This proposal aims at responding to the risk of drought by building gender-responsive resilience of most vulnerable communities with a focus on a 50% participation of women in community implementing groups. Despite this, the project makes no mention of gender-responsive technology needs assessment undertaken to inform about the use of technologies that for example women would prefer. Technologies employed must take into consideration differentiated technology needs and roles for men and women.

Resilience building requires extensive stakeholder engagement. However, the proposal document provides limited information on stakeholder consultations undertaken and on whether important beneficiary groups, such as smallholder farmers, were included. Although the proposal indicates that a demand-driven bottom up approach was followed to developing the project, there is no evidence of community participation during proposal development process for identification of approaches to be adopted to enhance resilience. For this and other projects it would be good if in the future the Secretariat could publish all Annexes related to stakeholder engagement.

We are concerned that Climate-smart agriculture (CSA) is highlighted to contribute to both adaptation and mitigation. As already mentioned, climate smart agriculture does not include any criteria to define what can or cannot be called “Climate Smart,” and thus practices that are inconsistent with achieving true sustainability could be included. We support the intervention by Omar that references to Climate Smart Agriculture should be changed in all current proposals and this term should not be used in future proposals, which should instead be as specific as possible about what agricultural practices and technologies will be supported.