

Responses to Peer Reviewer Comments

Comments and responses are provided only for “yellow” or “red” comments. Suggestions embedded in the “Green” comments of the reviewer were also considered and the IP adjusted in consequence.

Criteria	Rating	Comments of Peer Reviewer	GRZ Response
Part 1: General criteria: The Investment Plan complies with the general criteria indicated in the TORs			
A. Country capacity to Implement Plan	Yellow	<p>The FIP identifies the Forest Department as the key implementing agency, while also describing Zambia’s decentralization strategy and the need for community based approaches. It also emphasizes the need for cross sectoral approaches at all levels and illustrates overall FIP implementation architecture (figure 11). However it does not provide any specifics on implementing arrangements for each project, nor on capacity to implement. Project 2, for example, is likely to require close participation by agricultural authorities, while project 3 will require more participation of central government agencies in reviewing/revising regulations. The FIP would benefit from an institutional assessment with a clearer indication of which areas need strengthening, at national but especially at local level, in order to implement the projects. Each project is quite ambitious in design, with several components and subcomponents.</p> <p>Furthermore there is currently no information, for example, on the size of the rural population</p>	<p>The Core Investment Priorities (CIPs) are in fact not projects but rather an indication of broad programming areas which the GRZ would favor going forward, to most effectively implement the National REDD+ Strategy. This has been more clearly explained in the IP.</p> <p>At time of completion of IP, no FIP resources were available for a follow-on project and it remains to identify actual financing and partners for the majority of the suggested investments. Thus it is not possible at this time to enter into the specifics of project preparation. This would of course be done as part of standard project preparation, as the projects emerge over next several years.</p>

		<p>in each intervention area, nor on the extent of agricultural and non-agricultural activities. Table 10 is helpful but could usefully be added to. The FIP identifies mining companies as key partners, but some more specifics on how they would participate would be welcome. Table 10 highlights the extent of land that is managed as game management reserves, emphasizing the need to bring wildlife management into the FIP.</p>	
D. Prioritization of investments, lessons learnt, M&E, links to results framework	Yellow	<p>The logic behind prioritization is usefully illustrated by the maps and articulated in the introductory sections.</p> <p>Each project provides key indicators though these are not quantified at present. An estimate is made of GHG reductions from each project, though the document rightly emphasizes the difficulty of doing this at this stage of preparation.</p> <p>A broader point is that in order to quantify the benefits, it will be necessary to estimate the scale of the different interventions and numbers of people/areas to benefit.</p>	See above under Response A, in which we note that the intention was not to present formulated projects, and thus specific indicators, GHG reductions, and benefits, could not be calculated.
G. New investments or Funding additional to on-going/ planned MDB investments	Yellow	<p>The FIP describes ongoing programs both government and IFI supported, and mentions a planned IDA operation in sustainable landscape management. It does not mention specific related AfDB operations.</p> <p>A PPCR was approved under the CIFs for Zambia; it would be helpful to have some more</p>	AfDB's PPCR project in the Kafue Sub-basin is mentioned in Table 10 and page 53.

		<p>detail on progress and how this relates to the FIP ... in Zambia climate resilience and climate change mitigation are closely related in sustainable landscape management.</p> <p>A challenge for the FIP is that under the CIF FIP program there is currently no allocation for Zambia</p>	
H. Institutional arrangements and coordination	Yellow	<p>An institutional framework for FIP implementation is articulated and embedded within REDD strategy implementation. Cross sectoral coordination and the principle of the landscape approach are strong features. Implementation arrangements at project (watershed) level are not yet described. Furthermore (see above) it might be helpful to weave in local capacity building activities to the two principle investment operations, rather than have them as a stand- alone activity under project 3.</p> <p>The FIP mentions that, especially at district level, staffing and capacity are weak; at this stage of project preparation it is not possible to know what capacity building measures will be necessary to secure smooth project implementation, and, more important, post project sustainability. It would be helpful to carry out an institutional assessment linked to the geographical areas of intervention at an early stage of project preparation.</p>	<p>As noted above, the CIPs are not projects and so it is not feasible to add much detail on capacity building needs specific to a given investment – this will come later during project formulation. The capacity building under enabling environment aims to allow IP investments to go forward more smoothly.</p> <p>However, it is noted that in the designing of projects, the idea of institutional capacity assessment at the landscape level is a good one.</p>
J. Cost effectiveness of proposed investments	Red	<p>It is not possible to assess the cost effectiveness of interventions without an understanding of the likely number of</p>	<p>Agreed that now, in the absence of specific detailed project proposals, little more can be said about costs and beneficiaries.</p>

		<p>beneficiaries, area of intervention, or balance of intervention between different activities.</p> <p>However, once funding sources are identified it will be possible during project preparation to have a better understanding of these parameters. It would also be useful to draw upon past experience in this regard.</p>	
Part 2: compliance with investment criteria of FIP			
Principle (vi): Early, integrated and consistent learning efforts	Yellow	<p>The FIP build on monitoring systems being supported under REDD and landscape management initiatives and provides a framework for knowledge management.</p> <p>This framework will need to be developed during project preparation, both for projects 1 and 2.</p> <p>Project 3 would benefit from specific provision for learning across the FIP, with a costed program.</p>	<p>Agreed that as follow-on projects are formulated that additional focus will be needed on monitoring and learning.</p> <p>Section 7 outlines the priority accorded by the GRZ to knowledge management and learning. The enabling environment component has taken into account the needed actions</p>
Objective (d): To provide valuable experience and feedback in the context of UNFCCC on deliberations on REDD	Yellow	<p>The FIP is well placed to do this ... however, more explicit linkage of PPCR and FIP initiatives would be welcome</p>	<p>The PPCR has established a successful model to implement climate resilience and mitigation actions that are ready to be replicated in other parts of Zambia. The IP, with its landscape approach, would be an appropriate supporting vehicle to promote this scaling up in the three proposed watersheds.</p>
Criterion (f): Forest related governance	Yellow	<p>The FIP articulates governance arrangements clearly, and project 1 in particular proposes cooperation arrangements the game management industry.. Some more specifics</p>	<p>There is no forthcoming FIP project funding so the question is rather how the IP can better integrate DNPW in plans to move forward on REDD+. For the CIP1 investments that involve conservation of</p>

		<p>about how the FIP will interact with the Department of Wildlife within the Ministry of Tourism would be helpful as preparation proceeds, given the extent of areas managed under some form of protection or as game reserves, and the challenge of poaching .If there has been good experience in Zambia on reducing illegal harvesting for charcoal or other illegal activities, it also would be helpful, as the program is further developed, to have some specific on this.</p>	<p>protected areas (Component 1), DNPW will surely be the implementing agency. DNPW's role is highlighted in Table 11.</p> <p>One of the supporting studies carried out as part of the IP preparation was on wood fuel (as noted in Annex 2) so this detail is available but was too extensive to be included in the main body of the IP.</p>
<p>Criterion (g): Safeguarding the integrity of natural forests</p>	Yellow	<p>The FIP seeks to strengthen sustainable management of high conservation value forests. However the FIP document does not at present provide a tabular categorization of Zambia's forest by main types/areas .. it mentions that 40 percent is miombo forest and woodland, and mentions forest types in the high conservation value forests. It would benefit from providing specifics on forests/wooded landscapes by predominant type and area.</p>	<p>This has been done by providing the vegetation map and forest areas by province in Table 1.</p>
<p>Criterion (i): Cost effectiveness, including economic and financial viability</p>	Yellow	<p>It is too early to have a sense of this: there is no information yet on unit costs or on the scale of interventions</p>	<p>See responses to Part A above.</p>
<p>Criterion (j): Capacity building</p>	Yellow	<p>The FIP would benefit from more specifics on capacity building, especially at local level, in projects 1 and 2.</p>	<p>See responses to Part A above.</p>
<p>Criterion (k): Implementation potential</p>	Yellow	<p>Although there is strong institutional alignment, it is not possible form a judgement on implementability since the interventions are not linked to capacity building</p>	<p>See responses to Part A above. Agreed that in the absence of more specific financing arrangements, implementability is difficult to judge.</p>

Results Framework C2b: Evidence that laws and regulations in the project/program areas are being implemented, monitored and enforced and violations detected, reported and prosecuted	Yellow	The FIP has a particular focus on operationalizing community forest management. It includes measures for revising concessions to avoid HCV and for protection of other sensitive ecosystems. It also proposes improving regulations across a number of areas. It does not provide detailed indicators on monitoring and enforcement of specific violations,	Community forest management is still incipient in Zambia, which is the reason that the IP prioritizes making more rapid progress in this area. Monitoring and enforcement of violations of community management practices remains to be better developed.
Results Framework C4c: Improved access to effective justice/recourse systems	Yellow	This area will be better defined during detailed project preparation	Grievance redress mechanisms are indeed something that would be developed on a project-by-project basis. For example, GRMs are now obligatory in all WB-funded projects.
Results Framework C6: New and additional resources for forest projects	Yellow	Funding is not yet clear, especially given the scale of the proposed FIP	Indeed, that is the shortcoming of this IP, as it was prepared without the possibility of follow-on FIP project funding. Other funding sources are being carefully followed up by the GRZ (most notably, GCF, GEF, IDA and other MDB investments).