

RFP Title: Feasibility Assessment for Herding for Health Project, Beitbridge, Zimbabwe

RFP No: RRH4H 002/2023

Clarifications

Distributed on: March 14, 2022

Question	Response
1. Is there a target date by which CI would like this feasibility study completed?	Preferably within 3 to 4 months from start or sooner if possible
2. The RFP mentions VM0032 as the proposed methodology. But VM0026 and VM0042 are also applicable to this project and may be better suited. Is CI interested in considering either of those?	VM0032 is the preferred methodology for the project as it meets the applicability conditions.
3. What is the specific intervention(s) promoted by H4H that is expected to result in carbon removals? The RFP and H4H website mention improved grazing management, but additional details would be appreciated	The H4H model makes use of strategic kraaling and rotation for grazing management and restoration activities, that promote management practices that contributes to restoration through loosening compacted soil and incorporating reseeding initiatives within kraaled areas.
4. Can you provide additional details on CI's and Peace Parks Foundation's capacity in the region? How long have CI and Peace Parks Foundation been operating in the region? How many staff are working there? Are there staff with experience in MRV, community consultation, project management?	There is an implementer, Peace Parks and CI are partners through the H4H initiative supporting the implementer. Our project partners are fully capitated in their project operations, a project monitoring framework is in development to cover a wide spread of requirements. Although the project was initiated in 2022, the relationship between CI and PPF is a long standing one. The implementing partner has a long track record in the proposed project area and is in the process of setting up a conservation management area.

Question	Response
<p>5. Would CI also consider a feasibility approach based on relevant data from the peer-reviewed literature (e.g. grazing experiments or observational data from similar contexts)? Either instead of or in tandem with the modeling approach outlined in the RFP?</p>	<p>If the information is readily available yes, but only as supplementary information to the modelling.</p>
<p>6. The RFP specifically mentions using the SNAP and SNAPGRAZE models on page 2 for feasibility assessment, but also mentions other model options on page 3, including DAYCENT and ROTH-C. SNAP and SNAPGRAZE are readily available as open-source software and parameterized in a manner to be applicable to the H4H project area. DAYCENT and ROTH-C have been used to model grassland soil carbon dynamics in other locales but may require additional recalibration for this project context. Is the expectation that all these models should be applied for feasibility analysis? If so, would this contract be able to support potentially more extensive work to calibrate such models for the target context?</p>	<p>The carbon analysis should only consider the SNAP and SNAPGRAZE models. The other models may be considered if the project goes to the next phase and so to further calibration of SANP/SNAPGRAZE models.</p>