Project Proposal stage after those assessments have been completed.

Furthermore, Paragraph 180 and Part II.K have been further strengthened to clarify how unidentified sub-

projects will be managed. All site-specific investments whose locations are not known at concept stage will be screened through the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) to be prepared during full proposal development. Screening criteria will include biodiversity sensitivity, water availability, land tenure, social inclusion, gender impacts, cumulative impacts and climate resilience considerations. Activities involving significant adverse environmental or social impacts will be excluded from financing. Screening results will determine the level of environmental assessment and mitigation measures required prior to implementation.

June 26 2026

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CAR17 (new): Not cleared.

There is duplication in the description of USPs screening; please merge or streamline paragraphs 179–180 to keep the text concise. In addition, paragraphs 173–174 contain duplication both in the Category B classification under the Adaptation Fund ESP and in the description of environmental and social instruments to be prepared at Full Proposal stage. Please remove or consolidate the repeated content.

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR17: Cleared as per consolidated information in Para 179 , page 45

Resource Availability

Is the requested project / programme funding within the cap of the country?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes

March 3, 2026

Is the Implementing Entity Management Fee at or below 8.5 per cent of the total project/programme budget before the fee?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

However, some amendments are needed.

All figures are rounded to whole numbers, and the Implementing Entity Management Fee is 8.5% (USD 940,092). The PFG request is correct in size (USD 150,000), including the PFG fee for the Implementing Entity's Management of 8.5% (USD 12,750).

CR16: Please expand the description of each of the PFG activities in the "budget note" column of the PFG form, providing details and justifications for funding required.

March 3 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR16: Not Cleared

The PFG form has been revised to expand the description of each of the PFG activities and provide details and justification for funding requested. However, please ensure that the PFG form is signed when re-submitting the proposal.

May 14 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR16: Cleared

The PFG has been signed and will the signed PFG form will accompany the resubmitted CN

June 29 2026

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR16: Cleared.

The signed PFG form has been resubmitted together with the CN.

Are the Project/Programme Execution Costs at or below 9.5 per cent of the total project/programme budget (including the fee)?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

As per information provided in Table 2: Projects Components, Outputs Outcomes and Budgets. All figures are rounded to whole numbers, and the Implementing Entity Management Fee is 8.7% (USD 959,535).

March 3, 2026

Eligibility of IE

Is the project/programme submitted through an eligible Implementing Entity that has been accredited by the Board?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

International Fund for Agriculture Development (IFAD) is an accredited Multilateral Implementing Entity (MIE).

Accreditation Expiration Date: 05 February 2031

March 3 2026

Implementation Arrangements

Is there adequate arrangement for project / programme management, in compliance with the Gender Policy of the Fund?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Not applicable at Concept Note Stage

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Not applicable at Concept Stage

Are there measures for financial and project/programme risk management?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Not applicable at Concept Note stage

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Not applicable at Concept Stage

July 2 2029

Are there measures in place for the management of for environmental and social risks, in line with the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Fund?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Not applicable at Concept Note stage

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Not applicable at Concept Stage

July 2 2029

Is a budget on the Implementing Entity Management Fee use included?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Not applicable at Concept Note stage

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Not applicable at Concept Stage

July 2 2029

Is an explanation and a breakdown of the execution costs included?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Not applicable at Concept Note stage

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Not applicable at Concept Stage
July 2 2029

Is a detailed budget including budget notes included?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Not applicable at Concept Note stage

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Not applicable at Concept Stage
July 2 2029

Are arrangements for monitoring and evaluation clearly defined, including budgeted M&E plans and sex-disaggregated data, targets and indicators, in compliance with the Gender Policy of the Fund?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Not applicable at Concept Note stage

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Not applicable at Concept Stage
July 2 2029

Does the M&E Framework include a break-down of how implementing entity IE fees will be utilized in the supervision of the M&E function?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Not applicable at Concept Note stage

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Not applicable at Concept Stage
July 2 2029

Does the project/programme's results framework align with the AF's results framework? Does it include at least one core outcome indicator from the Fund's results framework?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Not applicable at Concept Note stage

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Not applicable at Concept Stage
July 2 2029

Is a disbursement schedule with time-bound milestones included?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Not applicable at Concept Note stage

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Not applicable at Concept Stage

July 2 2029

Please expand the description of each of the PFG activities in the "budget note" column of the PFG form, providing details and justifications for funding required.



Revised PFG Submission Form¹
Project Formulation Grant (PFG)

Submission Date:

Adaptation Fund Project ID:

Country/ies: Angola

Title of Project: Zimbabwe Adaptation for Drought and Agro-Production Transformation in Semi-arid Regions (Z-ADAPT)

Country: Zimbabwe

Type of IE (NIE/RIE/MIE): MIE

Implementing Entity: International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)

Executing Entity/ies: IFAD for the PFG and Ministry of Lands, Agriculture, Fisheries, Water and Rural Development (MLAFWRD); in collaboration with Ministry of Environment and Wildlife for the project

A. Project Preparation Timeframe

Start date of PFG	Upon Concept Note approval date
Completion date of PFG	(10 months) after Concept Note approval date

B. Proposed Project Preparation Activities (\$)

List of Proposed Project Preparation Activities	Output of the PFG Activities	US\$ Amount	Budget note²
Stakeholder consultations and participatory design	Stakeholder consultation reports; validated problem analysis; gender-responsive and youth-inclusive inputs integrated into project design.	18 000	Ensures national and local ownership through a structured and inclusive stakeholder consultation process at national, provincial, district and community levels in the targeted Natural Regions IV and V. The activity will finance inception and validation workshops, focus group discussions, and key informant interviews with government counterparts (MLAFWRD and Ministry of Environment and Wildlife), local authorities, farmer

¹ As presented in AFB/PPRC.33/40 Annex 1.

² The proposal should include a detailed budget with budget notes indicating the break-down of costs at the activity level. It should also include a budget on the Implementing Entity management fee use.

			organizations, women and youth groups, and private sector actors. The budget will cover workshop logistics, stakeholder travel and per diems, facilitation, and documentation. Particular emphasis will be placed on ensuring gender-responsive and youth-inclusive participation in line with the Adaptation Fund Environmental and Social Policy (ESP) and Gender Policy. This will validate climate risks and adaptation priorities, integrate indigenous knowledge, and strengthen the project design and sustainability.
Technical, climate risk and feasibility assessments	Climate risk and vulnerability assessment; technical feasibility studies for SPIS, sand/sub-surface dams, EbA interventions, and CIS/EWS strengthening	30 000	Provides evidence-based justification for adaptation investments; through detailed technical, climate risk and feasibility assessments. This includes (i) climate risk and vulnerability assessments using historical and projected climate data; (ii) hydrological and agro-ecological assessments for water-related investments such as solar-powered irrigation systems (SPIS), sand and subsurface dams; (iii) feasibility studies for ecosystem-based adaptation (EbA) interventions; and (iv) assessments of climate information services (CIS) and early warning systems (EWS). The budget will cover specialized technical consultants, field assessments, data collection, modelling tools, and reporting, including site verification missions. This will ensure a robust climate rationale, confirm site suitability, and enhance cost-effectiveness while reducing implementation risks.
Environmental and social safeguards studies	Updated ESP screening; draft ESMP and related safeguard instruments (as required at FP stage).	15 000	Ensures compliance with AF Environmental and Social Policy;) through the preparation and updating of safeguards instruments. This includes (i) updated environmental and social screening; (ii) preparation of a draft Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP); and (iii) development of related instruments as required at Full Proposal stage, such as a Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP), Gender Action Plan, and Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM). The budget will cover safeguards specialists, field verification where required, stakeholder consultations, and preparation of documentation in line with AF requirements. This will ensure early identification and mitigation of environmental

			and social risks and strengthen overall project quality and readiness.
Multi-disciplinary project formulation team	Full Funding Proposal; refined results framework and logframe; detailed budget; implementation arrangements; integration of stakeholder and technical inputs	74 250	Covers consultancy fees, technical writing, design workshops, travel and coordination required to meet Adaptation Fund Full Proposal standards. This activity will finance a multidisciplinary team comprising a lead writer/team leader, climate and adaptation specialist, agriculture/irrigation engineer, natural resources management/EbA specialist, environmental and social safeguards expert, gender and social inclusion specialist, financial/economic analyst, and monitoring and evaluation specialist. The budget will support drafting and revision processes, coordination meetings, in-country missions, and stakeholder validation workshops, as well as preparation of all required annexes including the results framework, detailed budget, and implementation arrangements. This ensures integration of stakeholder, technical and safeguards inputs into a coherent and high-quality proposal aligned with Adaptation Fund requirements.
Project formulation grant for concept note		137 250	Total PFG allocation for project formulation, for concept covering stakeholder consultations, technical assessments, safeguards studies, and preparation of the Adaptation Fund Full Proposal. The allocation is commensurate with the scope and complexity of the project and ensures adequate resources to develop a robust, evidence-based and fully compliant proposal.
Implementing Entity (IE) Fee (8.5%)		12 750	Total PFG allocation for concept preparation in accordance with Adaptation Fund guidelines. The fee will cover IFAD's costs related to project formulation oversight, including internal technical review, quality assurance, safeguards compliance checks, fiduciary oversight, and coordination with national counterparts, as well as administrative processes required for submission.
Project Formulation Grant + IE fee		150 000	Total PFG budget inclusive of IE fee, providing the full financing required to complete the project formulation process in accordance with Adaptation Fund standards and submission requirements.

Please describe below each of the PFG activities and provide justifications for their need and for the amount of funding required:

C. Implementing Entity

This request has been prepared in accordance with the Adaptation Fund Board's procedures and meets the Adaptation Fund's criteria for project identification and formulation. The PFG will be executed by the IE. The EE will be responsible for execution of the project once approved.

Implementing Entity Coordinator, IE Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Mr Pierre Yves Guedez, Lead, Multilateral Climate and Environmental Funds, ECG Division, IFAD		06/18/2026	Mr Claus Reiner, Regional Climate and Environment Specialist, IFAD	+254 11 5492302	E - mail: p.guedez@ifad.org E - mail: c.reiner@ifad.org

October

All communications should be addressed to: "The Secretary for Environment, Climate and Wildlife."

P Bag 7753 Causeway,
Zimbabwe
Telephone: 781688/3
Fax: 252673

Your Ref.:
Our Ref.:


ZIMBABWE

MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT,
CLIMATE AND WILDLIFE
11th Floor, Kagame Building
Cnr 6th Street/Central Avenue
Harare

18 December 2025

To: The Adaptation Fund Board
c/o Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat
Email: Secretariat@Adaptation-Fund.org
Fax: 202 522 3240/5

Subject: Endorsement for Zimbabwe Adaptation for Drought and Agro-Production Transformation in Semi-arid Regions (Z-ADAPT)

In my capacity as the Designated Authority for the Adaptation Fund in Zimbabwe, I confirm that the above national grant proposal is in accordance with the government's national priorities in implementing adaptation activities to reduce adverse impacts of, and risks, posed by climate change in Zimbabwe.

Accordingly, I am pleased to endorse the above grant proposal with support from the Adaptation Fund. If approved, the project will be implemented by International Fund for Agriculture Development and executed by Ministry of Lands, Agriculture, Fisheries, Water and Rural Development in collaboration with Ministry of Environment, Climate and Wildlife.

Sincerely,



Mr Washington Zhukata
Chief Director - Environment, Climate and Wildlife & Adaptation Fund Designated Authority
Ministry of Environment, Climate and Wildlife, Zimbabwe

Formatted: Centered

Annex 1. Endorsement Letter

All communications should be addressed to: "The Secretary for Environment, Climate and Wildlife."

P. Bag 7753 Causeway,
Zimbabwe
Telephone: 781488/3
Fax: 252473
Your Ref.:
Our Ref.:
ZIMBABWE



MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT,
CLIMATE AND WILDLIFE
117 Floor, Secretariat Building,
Car 4th Street/Central Avenue
Harare

18 December 2025

To: The Adaptation Fund Board
c/o Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat
Email: Secretariat@Adaptation-Fund.org
Fax: 202 522 3240/5

Subject: Endorsement for Zimbabwe Adaptation for Drought and Agro-Production Transformation in Semi-arid Regions (Z-ADAPT)

In my capacity as the Designated Authority for the Adaptation Fund in Zimbabwe, I confirm that the above national grant proposal is in accordance with the government's national priorities in implementing adaptation activities to reduce adverse impacts of, and risks, posed by climate change in Zimbabwe.

Accordingly, I am pleased to endorse the above grant proposal with support from the Adaptation Fund. If approved, the project will be implemented by International Fund for Agriculture Development and executed by Ministry of Lands, Agriculture, Fisheries, Water and Rural Development in collaboration with Ministry of Environment, Climate and Wildlife.

Sincerely,



Mr. Washington Zhakata
Chief Director - Environment, Climate and Wildlife & Adaptation Fund Designated Authority
Ministry of Environment, Climate and Wildlife, Zimbabwe

Formatted: Top: 0.15", Bottom: 0.25"

Formatted: Body Text

All communications should be addressed, "The Secretary for Environment, Climate and Wildlife"

P Bag 7753 Causeway,
Zimbabwe
Telephone: 701681/3
Fax: 252673

Your Ref.:
Our Ref:



MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT,
CLIMATE AND WILDLIFE
11th Floor, Kaguvi Building
Cnr 4th Street/Central Avenue
Harare

18 December 2025

To: The Adaptation Fund Board
c/o Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat
Email: Secretariat@Adaptation-Fund.org
Fax: 202 522 3240/5

Subject: Endorsement for Zimbabwe Adaptation for Drought and Agro-Production Transformation in Semi-arid Regions (Z-ADAPT)

In my capacity as the Designated Authority for the Adaptation Fund in Zimbabwe, I confirm that the above national grant proposal is in accordance with the government's national priorities in implementing adaptation activities to reduce adverse impacts of, and risks, posed by climate change in Zimbabwe.

Accordingly, I am pleased to endorse the above grant proposal with support from the Adaptation Fund. If approved, the project will be implemented by International Fund for Agriculture Development and executed by Ministry of Lands, Agriculture, Fisheries, Water and Rural Development in collaboration with Ministry of Environment, Climate and Wildlife.

Sincerely,



Mr Washington Zhakata
Chief Director - Environment, Climate and Wildlife & Adaptation Fund Designated Authority
Ministry of Environment, Climate and Wildlife, Zimbabwe