



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report 2021 – Revised Template



Period covered: 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Africa
Country (ies):	Lesotho
Project Title:	Strengthening Capacity for Climate Change Adaptation through support to Integrated Watershed Management
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/LES/049/LDF
GEF ID:	5124
GEF Focal Area(s):	Least Developed Country Fund
Project Executing Partners:	The Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation ¹ (MFRSC), Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MAFS), Ministry of Energy and Meteorology (MEM), Ministry of Water (MoW), Ministry of Local Government, Department of Environment (DOE) and National University of Lesotho (NUL)
Project Duration:	48 Months
Project coordinates: (Ctrl+Click here)	-29.3146/28.4750 Linakeng, Thaba Tseka -29.7792/27.1283 Qibing, Mafeteng -30.285 / 27.9619 Mt Moorosi, Quthing

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	March 11, 2015
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	November 1, 2015
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE²:	October 31, 2019
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ³	31-Jul-2021
Actual Implementation End Date⁴:	NA

¹ Formerly known as Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation

² As per FPMIS

³ In case of a project extension.

⁴ Actual date at which project implementation ends - only for projects that have ended.

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	3,592,694
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁵:	8,437,000
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2021 (USD m):	3,377,144
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2021⁶	7,801,881

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee Meeting:	February 03 2021
Expected Mid-term Review date⁷:	June 2018
Actual Mid-term review date:	26 May 2019
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2021 – June 2022)⁸:	No
Terminal Evaluation Date:	December 2020 – March 2021
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2021 – June 2022):	No
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁹	Yes

Ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	Satisfactory
Overall implementation progress rating:	Satisfactory
Overall risk rating:	Moderate

⁵ This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

⁶ Please see last section of this report where you are asked to provide updated co-financing estimates. Use the total from this Section and insert here.

⁷ The MTR should take place about half point between EOD and NTE – this is the expected date

⁸ Please note that the FAO GEF Coordination Unit should be contacted six months prior to the expected MTR date

⁹ Please note that the Tracking Tools are required at mid-term and closure for all GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects. Tracking tools are not mandatory for Medium Sized projects = < 2M USD at mid-term, but only at project completion. The new GEF-7 results indicators (core and sub-indicators) will be applied to all projects and programs approved on or after July 1, 2018. Also projects and programs approved from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018 (GEF-6) must apply core indicators and sub-indicators at mid-term and/or completion

Status

Implementation Status <i>(1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):</i>	5 th and Final PIR
--	-------------------------------

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Lekholoane Ignatius Lekholoane	Lekholoane.lekholoane@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Selvaraju Ramasamy	Selvaraju.Ramasamy@fao.org
Budget Holder	Lewis Hove	Lewis.Hoe@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Kuena Morebotsane	Kuena.Moerabotsane@fao.org

2. Progress Towards Achieving Project Objectives and Outcome (DO)

Project objective and Outcomes (as indicated at CEO Endorsement)	Description of indicator(s) ¹⁰	Baseline level	Mid-term target ¹¹	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2021	Progress rating ¹²
Objective(s): to implement sustainable land and water management practices (SLM/W) and resource conservation measures in selected watersheds to reduce vulnerability and enhance adaptive capacity at community level; and to strengthen diversified livelihood strategies focusing on crop, livestock and agro-forestry systems at community level in selected watersheds in three most vulnerable livelihood zones.						
Outcome 1 Strengthened technical capacity in MFLR, MAFS MNR, MLGC, DMA, MGYSR and NUL at national and district levels and community representatives on climate change adaptation and integrated watershed management	Number and type of targeted institutions with increased adaptive capacity to reduce risks of and response to climate variability	Limited training programmes organized at the watershed scale (score of 1 for indicator 2.2.2 of AMAT tool)	Implementation of training packages at the national and district levels (score of 3 substantial training for practical applications)	The national and district level staff are capable of implementing the adaptation projects and programmes	The project was able to train a total of 189 (97 males and 92 females) technical staff district level staff from implementing line ministries/Departments (i.e. Ministries of Agriculture and Food Security; Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation; Local Government; Water Affairs; Tourism Environment and Culture and Disaster Management Authority) in Climate change adaptation, integrated watershed management, diversified livelihood and resource conservation measures.	S

¹⁰ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

¹¹ Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework) therefore this column should only be filled when relevant.

¹² Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**, **Satisfactory (S)**, **Marginally Satisfactory (MS)**, **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)**, **Unsatisfactory (U)**, and **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)**.

<p>Outcome 2 Improved data, tools and methods for assessment of impact of climate change on land suitability and land use, vulnerability and risk at the national/district level implemented focusing on most vulnerable watersheds</p>	<p>Risk and vulnerability assessment conducted.</p> <p>Updated risk and vulnerability assessment</p> <p>Relevant risk information disseminated to stakeholders</p>	<p>No comprehensive data bases available for use for policy and operational decisions and are not systematically disseminated</p>	<p>Data base in place.</p>	<p>Government agencies share the data to users and data sets are effectively used for decision-making.</p> <p>Comprehensive database available for use At least 30 national level staff trained.</p>	<p>Invaluable datasets on risks and vulnerability are available and have been shared with government agencies at the national and district level and line ministries were trained by the consortium of the Institute of Natural Resources, Native Seed and Serumula Development Association.</p>	<p>MS</p>
<p>Outcome 3. Sustainable land and water management (SLM/W) practices (soil erosion control, soil and water conservation, water harvesting, run-off reduction, vegetative cover, range resource management) successfully adopted in selected watershed and catchments. (Total beneficiaries - 1200 households and 4800 individuals and total area covered will be 2400 hectares).</p>	<p>Percent target groups adopting adaptation technologies by type (refer AMAT indicators 3.1.1.1 & 3.1.1.2)</p>	<p>There are very few households that have the capacity to reduce the impacts to some extent (only those having off-farm employment).</p>	<p>At least 25% of the selected communities are capable of implementing the SLMW practices</p>	<p>The SLM/W practices are successfully demonstrated in all selected 24 communities (at least 75% have adopted SLM/W practices).</p>	<p>The 3 project sites has a total of 40 communities, 1374 beneficiary households made of up 487 males and 887 females. At least 98% of the selected communities have adopted one or more SLMW practice specific to the challenges in their communities. The practices cover rangeland rehabilitation (brush control and resting), construction of gabions, conservation agriculture, stone fire belts, stone lines, gully control, planting of truncheons; infiltration ditches and swales; wetlands protection, construction of roof water harvesting structures and fodder production.</p>	<p>HS</p>

<p>Outcome 4 Diversified livelihood strategies, small scale, and household level income generating activities successfully demonstrated and adopted by 24 target communities. Benefiting 750 (3000 individuals). Area covered under this investment 375 hectares).</p>	<p>Households and communities have more secure access to livelihood assets</p> <p>% increase per capita income of farm households due to adaptation measures applied.</p>	<p>2 – Poor access to livelihood assets</p> <p>No or limited income from diversified livelihood activities. The baseline income is very low due to low levels of yield (~450 kg/ha)</p>	<p>40% of the selected communities are capable of increasing their income by 20% during the third year.</p>	<p>At least 60% of the selected communities increase their household income by 40% (3 – 4) moderate to secure access to livelihood assets (AMAT tool)</p>	<p>In the 40 communities, 98% (i.e. 1,348 (378 males and 960 females) there have enhanced household food security, improved nutrition and income generating opportunities. The project demonstrated appropriate crops, livestock and alternative livelihood strategies out of which the benefits are being realized. These include horticultural production (vegetable gardens and fruit trees); short cycle livestock production (i.e. rabbits, pigs and dual purpose poultry), beekeeping and off-farm income like establishment of savings and credit schemes</p>	<p>S</p>
<p>Outcome 5. Stakeholders and communities aware of improved SLM/W practices, livelihood diversification and household level income generating practices through wide dissemination</p>	<p>Number of publications based on field experiences to be used for recommendations. Strengthened capacity to transfer appropriate adaptation technologies (refer the indicator 3.2.2 of AMAT tool)</p>	<p>There are few examples available based on the FAO TCP project completed in 2011.</p> <p>AMAT score of 1 (no capacity)</p> <p>Generic data available and provided in annex, but not specific to the watersheds</p>	<p>A communication strategy established and adopted by all stakeholders</p> <p>Moderate capacity achieved (AMAT score</p> <p>A systematic tracking of indicators. of 2)</p>	<p>Communication materials relevant to all successful SLM/WM practices and case studies documented and widely communicated The implementing partners are capable of transferring the technology to the beneficiaries</p>	<p>Project information was shared with key stakeholders through i) national forums e.g. National Climate Change Coordination Committee (NCCC), ii) project site visits by top government officials (i.e. the Prime Minister’s Office, cabinet ministers, MPs, District Administrators; and others. iii) Meetings of project district technical teams project steering committee iv) Media coverage Information units under Ministry of Forestry,</p>	<p>S</p>

	Indicator tracking table populated quarterly			A systematic tracking of indicators.	printed posters and a street poster; newspaper articles and FAO intranet (Photo in focus). Development of communication package that will be used now and beyond the life of the project is currently underway. It consists of a video, booklet, brochure, and a photo album and news article. Partners like IFAD and GIZ have drawn inspiration and lessons from this project in designing their upcoming programmes of support to the government of Lesotho.	
--	--	--	--	--------------------------------------	--	--

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 5. Stakeholders and communities aware of improved SLM/W practices, livelihood diversification and household level income generating practices through wide dissemination	Follow to complete the project's communication and visibility products.	Project Manager / Coordinator	July 28, 2021

3. Progress in Generating Project Outputs (Implementation Progress, IP)

(Please indicate progress achieved during this FY as planned in the Annual Work Plan)

Outputs ¹³	Expected completion date ¹⁴	Achievements at each PIR ¹⁵					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments Describe any variance ¹⁶ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
Output 1.1.1 National level male and female MFLR, MAFS, MNR, MLGC, DMA, MGYSR and National University of Lesotho (NUL) staff and district level male and female forestry and natural resources staff trained on climate change adaptation, integrated watershed management and community	Q2 Y3 Q1-2 Y4	No Data in 1 st PIR report	4 workshops done for 70 national and district level staff on climate change issues, risk and vulnerability assessment, IWM and SLM/W;	52 DTT members (26 males and 26 females) IWM, diversified livelihood strategies, community engagement and climate change adaptation in the agricultural sector; Environmental law and early warning systems.	A total of 67 line ministries staff was trained in the reporting period	No training was conducted for staff	39 more staff have been reached with training above the 150 targeted (189 actual -150 expected/target = 39 variance).	A positive variance indicates training of more staff than had been targeted.

mobilization (60 national + 90 districts staff).								
Output 1.1.2 Training to the local male and female representatives from community based organizations (CBOs) on good practice examples of sustainable land and water management, water harvesting, diversified livelihood strategies and range resources management	Q2-4 Y3 Q1-2 Y4	No Data in 1 st PIR report	<i>About 10 (i.e. 30% of 1200) community based /farmer groups trained SLM/W practices and livelihood strategies.</i>	A total of 444 (180 males and 264 females) community members were trained on SLM/W practices, Livelihood strategies, food preservation and improved nutrition	A total of 307 (129 males and 178 female) farmers have been trained in SLMW and Livelihood diversified strategies	11 (9 males and 2 females)	762 community representatives were trained.	

¹³ Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

¹⁴ As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

¹⁵ Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

¹⁶ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

<p>(at least 24 farmer groups (1200 male, female and child headed farm households) and 20 male and female representatives in each of the three livelihood zones (60 male and female representatives) and 20 male and female representatives in each of the 3 livelihood zones (60 male and female Representatives) will be trained.</p>								
<p>Output 2.1.1 Livelihood and land use (crop, livestock, agro-forestry) data base developed for most vulnerable watersheds (database will be</p>	<p>Q2 Y3</p>	<p>No Data in 1st PIR report</p>	<p>Letter of agreement signed with service provider</p>	<p>Livelihood and land use data was shared by INR and partners and 2 workshops were done for 36</p>	<p>Soil suitability analysis has been conducted and completed.</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>90%</p>	<p>Land suitability of the 3 projects sites have been determined to support farming decisions on the most appropriate land use for the farmers and technical staff.</p>

established in Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation and linked to potential male and female users at the national level) and relevant male and female staff trained (at least 30 core male and female staff)				District staff.				
Output 2.1.2 Vulnerabilities and risks (current and future) assessed for the selected watersheds in 3 livelihood zones and spatial information on vulnerability available (at Disaster Management Authority) to facilitate adaptation planning by the Government and relevant male and female staff trained (total 30	Q2-4 Y3 Q1-2 Y4	No Data in 1 st PIR report	Socio-economic risk and vulnerability database developed.	Assessment report on vulnerabilities and risks (current and future) have been shared internally to facilitate training district level staff.	Updates on vulnerabilities and risks (current and future) climate change and database could not be developed.	The project ends with the risk and vulnerability assessment of the project sites done for use by stakeholders	80%	

male and female staff – 10 male and female staff from each district).								
Output 3.1.1: Adaptive land use and sustainable land and water management practices implemented. (1200 male, female and child headed households and 1200 hectares)	Q2-4 Y3 Q1-2 Y4	No Data in 1 st PIR report	500 Households	SLM/W interventions implemented comprise agro-forestry techniques (truncheons); soil and water conservation techniques (agronomic – CA, mulching) and conservation structures infiltration ditches. 20 communities are involved in the 3 sites.	37 out of 40 communities are implementing feasible SLMW practices.	In addition to 37 communities there has been additional two communities that have adopted and successfully implemented SLMW practices	97.5%	39 out of 40 communities are implementing site specific SLMW interventions. There has been reluctance with community members in one remaining community (Ha Malibe in Quthing District) to proactively participate in the in SLMW activities.
Output 3.1.2: Improved water harvesting structures at the household level implemented	Q2-4 Y3; Q1-2 Y4	No Data in 1 st PIR report	27 x water harvesting tanks completed, 8 under	37 tanks have so far been installed for households	11 roof water tanks have been constructed	73 roof water tanks 1 sand dam 3 standalone tanks 1 earth dam	98.7% (148 roof water tank units). However, based on the demand for water by communities for domestic use and	2 units were short of 150 targeted roof water tanks because Thaba Tseka project site has more thatched-roofed houses

(150 male and female households)			construction.	in the 3 areas			their livestock the project looked beyond just roof water structures. It adopted and implemented alternative water harvesting techniques such boreholes, sand dams, check dams, animal drinking points and standalone tanks.	not suitable for roof water harvesting.
Output 3.1.3 Improved vegetative cover and range resource management measures adopted to improve productive use of marginal lands (600 male, female and child headed households and 2400 male and female individuals and cover a total area of 1200 hectares)	Q2-4 Y3; Q1-2 Y4	No Data in 1 st PIR report	2 x wetlands protected 20 Ha since 2016 15 Ha brush controlled of invasive species Invader (brush) control in 23.53 Ha (i.e.5.63Ha in Thaba-Tseka and 17.9Ha in Quthing) and Reseeding Eragrostis curvula in 2.5 Ha at Ha Robi, Quthing	805 households in the three project sites were involved in rehabilitation of degraded rangelands through pasture rest and brush control. Stone lines constructed where applicable. Fire belts were done to prevent destructive rangeland fires.	60 Ha of rangelands were rehabilitated across the three project sites.	An additional 5 hectares of the rangelands were land rehabilitated and resting during the reporting period	70%	11% or 127 Ha overall have been covered. This includes area under wetland protection.

<p>Output 4.1.1: Community participation ensured and introductory sessions conducted and small-scale household level income generating activities introduced to 750 male, female and child headed households</p>	<p>Q4 Y4 Q2 Y2</p>	<p>No Data in 1st PIR report</p>	<p>Currently there 17 groups formed (3, Mafeteng, 4 Quthing and 10 Thaba-Tseka /15 household per group 255) and 3 households involved in beekeeping in Quthing.</p>	<p>Households are engaged in Keyhole, trench and mobile gardens, shadenet production, double purpose poultry, rabbitry and later on piggery production. 36 SILC groups with 597 members saved USD6, 800 in a year.</p>	<p>73 community groups are involved in livelihood and income generating.</p>	<p>The 40 communities are proactively involved in agricultural based livelihoods (crops, livestock, beekeeping and savings and credits schemes)</p>	<p>90%</p>	<p>The groups involved in livelihood diversification have more or less stabilised at 90%, the 10% is ascribed to some individuals and or groups who started well but dropped off.</p>
<p>Output 4.1.2: Field demonstration of locally relevant gender-responsive multi-purpose agro-forestry systems to protect livelihood systems implemented and adopted (375 hectares)</p>	<p>Q4 Y4</p>	<p>No Data in 1st PIR report</p>	<p>None conducted</p>	<p>No appropriate fodder species have been identified for Lesotho. However, the activities focused on gender responsive small scale income</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>0%</p>	<p>0%</p>	<p>Suitable multi-purpose agro-forestry species were not identified for Lesotho climate under this project. Bamboo was proposed too late for trailing.</p>

				generation activities.				
Output 5.1.1 A gender-sensitive communication strategy established in close collaboration with the MFRSC, MAFS, MNR, Ministry of Local Government and Chieftainship (MLGC), MGYSR and NUL and implemented	Q2Y2	No Data in 1 st PIR report	Communication strategy has been developed	The project community strategy and action plan were accomplished	N/A	Project visibility has been increasing through meetings with stakeholders, national level information sharing forums; local media coverage and publicizing; visits by cabinet, top government officials and other interest groups.	97%	The project has engaged and finished photography and video filming to produce communication and knowledge products
Output 5.2.1 Systematic collection of field based gender sensitive data to monitor project outcome indicators at all levels and evaluation conducted	Q2-4 Y3	Socio-indicators derived from baseline survey. Letter of agreement signed with biophysical service provider.		Project outputs and outcomes indicators were monitored midterm using the LDCF Adaptation and Monitoring Tool (AMAT). Questionnaire	Project is monitored through monthly planning, meetings, half yearly by PSC field visits and reporting of project activities.	The project midterm and terminal reviews have been effected reflecting on project performance.	90%	The project has conducted both the midterm and terminal evaluations which assessed the performance of the project forwards delivery of the expected results.

				<p>ire has been designed register and make household survey for determine the distribution al effect of who benefited and who has not benefited from the project. Data will collected in a participator y manner. AWP/B 2019 has been prepared and approved. PPRs and PIRs shall follow. Monthly Project team and Internal programme meetings</p>				
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

				are being conducted.				
--	--	--	--	-------------------------	--	--	--	--

4. Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on Project Implementation

Please briefly summarize main progress achieving the outcomes (cumulative) and outputs (during this fiscal year):

The project has made major strides in achieving its set objectives and outcomes. It has developed the technical and institutional capacities for climate change adaptation. It has in particular been instrumental in strengthening the governance of natural resources and enhancing the livelihoods of the targeted communities. Key service providers in the form of government line ministries and departments, local authorities, traditional leadership have been trained on key aspects of climate change adaptation, natural resources management, on and off-farm livelihood support initiatives and community mobilization. The project also appreciated the importance of peer learning and established peer learning platforms in the form of exchange visits and study tours to centres of excellence. Technical backstopping and oversight by different players including District Technical Teams, National Project Steering Committee and senior government officials provided the required quality assurance. Best practices and lessons learnt were shared through several media and platforms, thus generating the required momentum for adopting new technologies and innovations. As a result of these initiatives, livelihoods of project beneficiaries have changed for the better. Degraded rangelands have been restored, leading to improved productivity of extensively kept livestock. Wetlands and other fragile ecosystems have been protected and are now providing the much needed ecosystem services for local communities including improved access to water for both domestic and agricultural use, increased biodiversity, and general improvement of the natural resource base. Food and nutrition security in the project area have been improved as a result of increased horticulture production, rearing of small livestock, production of honey and other hive products and establishment of village savings and credit schemes.

What are the major challenges the project has experienced during this reporting period?

The project is about to close and the biggest challenge is how to sustain and build on the gains made through this project within the shrinking government fiscal space. Operational capacity of key service providers has eroded as a result of budget cuts. Continued oversight and guidance to project beneficiaries is likely to be constrained upon closure of the project. Innovative solutions and well thought out exit strategy will be key to addressing this challenge.

Development Objective (DO) Ratings, Implementation Progress (IP) Ratings and Overall Assessment

Please note that the overall DO and IP ratings should be substantiated by evidence and progress reported in the Section 2 and Section 3 of the PIR.

For DO, the ratings and comments should reflect the overall progress of project results.

	FY2021 Development Objective rating¹⁷	FY2021 Implementation Progress rating¹⁸	Comments/reasons¹⁹ justifying the ratings for FY2021 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	The project has contributed to appreciation and increased climate change awareness amongst key stakeholders especially staff and communities. There has been phenomenal achievement in demonstrating water harvesting, livelihood diversification, SLMW practices, techniques and technologies and resource conservation measures. As a result the landscape in the demonstration sites has not only changed but communities have testified and reaping the benefits. Nearby communities want to be considered as well.

¹⁷ **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet.

For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁸ **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁹ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

<p>Budget Holder</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>The project has been exemplary in many ways. It has helped improve the governance of communally owned natural resources, something that many well intended initiatives and projects have struggled to achieve over the years. It has made major strides in improving the resilience and livelihoods of the targeted communities. It was instrumental in breaking existing silos, professional/technical arrogance and turf wars between different players in the agriculture and natural resource space. It bridged the divide between the state and non-state actors and made them realise their collective strengths and helped them exploit their comparative advantage in supporting community based development. Collaboration and coordination between different technical departments, district authorities and traditional/local leadership was greatly enhanced. Good practices and lessons learnt from this project continue to inform the design and implementation of new and upcoming investment projects. More importantly, this good practices are being mainstreamed into regular government programmes, which is a sign that the project has been a catalyst for bigger and better things to come.</p>
-----------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	--

GEF Operational Focal Point	S	S	<p>The project has demonstrated the integration of climate change adaptation into watershed management in the different pilot areas. Communities in the project areas have shown strong project inception as well as ownership and thereby have engaged in various SLMW practices to conserve the natural environment including sustainable range management and water harvesting. In addition, these practices were complemented with income-generating and livelihood strategies such as food preservation, indigenous chicken production and piggery. Perhaps the most innovative indication of this complementarity has been the establishment of Credit and Savings Schemes for communities, a strategy that seems to have empowered such communities and which is worth upscaling in future interventions, for example, by making it a part of financing mechanisms for conservation. Another notable lesson has been on project coordination in which there has been constant communication between project team and supporting structures i.e. Project Steering Committee, as well as consultation. This contributed to one of the most well coordinated, recognised, organised, strongest and committed PSCs compared to other GEF-funded projects. Still on this, an innovative strategy in which the PSC made a decision to combine its sittings with field visits in an effort to fast track project implementation, offer direct oversight to project District Coordinating Team and also be conversant with all project activities needs to be copied across all GEF projects.</p>
Lead Technical Officer²⁰	S	S	<p>The majority of the project outputs were successfully implemented with the status of more than 80-90%. The project has contributed significantly to the development objectives. However, the status of some of the outputs (2.1.2,3.1.3 and 4.1.2) are slightly below the expected level, but this did not affect overall achievement of the project. The project also contributed significantly to major adaptation objectives with some minor shortcomings.</p>

²⁰ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

<p>FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>Overall, the project has achieved its key objectives and results. The achievement and best practices are well captured in a study conducted by the project prior to the independent terminal evaluation. The evaluation confirmed the satisfactory rating in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency in implementation and delivery of results.</p> <p>Relevant lessons and best practices are already being incorporated in the design of a recently approved GEF-7 LDCF project “Building climate-resilient livelihoods and food systems”.</p>
---	-----------------	-----------------	--

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

Under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

This section of the PIR describes the progress made towards complying with the approved ESM plan, when appropriate. Note that only projects with **moderate** or **high** Environmental and Social Risk, approved from June 2015 should have submitted an ESM plan/table at CEO endorsement.

This does not apply to **low** risk projects. Please add recommendations to improve the implementation of the ESM plan, when needed.

Social & Environmental Risk Impacts identified at CEO Endorsement	Expected mitigation measures	Actions taken during this FY	Remaining measures to be taken	Responsibility
ESS 1: Natural Resource Management				
ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats				
ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management				
ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement				
ESS 7: Decent Work				
ESS 8: Gender Equality				
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage				
New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY				

In case the project did not include an ESM Plan at CEO endorsement stage, please indicate if the initial Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid; if not, what is the new classification and explain.

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ²¹ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low	Still valid.

<i>Please report if any grievance was received as per FAO and GEF ESS policies. If yes, please indicate how it is being/has been addressed.</i>
No grievances were received.

6. Risks

Risk ratings

RISK TABLE
<p><i>The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation. Please make sure that the table also includes the Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans. The <u>Notes</u> column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, as relevant.</i></p>

²¹ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

	Risk	Risk rating ²²	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions ²³	Notes from the Project Task Force
A. Risks identified in the Project Document					
1	Institutional conflicts over ownership of the project	L	The project formulation process has secured the understanding and commitment to establish a Steering Committee of key relevant line Ministries (i.e. MFLR and MAFS and local government), Meteorological Services, Disaster Management Authority at both national and district levels in order to ensure effective coordination and participatory decision-making.		
2	Highly fragile environment for intensifying crop and livestock production	M	Building resilience of local ecosystem and ensuring stability in yields with little or no expansion on cropland or rangeland and optimal use of chemicals and fertilizer. Reducing vulnerability through reliance on improved farming practices, improved natural resources management including erosion control, micro-scale water control, pasture and fodder management, agroforestry and diversification of livelihood options.		
3	Conflicts in the management of communally owned resources	M	Participatory approach in decision-making and building community consensus at the initial stage including some training on conflict management of common resources.		

²² GEF Risk ratings: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High

²³ If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period".

	Risk	Risk rating ²²	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions ²³	Notes from the Project Task Force
4	Sustainability/ institutionalization of technical assistance related to data base development and management and capacity development	L	The concerned ministries and institutions were consulted and a thorough assessment was done to identify the host institution for data collection and management especially related to the land use and vulnerability and risk assessment. The capacity development activities under component 1 and 2 are designed based on the needs assessment and participants will be identified in close consultation with the respective ministries. The training resources will be integrated into the regular training activities.	.	
B. New risks identified in the course of project implementation.					
1	Political changes and instability. The Ministers changed three times during project implementation, and ongoing briefing was required to keep them abreast and solicit their buy in.	H	New principals were sensitised on the project to create awareness and seek advocacy. Project site visits were initiated to showcase adaptation interventions.	The Prime Minister' Office, cabinet Ministers and MPs have visited the project site to acquaint themselves of the developments	
2	Lack of gender sensitive interventions and replicable approaches	M	Gender mainstreaming guidelines were developed and staff of implementing partners were trained to mainstream gender into climate change adaptive measures.	The awareness of gender issues has increased and gender sensitive approaches are being considered by the project staff and implementing partners.	

	Risk	Risk rating²²	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions²³	Notes from the Project Task Force
3	The nature of adaptive SLM/W and diversified livelihood strategies and /or interventions are not relevant to the location and are not responsive to communities' felt needs.	M	Communities and their local leadership structures were engaged in order to identify their felt needs and to prioritise them.	Site specific interventions were made.	
4	Insufficient of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by the Government of Lesotho and other key stakeholders) to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained.	M	Involvement of the technical and extension staff during planning, implementation and monitoring of project activities.	Government counterparts are aware of the interventions even though the Government has limited resources.	
5	Environmental risks (water shortage, hailstorm, frost, increase in invasive species occurrence in rangeland areas) may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes	M	The project identified and analyses the types of risks involved and implemented appropriate adaptation measures such as construction different water harvesting structures to solve water shortage; facilitated construction and supplied shadenets against hail damage; did brush control and range resting.	Communities are implementing a number of SLMW adaptation solutions against identified risks.	

Project overall risk rating (Low, Moderate, Substantial or High):

FY2020 rating	FY2021 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2021 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Moderate	Moderate	Implementation was affected by the COVID-19 pandemic and associated restrictions. Even so, all remaining activities have been completed and the project will be closed on 31 July 2021.

7. Adjustments to Project Strategy – Only for projects that had the Mid-term review (or supervision mission)

If the project had a MTR review or a supervision mission, please report on how the MTR recommendations were implemented as indicated in the Management Response or in the supervision mission report.

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented
<p>Recommendation 1 linked to Conclusion 1 and 2: To MFRSC and FAO, in selecting activities to be implemented within communities, relevance and effectiveness could be improved by identified priority community needs and interventions that create the necessary enabling environment.</p> <p>a) Prioritized community needs acknowledge heterogeneity amongst communities</p> <p>b) Reduce procurement complexity, e.g. beekeeping, livestock, source locally or develop partnerships with suppliers</p> <p>c) The PMU considers elaborating and prioritizing the sub-activities under Output 2.1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Communities, leadership structures and natural resource user groups, farming family households were consulted and engaged in participatory manner to determine their felt needs, existing opportunities and prioritization. - Context specific interventions: Prioritized felt needs and existing opportunities informed and were aligned to community level adaption measures under sustainable land and water management, diversified livelihoods and income generating activities . These adjustment were done without modifying the project outcomes and outputs. - Technical departments and expertise on specialized areas provided guidance as to ensure feasibility and quality control in delivering the works and services. - Annual work plans and budget were aligned to community priorities. They were developed and jointly implemented and monitored with implementing partners. - Procurement complexities were resolved by having in place elaborate project procurement plan to guide project requirements. The beekeeping and livestock issues were resolved. FAO reinforced the procurement office with the Operations and Administration Officer to enhance effectiveness and avoid delays in procurement.
<p>Recommendation 2 linked to Conclusion 3: to PMU, consider options that are replicable for improving further participation of women. An elaborate gender mainstreaming strategy, supported by guidance and replicable measures will ensure project effectiveness beyond the demonstration activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project engaged the services of a gender expert who developed guidelines and tools to mainstream gender into climate change adaptive measures. In addition, district staff from implementing line ministries and departments were trained on gender mainstreaming in natural resources, agriculture and climate change adaptation programmes.
<p>Recommendation 3 linked to Conclusion 4: to PMU, in order to improve the utility of the Monitoring & Evaluation framework and enable assessment of project impact, especially in relation to sustainable land and watershed management, it is necessary to have baseline data where practical.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Following the MTR and this recommendation baseline studies / datasets acquired by the project were on: Soil and Land suitability in all the project sites; rangeland monitoring was also implemented to determine the trends against the baseline and direct beneficiary database was also developed. - The GIS Officer in FAO prepared the geospatial maps that indicated the degree of land degradation in the three project sites

<p>a) Specifically, the baseline status of Component 2 should be stated by listing the specific types of databases that exist, outline user needs and the gaps to identified priority actions.</p> <p>b) For Component 3, spatial analysis could be used to establish the extent of the land area where sustainable land use practices could be applied.</p>	
<p>Recommendation 4 linked to Conclusion 5 and 6: to FAO, PMU and PSC, to improve project implementation and maintain timelines, there is need to ensure project risks and factors affecting delivery are addressed with expedience and regularly.</p> <p>a) Despite having good management structures in place, the project implementation has been ineffective and inefficient in addressing project risks. Decisions need to be made as quickly as possible</p> <p>b) The PMU assesses the list of remaining activities presented in Appendix II and discontinues some activities. To improve PSC meetings attendance, considerations need to be made to ensure the role of the PSC is effective by enabling quick and strategic decision-making when project issues arise as well as managing risks and opportunities.</p> <p>c) The PMU ensures PIRs have adequate information to enable the PSC to identify potential risks, including provision of reasonable summary of project expenditure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To improve project implementation and maintain timelines aimed to address project risks and make timely decisions, the Project Steering Committee (PSC) made two important strategic decisions: First, the frequency of ordinary meetings was intensified from half yearly to quarterly basis. Secondly, monitoring field visits were conducted every second quarter and alternated amongst the three project sites. The field visit concluded with a reflection meeting on the visits whereby strategic decisions, solutions, directions and conclusions were taken immediately based on the community feedback, opportunities, constraints and challenges encountered. The PSC also maximized use of this period for convene the ordinary quarterly meeting. - The decision to treat each community differently from the next allowed screening, hence discontinuing some activities presented in Appendix II. For instance, wetland protection was an important SLMW intervention but not all the 40 communities in the project had wetlands like those protected at Ha Patsa and Ha Mohlehli in Mafeteng. Under Output 3.1.2 the project encouraged construction of 150 roof water tanks at the household level in the three project sites. The logical step during planning was to apportion the number into 50 units linked and to ensure equity amongst the 3 project sites. However, roof water tank technology was constrained by thatched roof huts in Thaba Tseka where only 2 tanks were built. This meant discontinuing 48 units. Also beekeeping was discontinued due to lack of plants and or forage resources for bees.
<p>Recommendation 5 linked to Conclusion 7 and 8: To FAO and MFRSC, the project is highly relevant with reasonable potential for replication and scaling up but requires a deliberate strategy leveraging of the existing partnership.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project communication strategy was developed but the project team lacked technical expertise to implement it. The strategy adopted was to outsource expertise. Hence, project visibility, i.e. development of communication and knowledge management products was planned and budget for. The project engaged a private company to develop the visibility products.

Adjustments to the project strategy.

Please note that changes to outputs, baselines, indicators or targets cannot be made without official approval from PSC and PTF members, including the FLO. These changes will follow the recommendations of the MTR or the supervision mission.

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outputs	No	
Project Indicators/Targets	Yes	- Scope increased: Targeted beneficiaries, 24 communities and 1200 households increased from 40 and 1370 respectively.

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

If the duration of the project, the project work schedule, or the timing of any key events such as project start up, mid-term review, final evaluation or closing date, have been adjusted since project approval, please explain the changes and the reasons for these changes. The Budget Holder may decide, in consultation with the PTF, to request the adjustment of the EOD-NTE in FPMIS to the actual start of operations providing a sound justification.

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	Original NTE: October 31 2019 Revised NTE: July 31 2021 Justification: The project was given a no cost extension up to March 31 2021. On account of the continuing COVID 19 disruptions implementation of project activities stalled due to national lockdown in February 2021, travel and public gathering restrictions. Additional four (4) was given up to end of July 2021 in order to allow the project to catch up with the valuable time lost.

8. Stakeholders Engagement

Please report on progress, challenges, and outcomes on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan included at CEO Endorsement/Approval (when applicable))

If your project had a stakeholder engagement plan, specify whether any new stakeholders have been identified/engaged:

Section 4. Sub-section 4.1 Institutional arrangements and pages 52 -56 of the ProDoc acknowledges a multi-stakeholder approach in dealing with complex climate change adaptation issues. The stakeholder mapping identified fourteen key stakeholders. Nine (9) new stakeholders identified and engaged were development projects and namely are: Ministry of Home Affairs; Ministry of Small Business Development, Cooperatives and Marketing; the World Bank; Wool and Mohair Promotion Project (WAMPP); Smallholder Agricultural Development Programme II (SADP II); Integrated Catchment Management Project (ICM) and Improving adaptive capacity of vulnerable and food-insecure populations in Lesotho (WFP-IACOV), National Climate Change Coordination Committee (NCCC) and local schools (i.e. primary, secondary and high schools).

If a stakeholder engagement plan was not requested for your project at CEO endorsement stage, please

- list all stakeholders engaged in the project;-
 - 1. Government line ministries and or departments:** Ministries of Range, Forestry and Soil Conservation; Agriculture and Food Security; Water; Energy and Meteorology; Local Government and Chieftainship Affairs; Small Business Development, Cooperatives and Marketing and Home Affairs; Department of Environment and Disaster Management Authority.
 - 2. Inter-governmental organisations:** Food and Agricultural Organisation; World Food Programme and United Nations Development Programme; The World Bank and International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD).
 - 3. Education/Academia:** National University of Lesotho and schools (primary, secondary and high)
 - 4. Community Leadership structures:** Members of Parliament, Chiefs, Headmen and Councillors
 - 5. Civil Society Organisations and Community Based Organisations**
 - 6. Informal organisations and direct beneficiaries.**
- Please indicate if the project works with Civil Society Organizations and/or NGOs **Catholic Relief Services (CRS) and Lesotho Council of NGOs (LCN), Rural Self Help Development Programme (RSDA); Bethel Business and Community Development Centre (BBCDC).**

- Briefly describe stakeholders' engagement events, specifying time, date stakeholders engaged, purpose (information, consultation, participation in decision making, etc.) and outcomes.

Project Steering Committee meetings on quarterly basis at the national level involves heads of Government line ministries, academia and NGO representative to monitor and discuss project performance, give it direction and take strategic decisions regarding its implementation strategy. **District Technical Teams** (3) involves staff from line ministries and other development projects meet on monthly basis to exchange experiences, plans and lessons learned. **Community Leadership structures** are met during community mobilisation to discuss project implementation matters; special events and visits to the project site by dignitaries. **National Climate Change Coordinating Committee:** meets quarterly to share information covering all practitioners implementing climate change projects in the country. **Informal organisations and direct beneficiaries:** are routinely met and monitored almost on daily basis for trainings, demonstrations, to collect primary data, identify constraints encountered and determine and implement remedial solutions in participatory manner.

Private sector has been involved in the project and provide the nature of the private sector actors, their role in the project and the way they were involved.

Private sector has provided multifaceted roles in supporting the project through provision of goods and services to different layers of the project (governance, administration, procurement and finance, technical and direct beneficiaries).

1. **Under services:** the hospitality industry provided training venues covering boarding and lodging; the transport industry ferried goods and people across the project; telecommunications enabled connectivity across different role players; media houses covered project stories and informed a wider audience about the project, contractors provided specialized services such drilling boreholes, construction of sand dams, etc. The financial sector provided banking services and other transactional activities involving deposits and withdrawals, checking bank statements, facilitation of purchases and settling of payments through electronic funds transfer.

Under goods and other materials: the private sector played a key role in provision of project inputs and other resources such as agro-input dealerships, agro-chemicals, short-cycle livestock, hardware, construction materials

9. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable)

Was a gender analysis undertaken or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages? Please briefly indicate the gender differences here.

Does the M&E system have gender-disaggregated data? How is the project tracking gender results and impacts?

Does the project staff have gender expertise?

If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:

- Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources.
- improving women's participation and decision making; and or
- generating socio-economic benefits or services for women

Was a gender analysis undertaken or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages? Please briefly indicate the gender differences here.

Yes, gender analysis was undertaken as provided for by the FAO's Policy on Gender Equality (2012).

According to this framework gender analysis is incorporated in the formulation, implementation and evaluation of all field programmes and projects.

Does the M&E system have gender-disaggregated data? How is the project tracking gender results and impacts?

Yes, the M&E system have gender disaggregated data. This project uses the Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool (AMAT). Indicators generally consider gender and reports, including the AMAT disaggregate beneficiaries and participants by gender. The three objectives under AMAT have adequately ensured gender sensitive programming. There is a high-level participation of women and youth based on the data in the AMAT.

Does the project staff have gender expertise?

No expertise, but there have been mandatory online courses and physical training sessions the project staff took on gender issues. Project staff is aware and is incorporating gender issues during planning, implementation, monitoring and reporting of project activities.

If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:

- closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources; improving women's participation and decision making; and or
- generating socio-economic benefits or services for women

Strengthened capacity of community representatives in governance and decision making on issues of proper use and management rangeland resources; household income generating activities. The choice of adaptive technologies such as the decisions for choice of drought tolerant crop varieties.

10. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in knowledge management approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval

- **Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far.**

No, the project did not have documented knowledge management strategy (KMS). In the absence of a strategy the FAO Factsheets (2012) on Knowledge Management and Sharing provided useful guidance in that:

“There are several ways to identify and use a good practice, whether at a local, national or international level. A good practice needs: i) validation with appropriate stakeholders, ii) to have a positive impact, economically, environmentally and technically sustainable, iii) to be culturally sensitive, iv) to be transferable to other contexts, v) to improve over time as circumstances change i.e. an evolving process”.

It worth noting that unless for innovations, the project replicated and implemented tried and tested SLMW practices, technologies and resource conservation measures, livelihood and income generating options. Most of these approaches met the above mentioned criteria but they were not trialled under climate change adaptation scenario. The hypothesis tested was whether the selected practices under SLMW, livelihood and income generating activities would reduce vulnerability and build adaptive capacity at the community level.

Good practices learned and shared: i) *Farmer Field Schools*: an approach where farmers collectively share ideas, learn and exchange knowledge on a given enterprise; ii) *Pass system*: ‘Neheletse (whereby the first beneficiar(ies) commit to pass on the progeny/offsprings to other group members and so on until everybody has benefited. iii) *Savings and internal lending communities (SILC)*. iv) *Matsema (Letsema –singular form)* i.e. a voluntary group work (campaign) to carry out a physically engaging activity in a within a short time compared to an individual’s toil.

- **Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.**

Yes, a communication strategy exists. Communication successes have been:

- i) *Regular meetings* held by project, programme and all staff; District Technical Teams and the Project Steering Committee. Most of these were held meetings monthly basis the PSC which held quarterly meetings.
- ii) *Project site visits* three cabinet ministers, MPs, District Administrators including other district based projects have visited the project sites.
- iii) *Local media coverage* Information Units (videographers) within the Ministries of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation and Agriculture and Food Security have covered and aired project activities on Lesotho Television.
- iv) *Online resources* some project photos were shared on the FAO corporate intranet to showcase adaptation activities globally.
- v) *Project visibility products*, a local company Creative Hub has been engaged to develop project communication and knowledge management products. Field work (videography, photography and stakeholder interviews) was completed and the products are being developed.

Communication services and the ability to implement the Communication Strategy is constrained by the absence of a fulltime communication officer within the Organisation. Such services have to be outsourced. This has negative impacts such as delays for recruitment, time lost to brief and orientate the entity or individual about the project and the assignment is of short duration hence misses critical moments and events of the project. COVID 19 disrupted engaging a videographer in March when interventions were at their prime.

Please share a human interest story from your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihoods while contributing to achieving the expected global environmental benefits. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits. Farmers perspective of vegetable production

While young women of her age are either working as civil servants or migrate to South Africa for employment, 32 year old Mrs. Mapaballo Khooanyana of Ha-Patsa village in Mafeteng district is going strong as a farmer. She is an inspiration to those who shy away from agriculture and migrate to South Africa seeking job opportunities. She is married to Mr. Motlatsi who is teacher and they have two children at primary and high school.

Mapaballo is engaged fulltime in vegetable farming while her husband only comes home on weekends and official holidays. She has graduated from subsistence into commercial farming, she noted that she used to earn LSL2500, 00 per planting season before support from the project. This situation has changed in the past 2 years after being a project beneficiary. She now earns up to LSL 20,000.00 per planting season.

This young entrepreneur used to cultivate cabbages, tomatoes, green pepper and butternut squash on her piece of land on smallscale with just one permanent worker. The yield was mostly used for household consumption, and what was mostly sold was cabbage and butternut. Now based on a market demand, her focus is mainly on cabbage in winter and tomato in summer.

Mrs. Khooanyana's farming methods changed since she received trainings offered by the project through different government counterparts. Among others she was trained on vegetable production, soil preparation, pest management and irrigation techniques. More skills were imparted to Mapaballo on production of fruit tree seedlings, which she also ventured into. The spirit of diversification grew much stronger and started producing and selling trees to Ministry of Forestry and neighbours.

This vegetable production on large scale has impacted so much on other women and youth in my village, because they no longer spend most of their time collecting wild vegetables, save transport money because they no longer have to go to town to buy vegetables, most of them have embarked on vegetable production. "Some of youth who have completed high school usually come to volunteer in my farm in order to gain experience" she said. She further added by indicating that nutrition has quite improved in her village through established nutrition clubs. She was trained on food preparation and preservation by Nutrition Officers from the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security. The nutrition club members have acquired skills and imparted them to other women on the etiquette of food handling, preparing and preservation (especially fruits and vegetables) from their gardens in order to use during lean season.

Most of these women are members of savings and lending communities, introduced by the project; In an interview with some of these women, they mentioned that they are now able to acquire credit from their schemes to send children to school, purchase seeds and to meet other household needs.

The profits Mapaballo earns from vegetable, fruit tree seedlings and poultry (layers) are used to pay for school fees, household needs, purchase of inputs, and wages for labours. The balance is invested into

her bank account she recently opened. "I've never felt desperate to seek a job, am satisfied with farming" she says

Mrs. Khoanyana is happy with the amount of responsibilities and claims to have the majority of control over the assets related to their vegetable production as a woman.



Mrs Khoanyane with her employees working in her farm

- Please provide links to publications, leaflets, video materials, related website, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.

<https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=1tDAF77Ju67j041pd9v7u212Qr6S93kfi>

https://intranet.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/intranet/photos/medium_ooo.jpg

https://intranet.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/intranet/photos/medium_49608568141_19539b63a1_k.jpg

Does the project have a communication and/or knowledge management focal point? If yes, please provide their names and email addresses

N/A

11. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

Are Indigenous Peoples involved in the project? How? Please briefly explain.

Not applicable to this project and Lesotho.

12. Innovative Approaches

Please provide a brief description of an innovative²⁴ approach in the project / programme, describe the type (e.g. technological, financial, institutional, policy, business model) and explain why it stands out as an innovation.

1. **Ground water dam technology** for water harvesting in three project sites, Ha Patsa and Boluma Tau in Mafeteng and Seroala-Nkhoana in Thaba Tseka. The sand dams provide potable water to the communities. Before the project intervened, women and girls travelled long distances and waited too long hours to fetch unsafe water from unprotected springs.
2. **Twinning of projects existing within the same districts.** In Mafeteng District, the District Technical Team structure was joined forces with other sector related projects in their monthly meetings. The twinning encouraged exchange of experiences, planning, progress and results. Better communication and effectiveness was enhanced. Government officials are able to provide support to projects in a well-coordinated manner without clashes and conflicts.
3. **Community Mobiliser Model:** presence of project personnel at the community level enhances project visibility, it bridges services delivery gap and provides communities a convenient and easy access back up support. The approach empowers these individuals to acquire a set of new skills and knowledge. The project leverages the knowledge the personnel has about the local communities, direct beneficiaries and the local systems. The model is time and cost effective by reducing travel costs for both the CMs and clients as well as accommodation costs.

13. Possible impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the project

Please indicate any implication of the Covid-19 pandemic on the activities and progress of the project. Highlight the adaptive measures taken to continue with the project implementation.

- Are the outcomes/outputs still achievable within the project period?**
- Yes there was sufficient time allowed under the no cost extension
- Will the timing of the project MTR or TE be affected/delayed?**
- TE was affected but not delayed. The International consultant could not travel to Lesotho due to the travel restrictions and had to rely on virtual contact.
- What is the impact of COVID-19 on project beneficiaries, personnel, etc.**
- Lack of access to services, resources, and information people need to mitigate and overcome crises.
Disruption of business continuity, normal flow of local transport to markets to acquire inputs and deliver goods to markets; debilitated livelihoods and contributed to mass unemployment, especially season workers; reduced household income; fueled escalation of commodity basic food items, created uncertainty and anxiety; discontinued communal activities such as public gatherings, social especially work on communal assets, training and demonstrations.
- Are there good practices and lessons learned to be shared?**

²⁴ Innovation is defined as *doing something new or different in a specific context that adds value*

Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs): having SOPs makes it convenient and predictable to adjust to the “new normal” under COVID 19. They encouraged consistency, provided guidance and credible source of information and how it’s communicated (who, whom, where, how, why and when). This protects staff against information overdose, rumours, propaganda and fake news that strews online and social media platforms.

Stay and Deliver: working from home and or isolated areas away from the crowded work environment help to protect and safe lives.

- **Access to technology:** modern-day Information Communication Technology and the information age has enabled to leverage use of electronic gadgets, apps, internet, etc has enabled virtual and digital technology to take root. A number of social events meetings, seminars, conferences, webinars, etc need not rely on traditional in person format It has become easier to conduct them virtually through teleconference apps like Zoom, MS teams, etc and banking services are also wired.

14. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²⁵	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2021	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
GEF Agency	FAO	In-kind	937,000	890,000	500,000	937,000
Recipient Country Government	Government of Lesotho	In-kind	7,500,000	6,911,881	2,600,000	7,500,000
		TOTAL	8,437,000	7,801,881	3,100,000	8,437,000

Please explain any significant changes in project co-financing since Project Document signature, or differences between the anticipated and actual rates of disbursement

²⁵ Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. **DO Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** - Project is expected to achieve or exceed **all** its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”); **Satisfactory (S)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings); **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits); **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** - Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major global environmental objectives); **Unsatisfactory (U)** - Project is expected **not** to achieve **most** of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits); **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** - The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, **any** of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

Implementation Progress Rating – Assess the progress of project implementation. **IP Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as “good practice”. **Satisfactory (S):** Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action. **Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action. **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action. **Unsatisfactory (U):** Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.