**FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report**
**2023 – Revised Template**
Period covered: 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

# Table of contents

# 1. Basic Project Data

## General Information

| | |
|---|---|
| **Region:** | Southern Africa |
| **Country (ies):** | Zimbabwe |
| **Project Title:** | A cross-sector approach supporting the mainstreaming of sustainable forest and land management to enhance ecosystem resilience for improved livelihoods in the Save and Runde Catchments of Zimbabwe |
| **FAO Project Symbol:** | GCP /ZIM/031/GFF |
| **GEF ID:** | 10257 |
| **GEF Focal Area(s):** | Multi Focal Area: <br> i) Land Degradation (LD) Objective 1 "Support on the ground implementation of SLM to achieve LDN" <br> ii) Biodiversity (BD) Objective 1 "Mainstream biodiversity across sectors as well as landscapes and seascapes" <br> iii) Climate Change Mitigation (CCM) Objective 2 "Demonstrate mitigation options with systemic impacts |
| **Project Executing Partners:** | Environmental Management Agency (EMA), Forestry Commission, Zimbabwe (FC), Zimbabwe Parks and Wildlife Management Authority (ZPWMA), World Vision (WV), Community Technology Development Organization (CTDO). |
| **Initial project duration (years):** | 5 years |
| **Project coordinates:** <br> *This section should be completed ONLY by:* <br> a) *Projects with 1st PIR;* <br> b) *In case the geographic coverage of project activities has changed since the last reporting period.* | *[Projects in a) and b) categories should indicate YES here and provide the geocoded data in Annex 2]* |

## Project Dates

| | |
|---|---|
| **GEF CEO Endorsement Date:** | 3-Jun-21 |
| **Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :** | 25-Aug-21 |
| **Project Implementation End Date/NTE[1]:** | 30-Sep-2026 |
| **Revised project implementation End date (if approved) [2]** | NA |

## Funding

| | |
|---|---|
| **GEF Grant Amount (USD):** | $ 10,433,945 |
| **Total Co-financing amount (USD)[3]:** | $60,830,179 |
| **Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD):** | $1,517,401 |

---

[1] As per FPMIS

[2] If NTE extension has been requested and approved by the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit.

[3] This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO Document/Project Document.

| Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD)[4]: | $ 1,368,773 |
|---|---|
| Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023[5] | $ 152,472.00 |

## M&E Milestones

| Date of Last Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting: | 27 January 2023 |
|---|---|
| Expected Mid-term Review date[6]: | |
| Actual Mid-term review date (if already completed): | TBA |
| Expected Terminal Evaluation Date[7]: | |
| Tracking tools (TT)/Core indicators (CI) updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex) | *[It is mandatory for projects to update the TT or CI before Mid-Term or Terminal Evaluation stage. For projects that have a planned MTR or TE in the next fiscal year, please indicate YES here and provide the updated TT or CI as Annex.]* |

## Overall ratings

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

## ESS risk classification

| Current ESS Risk classification: | *Medium* |
|---|---|

## Status

| Implementation Status (1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR): | 1st PIR |
|---|---|

## Project Contacts

| Contact | Name, Title, Division/Institution | E-mail |
|---|---|---|
| Project Coordinator (PC) | Magwaza Precious, Acting National Project Coordinator, Environmental Management Agency (EMA); | precious.magwaza@ema.co.zw |
| Budget Holder (BH) | Talla Takoukam, Patrice Sub-Regional Coordinator | Patrice.Talla@fao.org |

---

[4] The amount should show the values included in the financial statements generated by IMIS.

[5] Please refer to the Section 13 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

[6] The Mid-Term Review (MTR) should take place after the 2nd PIR, around half-point between EOD and NTE. The MTR report in English should be submitted to the GEF Secretariat within 4 years of the CEO Endorsement date.

[7] The Terminal Evaluation date should be discussed with OED 6 months before the project's NTE date.

| GEF Operational Focal Point (GEF OFP) | Tanyaradzwa Mundonga, Deputy Director - Natural Resources, Ministry of Environment, Climate, Tourism and Hospitality Industry | tmundoga@gmail.com |
|---|---|---|
| Lead Technical Officer (LTO) | Edward Kilawe<br>Forestry Officer | Edward.Kilawe@fao.org |
| GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO) | Sandra Corsi | sandra.corsi@fao.org |

## 2. Progress towards Achieving Project Objective(s) (Development Objective)

(*All inputs in this section should be cumulative from project start, not annual*)

| Project or Development Objective | Outcomes | Outcome indicators[8] | Baseline | Mid-term Target[9] | End-of-project Target | Cumulative progress[10] since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023 | Progress rating[11] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Component1: Strengthening the enabling environment for the integrated management of natural resources at the national and landscape levels** | **Outcome 1.1:** Strengthened and harmonized intersectoral and multilevel decision-making and planning in the targeted sub-basins to avoid, reduce and reverse land degradation | (i) # of landscape-level cross-sectoral governance platform for land use planning and management in Save and Runde sub-basins established and operational, with # active members. | (i) No landscape-level cross-sectoral governance platform in place in Save and Runde sub-basins. | (i) Two landscape-level cross-sectoral governance platform in Save and Runde subbasins established and operational with # active members (TBD) | 2 sectoral landscape level governance platforms | Engagement of the Consultant for Stakeholder Mapping and Analysis is currently being finalized[12].<br><br>District level Rural District Development subcommittee on Agriculture and Environment platforms were activated for the purpose.<br><br>Provincial-level subcommittee on Environment, Climate and Natural resources were activated | Satisfactory (S) |

---

[8] This is taken from the approved results framework of the project.
[9] 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.
[10] Please report on results obtained in terms of Global Environmental Benefits and Socio-economic co-benefits as well.
[11] Use GEF Secretariat required a six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory** (HS), **Satisfactory** (S), **Moderately Satisfactory** (MS), **Moderately Unsatisfactory** (MU), **Unsatisfactory** (U), and **Highly Unsatisfactory** (HU). Refer to Annex 1.
[12] https://drive.google.com/file/d/1NkWg3xb7dMmEdKrM-7JE3Va9KeMC7BFC/view?usp=drive_link

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | (ii) # of SLM/SFM policy recommendations at national level developed, submitted and adopted | (ii) There are several weaknesses in the policy framework regarding the integrated management of natural resources.<br><br>Zimbabwe does not have national policies or provisions in the National Seed Law to guide and regulate local seed production.<br><br>There is no Statutory Instrument to regulate charcoal production. | At least two policy recommendation documents developed and submitted | At least two policy recommendation documents developed and adopted | Consultant to be engaged after achievement of mid-term target 1 under outcome 1.1 | Satisfactory (S) |
| | | (iii) Increased support for SLM and/or SFM through # government finance mechanisms and programmes as a result of the project. | (iii) The budget allocated to LDN-relevant interventions across public institutions is unknown.<br>The Environmental Fund is not yet operational.<br>The Presidential Input Programme is in favour of conservation agriculture but it is not yet mainstreamed in the programme. | Increased support for SLM and/or SFM through at least one government finance mechanisms and programmes | Increased support for SLM and/or SFM through at least three government finance mechanisms and programmes | Activity dependent on target 1 under outcome 1.1. | Satisfactory (S) |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | (iv) # of by-laws developed/updated in the targeted districts/wards in support of the implementation of the ILUPs (e.g. to address the issue of sand mining, clarify access to forests, improve monitoring of natural resources extraction) | iv) Misaligned By-laws necessary in the targeted districts/wards to guide the implementation of national policy of natural resources management and address land degradation issues in alignment with the ILUPs | At least four by-laws developed/updated to address land degradation issues submitted for validation | At least six by-laws developed/updated to address land degradation issues validated and under implementation | Dependent on target 1 of outcome 1.2. | Satisfactory (S) |
| | **Outcome 1.2:** Integrated Landscape Planning incorporating LDN objectives applied and sustained in the Save and Runde sub-basins | (i) # of ILUPs for integrated land-use management planning developed and under implementation in the Save and Runde sub-basins | (i) No integrated land-use management plans are available for the targeted sub-basins | Two ILUPs developed and under validation in the Save and Runde sub-basins | Two ILUPs developed, validated and under implementation in the Save and Runde sub-basins | Engagement of Integrated Landscape Planning consultant is underway[13]. | Satisfactory (S) |
| | | (ii) # of existing development plans from the Provincial to the Village level across the targeted sub-basins integrating the ILUPs and LDN aims | (ii) Each of the 8 districts has a DDP. LEAPs haven't been developed. | At least 6 existing development plans from the Provincial to the Village level across the targeted sub-basins integrating the ILUPs and LDN aims (e.g. LEAPs) | At least 10 existing development plans from the Provincial to the Village level across the targeted sub-basins integrating the ILUPs and LDN aims (e.g. LEAPs, DDPs) | 39 WEAPs were developed and these will inform the LEAPs[14] | Satisfactory (S) |

---

[13] https://drive.google.com/file/d/1NkWg3xb7dMmEdKrM-7JE3Va9KeMC7BFC/view?usp=drive_link

[14] https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1coR_veGx6iFHR0oX2ZEdjX12onkEPa-U/edit?usp=drive_link&ouid=109331358326509161257&rtpof=true&sd=true

| | |
|---|---|
| **GCP country docking support under Component 1 (See Annex 3)** | (General)<br><br>Provision of inception support package comprising of:<br>1. Draft/example ToRs (PMU), including linkages to the GCP support structure<br>&bull; National Project Coordinator<br>&bull; Monitoring and Evaluation<br>&bull; Knowledge management, stakeholder engagement, capacity development<br>&bull; Technical Experts-CSB, GVC, Rural Advisory Services<br>2. Inception workshop documents<br>&bull; Draft agenda<br>&bull; Annual workplan template<br>&bull; Monitoring and Evaluation plan (GEB template, Results Framework Template, Financial tracking Template)<br>&bull; Draft Child Project PPT<br>&bull; Draft Global & Regional DSL IP PPT<br>&bull; ToRs national steering committee<br>&bull; OPIM PPT<br>3. Outreach starter package (for inception workshop)<br>&bull; Roll up Banner (global and child project)<br>&bull; DSL-IP Brochure<br><br>Linking the Zimbabwe PMU and government focal points to the GCP implementation (country docking) structure<br>&bull; Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Working Group (to support in M&E, capacity development on M&E assessment tools and approaches, ILM best practices, lessons learning and sharing among DSL-IP M&E specialists)<br>&bull; Knowledge, capacity , outreach Working Groups (to support in linking child projects to the technical support structures that have been established; tap into capacity development opportunities resulting from the technical support package; translating them into action and learning how to disseminate those actions in a way that up, out and deepscales results and findings with other child projects, regions and beyond the IP itself)<br><br>Component 1 specific - Gender:<br>The GCP and executing partner IUCN have hired a gender expert to conduct, a comprehensive assessment of gender considerations in the global project and in the CPs. The results will be discussed in a global gender workshop (November 2023) and flow into a a 2-year action plan to address the identified gender gaps including specific, demand-based technical backstopping. Moreover, the GCP has hired a behavioral change expert to conduct selected behavior change studies (NTFPs) which will take gender aspects into close consideration. |

| Component 2: Demonstrating, implementing, and scaling up and out SLM and SFM good practices in Save and Runde basins | Outcome 2.1: SLM and SFM interventions implemented in Save and Runde sub-basins, and scaled up and out | (i) # of ha of Miombo and Mopane production landscapes under SLM and/or SFM practices for improved and sustainable production with the following distribution across the targeted LUS: | (i) LD Assessment: more than 70% of the area is considered to be affected by soil erosion by water and fertility decline. Grasslands in the Save and Runde basins have shrunk over the years and the remaining patches are under threat from overgrazing, veld fires and invasion by alien species such as *Lantana Camara* | i) 10,400 of ha of Miombo and Mopane production landscapes under SLM and/or SFM practices with following distribution across the targeted LUS: | (i) 42,500 of ha of Miombo and Mopane production landscapes under SLM and/or SFM practices with the following distribution across the targeted LUS:

communal areas 5,000 ha under improved rangeland management | Dependent on activity 1. Outcome 1.2 and FFPO assessment

FFPO assessment in progress[15] | Satisfactory (S) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | # of ha of cropland in Save and Runde sub-basins under sustainable intensification | Baseline on sustainable intensification has to be carried out. | -8,000 ha of cropland in Save and Runde sub-basins under sustainable intensification | 30,000 ha of cropland in Save and Runde sub-basins under sustainable intensification | FFPO assessment underway in progress | Satisfactory (S) |
| | | # of ha of mixed landscapes with SLM and SFM practices applied for sustainable NTFP and wood harvesting | Baseline on current SFM and SLM practices applied for sustainable NTFP and wood harvesting to be carried out. | -400 ha of woodlots in mixed landscapes created for sustainable NTFP and wood harvesting in communal land | 500ha of woodlots established for sustainable NTFP and wood harvesting | This is dependent on activity 1, Outcome 1.2 and FFPO assessment.

59.6 ha woodland covered under Co-Financing by FC[16]: | Satisfactory (S) |

---

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | 4.8ha woodlots were established, 5 nurseries established, 52ha of woodlands put under woodland management, 1.3ha of agroforestry projects established, 1.5ha of orchards established. | |
| | | # of ha of mixed landscapes under improved fire management | | 2,000 ha under improved fire management of forest and communal areas | 7,000 ha under improved fire management of forest and communal areas | Fire strategies developed at landscape level[17]. | Satisfactory (S) |
| | | # of ha of rangeland under improved management | | | 5,000 ha under improved rangeland management | Dependent on activity 1 under outcome 1.2. | Satisfactory (S) |
| | | (ii) # of ha of forests and mixed landscapes under regeneration (contributing to GEF Core Indicator 3, Sub-Indicators 3.2 and 3.3) | (ii) 80% of forests are considered to be affected by veld fires (especially in Chipinge, Masvingo and Bikita districts), and 40% of forests are affected by deforestation and invasive alien plants and other species. Gully formation affects 2,220 ha | (ii) 410 ha of forests and mixed landscapes under regeneration | (ii) 2,150 ha of forests and mixed landscapes under regeneration | Dependent on activity 1 under outcome 1.2. | Satisfactory (S) |

---

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1hOYbBWgZR3HqujPzNYybz2EEXUuHVepw/edit?usp=drive_link&ouid=109331358326509161257&rtpof=true&sd=true

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | across the eight targeted districts. | | | | |
| | | # of ha of degraded forests under assisted natural regeneration | | 400 ha of ANR in forest land | 2,000 ha of ANR in forest land | Dependent on activity 1 under outcome 1.2. | Satisfactory (S) |
| | | # of ha of degraded forests (mining sites) under rehabilitation | | 10 ha of mining sites under the process of being restored | 50 ha of mining sites under the process of being restored | Dependent on activity 1 under outcome 1.2. | Satisfactory (S) |
| | | # of ha of mixed landscape (gullies, land degraded by: | | | 100 ha of degraded land (gullies, land degraded by invasive species) under rehabilitation. | Dependent on activity 1 under outcome 1.2., Forestry Co Financing: Restoration of 5ha of mined area. | Satisfactory (S) |
| | | (iii) # of management plans for Protected Areas developed for conservation and sustainable use | (iii) Chimanimani National Park does not have a management plan. | (iii) One Management Plan for Chimanimani National Park covering 21,200 ha under development | (iii) One Management Plan for Chimanimani National Park covering 21,200 ha developed | Consultant engagement process already done[18]. | Satisfactory (S) |

---

[18] https://docs.google.com/document/d/1E_b9bYtcx3cJi_gRsrvc3jhnRHRsziZb/edit?usp=drive_link&ouid=109331358326509161257&rtpof=true&sd=true

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | (iv) Increase in the # of ha of forests sustainably managed by community-based forest managem ent committees | (iv) The Forestry Commission is implementing community-based forest management committees at a small scale in the sub-basins | (iv) An additional 30,000 ha of forests sustainably managed by community-based forest management committees 20,000 ha of woodlands in riverine areas 10,000 ha of woodlands in the buffer zone of Save Valley | (iv) An additional 130,000 ha of forests sustainably managed by community-based forest management committees 90,000 ha of woodlands in riverine areas 40,000 ha of woodlands in the buffer zone of Save Valley Conservancy | Dependent on activity 1 under outcome 1.2 | Satisfactory (S) |
| | **Outcome 2.2:** Key sustainable dryland commodity Value Chains established and/or strengthened | (i) # of business plans for the development of climate-resilient NUSs, NTFPs and small livestock Value Chains under implementation | (i) SHARP results: 29% of farmers in Runde and 12% in Save direct their production to local markets. 90% did not manage to sell due to low production rates. The Post-harvesting practices include treatment methods (ashes for maize) (33%), cleaning (32%) and sorting (5%) the produce. None reported transformation of crops or animal products. | At least 15 business plans (for at least 15 FFPOs with 70 members on average) validated for the development of climate-resilient NUS, NTFP and small livestock Value Chains | At least 15 business plans (for at least 15 FFPOs with 70 members on average) under implementation | Pending LOA for WV | Satisfactory (S) |
| | | (ii) # of loans and other financial contributions for post-harvest processing of | (ii) Farmers have limited access to microfinance schemes (e.g. | | (ii) [TBD during the first year of the project] | Pending LOA for WV which is delayed | **Moderately Satisfactory** (MS) |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | agricultural and forest products attributed by microfinance schemes and other private sector organizations in the targeted areas, particularly to women. | SACCOS, Youth and Women Banks). EMA and the FC receive some support from the private sector (e.g. FOTE), but this is not regular and not rigorously monitored. | | | | |
| | | # At least two round table events organized with private sector and microfinance providers. | | | Two round table finance initiatives | Pending LOA for WV which is delayed | **Moderately Satisfactory** (MS) |
| **GCP Country Docking support under Component 2 (see Annex 3)** | 1. Linking Zimbabwe to the **MEL working group** structure, and conduct orientation calls<br>2. As part of the KCOS working group preparatory work and subsequent country docking meetings took place to:<br>• Raise awareness about the CGP Technical support structure<br>• Define Zimbabwe's project's core theme (NTFPs and NUS) based on list of criteria<br>• Integrate the GCP TA (Sustainable Landscape Production Framework) into the Zimbabwe CP workplan<br>• Finalize the FFPO assessment ToRs and initiate the assessment. | | | | | | |
| **Component 3:** Strengthening Knowledge Management, Monitoring and Collaboration for addressing SLM/SFM at landscape, national, regional and global levels | **Outcome 3.1:** Project implementation supported by an M&E strategy, based on measurable and verifiable outcomes and adaptive management | | | (i) One baseline and mid- term review report | (i) One Baseline, Mid-Term Review report and one Final Evaluation report | M&E strategy under development[19]. | Satisfactory (S) |
| | **Outcome 3.2:** | (i) # of national database | (i) EMA is expecting funding from | (i) One intersectoral database gathering | (i) One intersectoral | Consultant for the development of the | Satisfactory (S) |

---

[19] https://docs.google.com/document/d/1UGMYcPd9Mw-kSj6OmXMhAMdyc4CmSX54/edit?usp=drive_link&ouid=109331358326509161257&rtpof=true&sd=true
https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1u0j7LrSAiL48ejVe4H82yyEScty-yKDx/edit?usp=drive_link&ouid=109331358326509161257&rtpof=true&sd=true

| | | Data collection and knowledge sharing approach on SFM/SLM contributing to LDN assessment work improved | strengthened to facilitate access to LD information to all relevant sectors to support LDN in Zimbabwe | UNCCD to establish an LDN database | information from different sectors on the extent of LD and its trends, LD drivers and | database gathering information from different sectors on the extent of LD and its trends, LD drivers and ecosystem health | LDN database engaged[20]. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | (ii) # of regional and global knowledge platforms where the lessons learned, good practices and achievements supportive of LDN of the DSL IP are accessible | (ii) Regional and global platforms exist (e.g. SADC GGWI, Miombo Network and WOCAT, NEPAD, Global Landscapes Forum, TerrAfrica) but are not sufficient used for knowledge sharing between countries faced similar LD issues | At least four knowledge platforms where the results of the project are accessible to local, regional and international audiences | (ii) At least four knowledge platforms where the results of the project are accessible to local, regional and international audiences | Consultant for the development of project website engaged[21]. | Satisfactory (S) |
| | | | iii) # of lessons learned/good practices documents from the implementation of Component 1 and 2 of the GEF7 project published on regional and global platforms. | (iii) Information sharing is mainly happening face-to-face between sectors at the national level, and the data available on regional and global platform only covers part of the experience held in the targeted countries, and this information is not visible and accessible enough | At least one communication document based on the experience generated under Component 1 and 2 of the GEF7 project published on regional and global platform | At least five of communication documents based on the experience generated under Component 1 and 2 of the GEF7 project published on regional and global platform | Dependent on implementation of Components 1 and 2 | Satisfactory (S) |

---

[20] https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Kxcs3I5PldTxuy9IuW-LCGCsr7ovu-SL/edit?usp=drive_link&ouid=109331358326509161257&rtpof=true&sd=true
[21] https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Kxcs3I5PldTxuy9IuW-LCGCsr7ovu-SL/edit?usp=drive_link&ouid=109331358326509161257&rtpof=true&sd=true

| | | | to many government and non-government stakeholders | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | iv) # of regional and global workshops held sharing information/ lessons learned/ best practice on SLM, SFM and LDN | (iv) A regional workshop with eight countries from Southern and Central Africa was organized in February 2020 to share lessons on "Wood fuel Domestic Strategies and Options for Production and Trade" | At least one regional workshop with a minimum of 40 participants each (including at least 30% of women) on shared land degradation issues and experience sharing in SLM, SFM and LDN involving Miombo countries | At least two regional workshops and one global workshop with a minimum of 40 participants each (including at least 30% of women) on shared land degradation issues and experience sharing in SLM, SFM and LDN involving Miombo countries | Dependent on implementation of Components 1 and 2 | Satisfactory (S) |
| **GCP Country Docking support under Component 3 (see Annex 3)** | **M&E specialist and National Project Coordinator onboarded in the DSL-IP Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning Working Group (MEL WG).** <br> **M&E specialist trained currently supporting the participatory DSL-IP M&E Dashboard.** <br> **GCP support to the refinement of project intervention areas and alignment with the DSL-IP Miombo-Mopane criteria.** <br> **Project staff received inputs and guidance on M&E standards and harmonization, as well as minimum requirements for reporting.** <br> **The project received baseline assessment results collected during project preparation for informed decision making and refinement of interventions.** <br> **Zimbabwe Project sites integrated into the DSL-IP Geospatial Platform to facilitate analysis of existing remote sensing products. Access here.** <br> **Transboundary priorities for Zimbabwe and Southern Africa region identified during the DSL-IP Regional Workshop for Southern Africa.** | | | | | | |

## Measures taken to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings on Section 2

| Outcome | Action(s) to be taken | By whom? | By when? |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

# 3. Implementation Progress (IP)

*(Please indicate progress achieved during this FY as per the Implementation Plan/Annual Work Plan)*

| Outcomes and Outputs[22] | Indicators (as per the Logical Framework) | Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan) | Main achievements[23] (please DO NOT repeat results reported in previous year PIR) | Describe any variance[24] in delivering outputs |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Outcome 1.1:** Strengthened and harmonized intersectoral and multilevel decision-making and planning in the targeted sub-basins to avoid, reduce and reverse land degradation | (i) # of landscape-level cross-sectoral governance platform for land use planning and management in Save and Runde sub- basins established and operational, with # active members | (i) Two landscape-level cross-sectoral governance platform in Save and Runde sub basins established and operational with # active members (TBD) | Consultant engagement process in progress[25]. District level Rural District Development subcommittee on Agriculture and Environment platforms activated. Provincial-level subcommittee on Environment, Climate and Natural resources activated | - |
| **Output 1.1.1:** National platform for LDN improved, with a particular focus on the national LDN TWG | # of National platform for LDN improved, with a particular focus on the national LDN TWG | An improved national platform for LDN. | National TWG on LDN is in existence. Engagement of stakeholder mapping and analysis consultant is in progress. Consultant to carry out assessment and capacity building. | - |
| **Output 1.1.2:** Cross-sectoral and gender-sensitive governance platforms – including a landscape-level LDN working group – established at the landscape level in both Save and Runde sub-basins | # of Cross-sectoral and gender-sensitive governance platforms – including a landscape-level LDN working group – established at the landscape level in both Save and Runde sub-basins | 2 Cross-sectoral and gender-sensitive governance platforms established | Engagement of the Stakeholder Mapping and Analysis consultant is in progress. The consultant to facilitate the establishment of the platforms and TWGs. The consultant will also develop both community mobilization and conflict management strategies. | - |
| **Output 1.1.3:** Assessments of targeted sub-basins jointly deepened and extended, and effective current practices identified in support of LDN decision-making and corresponding capacity development program designed and delivered for relevant | # of Assessments of targeted sub-basins jointly deepened and extended, and effective current practices identified in support of LDN decision making and corresponding capacity development program designed | 2 Support and capacity-building efforts deepened and extended within the sub-basin and effective current practices identified in support of LDN decision-making and corresponding capacity | Engagement and identification of the consultants completed and awaiting training together with the baseline teams. | - |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| stakeholders from government, private sector, civil society, and communities using a training-of-trainers approach | and delivered for relevant stakeholders from government, private sector, civil society and communities using a training-of-trainers approach | development programme designed and delivered for relevant stakeholders from government, private sector, civil society and communities using a training-of-trainers approach. | | |
| **Outcome 1.2:** Integrated Landscape Planning incorporating LDN objectives applied and sustained in the Save and Runde sub-basins | (i) # of ILUPs for integrated land-use management planning developed and under implementation in the Save and Runde sub-basins | (i) Two ILUPs developed, validated, and under implementation in the Save and Runde sub-basins | Engagement of Integrated Landscape Planning consultant in progress[26]. | - |
| | (ii) # of existing development plans from the Provincial to the Village level across the targeted sub-basins integrating the ILUPs and LDN aims | (ii) At least 10 existing development plans from the Provincial to the Village level across the targeted sub-basins integrating the ILUPs and LDN aims (e.g. LEAPs, DDPs) | Engagement of Integrated Landscape Planning consultant in progress. | - |
| **Output 1.2.1:** Two integrated landscape management and corresponding action plans developed for Save and Runde sub-basins | # of integrated landscape management and corresponding action plans developed for Save and Runde sub-basins | Two integrated landscape management and corresponding action plans developed for Save and Runde sub-basins | Engagement of Integrated Landscape Planning consultant in progress. | |
| **Output 1.2.2**: Existing provincial-level, district-level, and ward-level plans and finance mechanisms developed and reviewed to align with the ILUPs and to support SLM, SFM and LDN | Plans developed from the provincial to district level incorporating ILUPs and supporting SLM, SFM, and LDN | At least 10 plans integrating ILUPs, SLM, SFM, and LDN | Supported the ongoing development of the NEAP and undertook preliminary development of WEAPs as part of capacity development of EMA's decentralized staff on environmental planning[27]. | |

---

[22] Outputs as described in the project Logframe or in any approved project revision.
[23] Please use the same unit of measurement of the project indicators as per the approved Implementation Plan or Annual Workplan. Please be concise (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)
[24] Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.
[25] https://drive.google.com/file/d/1NkWg3xb7dMmEdKrM-7JE3Va9KeMC7BFC/view?usp=drive_link
[26] https://drive.google.com/file/d/1SHuYqr9lpKsEOhMW0J0jjqcvajGeBiPR/view?usp=drive_link
[27] https://drive.google.com/file/d/1BuWpoRT_gj527e73yMskRW50KyVk3eAS/view?usp=drive_link

| | | | | - |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Outcome 2.1:** SLM and SFM interventions implemented in Save and Runde sub-basins, and scaled up and out | (i) # of ha of Miombo and Mopane production landscapes under SLM and/or SFM practices for improved and sustainable production with the following distribution across the targeted LUS: | (i) 10,400 ha of Miombo and Mopane production landscapes under SLM and/or SFM practices with the following distribution across the targeted LUS: | Dependent on activity 1. Outcome 1.2 and FFPO assessment<br><br>FFPO assessment in progress | - |
| | # of ha of cropland in Save and Runde sub-basins under sustainable intensification | - | FFPO assessment in progress<br><br>FFS and AGFS strategies development are in progress.<br><br>CTDO supported traditional grain seed multiplication initiatives for 600 farmers.<br><br>Forestry Commission established 1.3 ha of demonstration plots under the Co-financing component. | - |
| | # of ha of mixed landscapes with SLM and SFM practices applied for sustainable NTFP and wood harvesting | • 20 ha of woodlots established for sustainable NTFP and wood harvesting in communal land | This is dependent on activity 1, Outcome 1.2 and FFPO assessment.<br><br>FC has established 4.8 ha of woodlots as co- financing. | - |
| | # of ha of mixed landscapes under improved fire management | •7,000 ha under improved fire management of forest and communal areas | Fire prediction and management strategies developed at landscape level.<br>Protection of 50Ha in the Chimanimani National Park in Manicaland by ZPWMA. | - |
| | (ii) # of ha of forests and mixed landscapes under regeneration. (contributing to GEF Core Indicator 3, Sub-Indicators 3.2 and 3.3)<br>•# of ha of degraded forests under assisted natural regeneration | (ii) 2,000 ha of forests and mixed landscapes under AN regeneration | Dependent on activity 1 under outcome 1.2 and FFPO assessment. | - |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | •# of ha of degraded forests (mining sites) under rehabilitation. | 15 ha of mining sites under the process of being restored | Dependent on activity 1 under outcome 1.2.<br><br>Forestry Co Financing: Restoration of 5ha of mined area. | - |
| | # of ha of mixed landscape (gullies, land degraded by: | 20ha. of degraded land (gullies, land degraded by invasive species) under rehabilitation. | Dependent on activity 1 under outcome 1.2.<br><br>Research on effective method *Lantana Camara* eradication is in progress. | - |
| | (iii) # of management plans for Protected Areas developed for conservation and sustainable use. | (iii) One Management Plan for Chimanimani National Park covering 21,200 ha developed: | Consultant on Protected Area and Trans-frontier Conservation Area (TFCA) Planning Consultant selected. | - |
| | (iv) Increase in the # of ha of forests sustainably managed by community-based forest management committees | (iv) 20,000 ha of woodlands sustainably managed by community-based forest management committees in riverine areas. | Dependent on activity 1 under outcome 1.2.<br><br>Forestry Commission has put 52 ha under Community Based Forest Management as co- financing. | - |
| **Output 2.1.1**: Capacity building programme delivered in the sub-basins and the targeted Forest, Farm, and Rangeland users supported in the implementation of SLM/SFM activities in targeted production landscapes | # of Capacity building programs delivered in the sub-basins and the targeted Forest, Farm and Rangeland users in support of implementation of SLM/SFM activities in targeted production landscapes | Baseline figures to be populated after the survey | Undertook 39 community awareness meetings for enhanced stakeholder buy-in.<br><br>FFPO assessment in progress.<br><br>FFS/APFS strategy and action plan in progress. | - |

| | | | Mapping of traditional grain production zones across all districts was conducted. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | **Co- financing with AGRITEX**: | |
| | | | 100 FFS/APFS Master trainers were selected (50 Males and 50 Females) with preliminary training ongoing. | |
| | | | 483 FFS/APFS Facilitators selected. | |
| | | | 215 FFS/ APFS established with 5 365 farmers (1 948 Males and 3 417 Females). | |
| **Output 2.1.2**: CSBs established/strengthened and tree nurseries strengthened in support of SLM and SFM | # of CSBs established/strengthened and tree nurseries strengthened in support of SLM and SFM | Baseline figures to be established after the baseline. | -Community seed bank mapping was conducted across districts to establish the existence, functionality, and current gaps of possible robust community seed bank network. | - |
| | | | -Community seed bank awareness raising meetings were held across targeted DSL-IP districts targeting local authorities, local leadership and community members. | |
| | | | The meetings were also a platform for soliciting for communal land for purposes of building seed banks establishing a community nursery. | |
| | | | - Two Community Seed Bank sites were selected (Masvingo rural and Zaka districts). | |
| | | | •Borehole drilling in both sites done | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | •Borehole solar-powered pumping installations completed in both sites. | |
| | | | •Area perimeter fencing (2-ha) Ongoing | |
| | | | •Tree nursery shed establishment (200 square meters per site) ongoing. | |
| | | | •Seed house construction to commence in the 3rd quarter of 2023. | |
| | | | -A total of 2915 kgs of small grain seeds was distributed to 600 farmers across districts for seed multiplication. | |
| **Outcome 2.2:** Key sustainable dryland commodity Value Chains established and/or strengthened | (i) # of business plans for the development of climate-resilient NUSs, NTFPs, and small livestock Value Chains under implementation | Not yet developed but the project wide target is (i) At least 15 business plans (for at least 15 FFPOs with 70 members on average) under implementation | World Vision awaiting LOA. FFPO assessment in progress. | - |
| **Output 2.2.1**: Miombo Woodlands Value Chains ("basket product approach") identified, selected, and developed along with bankable business plans | # of Miombo woodlands Value Chains ("basket product approach*) identified, selected and developed along with bankable business plans | Selected the National thematic value chain | World Vision awaiting LOA. FFPO assessment in progress. | - |
| **Output 2.2.2:** Finance and business incubation mechanisms established in support of Forest Farm Producers and their organizations | # of Finance and business incubation mechanisms established in support of Forest Farm Producers and their organizations | To be established through a baseline study | World Vision awaiting LOA. FFPO assessment in progress. | - |
| **Outcome 3.1:** Project implementation supported by an M&E strategy, based on measurable and verifiable outcomes and adaptive management principles | (i) # of evaluation reports | (i) One baseline report | Consultant engaged | - |
| **Output 3.1.1:** M & E strategy developed with relevant stakeholders, clearly defining the | •# M&E strategy developed and implemented. | One M&E strategy developed with the M&E plan, Tools, data templates, ITT, databases | Developed the following: The M&E plan. | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| expected outcomes, expected implementation timeframe, and confirmation through objectively verifiable indicators and means of verification. | • # of trainings on M&E for stakeholders<br>•Quarterly review workshops to review progress on indicators.<br>• # of Learning events to review best practices<br>•# of adaptations based on M&E results implemented within the project during implementation | | ITT<br>Data collection tools. | |
| **Output 3.2.2:** Knowledge exchanges on Dryland IP results and collaboration between neighboring countries and at regional and global levels to support mutual capacity development and learning | **(i)** # of national database strengthened to facilitate access to LD information to all relevant sectors to support LDN in Zimbabwe | **(i)** One intersectoral database gathering information from different sectors on the extent of LD and its trends, LD drivers and ecosystem health strengthened and widely used | IT/data expert engaged. | - |
| **Outcome 3.2:**<br>Data collection and knowledge sharing approach on SFM/SLM contributing to LDN assessment work improved | (i) # of national database strengthened to facilitate access to LD information to all relevant sectors to support LDN in Zimbabwe | (i) One intersectoral database gathering information from different sectors on the extent of LD and its trends, LD drivers and ecosystem health | IT/data expert engaged. | - |
| Output 3.2.2: Participatory landscape level LDN monitoring, reporting and evaluation system established and operational | (iv)# of support initiatives with the Forestry Commission in identifying environmentally-friendly and cost-effective methods to prevent and control invasive bush and tree species such as *Lantana camara* and *Vernonanthura Polyanthes* based on the lessons learned and experience from other countries in the region, and developing corresponding management strategy for invasive species in the targeted sub-basins | (iv) One initiative carried out within the landscape. | One initiative in progress for ward 17 of Zaka | - |
| | (v) # of learning visits (South-South Cooperation), regional (REM), and global learning platforms events. | (v) one learning visit (South-South Cooperation), regional (REM) and global learning platforms events. | One regional workshop was held in Zimbabwe (22-26 May 2023). | |

**4.** **Summary on Progress and Ratings**

| **Please provide a summary paragraph on progress, challenges and outcomes of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR (max 400 words)** |
| --- |
| The project has started off very well with the National Inception meeting[28] held in October 2022, and District Roll-out meetings were held from the 26th of November to the 3rd of December 2023. The project teams across operational partners have been trained on SLM, SFM, LDN, Rangeland Management etc[29]. To this end, the district teams have held 39 community meetings for enhanced project buy- in. The project has so far engaged the initial consultants to kick-start the fundamental processes such as FFPO assessment, ILUP development and stakeholder mapping and analysis to map specific interventions, beneficiaries, identify gaps and establishments of structures for project implementation and monitoring. SLM and SFM interventions are ongoing through co- financing activities in the wider landscape. |

---

[28] https://docs.google.com/document/d/1bdkt2QTF3s8u3x6yramw6VJAzSc0KEYI/edit?usp=drive_link&ouid=109331358326509161257&rtpof=true&sd=true

[29] https://docs.google.com/document/d/1chAujTWQ7-juA736qK8txkWUxom-9q3K/edit?usp=drive_link&ouid=109331358326509161257&rtpof=true&sd=true

*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.

| | FY2023 Development Objective rating[30] | FY2023 Implementation Progress rating[31] | Comments/reasons[32] justifying the ratings for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Project Manager / Coordinator** | S | S | *The project experienced teething problems but is now on course.* |
| **Budget Holder** | S | S | *Despite the initial operational challenges the project is now on course to deliver the expected outputs* |
| **GEF Operational Focal Point[33]** | S | S | *The project seems to be on course after experiencing staffing and operational challenges.* |
| **Lead Technical Officer[34]** | S | S | Project implementation is progressing well. However, the PMU need to accelerate implementation of project activities, and guided with annual work plan which consolidate each partners' contribution. |
| **GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)** | S | S | *Ratings/comments*<br>While the project initially gained momentum in implementing activities, it is important to maintain a positive trajectory. A key step towards this is establishing a routine for developing Letters of Agreements. This proactive approach will streamline the process, allowing for greater efficiency and minimizing any risk for potential delays. |

---

[30] **Development Objectives Rating** – A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.
[31] **Implementation Progress Rating** – A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project's components and activities is in compliance with the projects approved implementation plan. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.
[32] Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence
[33] In case the GEF OFP didn't provide his/her comments, please explain the reason.
[34] The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

# 5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

*This section is under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)*

Please describe the progress made to comply with the approved ESM plan. 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 indicate if new risks have emerged during this FY.

| 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** | | | | |
| Insecure land tenure systems | During implementation, the project activities will improve women's access to natural resources and ensure sustainable utilisation through the implementation of integrated land use plans.<br><br>Conflict resolution strategy will be developed to address land conflicts and boundary disputes.<br><br>The project will follow the stakeholder engagement plan assessment and planning at national and landscape level.<br><br>The project will apply and adhere to the principles/framework of the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VGGT) and stakeholders will be trained in its use. | Currently engaging consultants to develop land use plans, community mobilization strategy and conflict management strategies. | Validation and implementation of the listed plans, strategies and enhancing access to land for women through the implementation of the project Gender Action Plan. | OPs, PSC and FAO |
| **ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats** | | | | |
| | N/A | | | |
| **ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture** | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Transfer of plant diseases and pest. | The CSB management will ensure that the seeds and planting materials are free from pests and diseases according to agreed norms, especially the IPPC. The transfer of seeds across borders will take place, if needed, following international regulations on plant health (IPPC). <br><br> Involvement of key institutions such as Department of Research & Specialist Services (DR&SS) in ensuring compliance with phytosanitary plant safety requirements. | | | |
| **ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture** | | | | |
| | N/A | | | |
| **ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management** | | | | |
| Pests from transfer of seed varieties to and from the CSB and to other farmers likely to spread pests. | Refer to ESS 3 above | Refer to ESS 3 above | Refer to ESS 3 above | Refer to ESS 3 above |
| **ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement** | | | | |
| | N/A | | | |
| **ESS 7: Decent Work** | | | | |
| | Adhere to FAO's guidance on decent rural employment, promoting more and better employment opportunities and working conditions in rural areas and avoiding practices that could increase workers' vulnerability? <br><br> Respect the fundamental principles and rights at work and support the effective implementation of other international labor standards, in particular those that are relevant to the agri-food sector? | | | |
| **ESS 8: Gender Equality** | | | | |
| Gender and social exclusion | The project will develop a Gender strategy to: | The project is collaborating with | Gender action plan. | OPs |

| | | the *WeCan* network. | Incorporation of gendered and gender indicators in the project. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Ensure that the needs, priorities and constraints of both women and men are accounted for. Promote women's and men's equitable access to and control over productive resources and services. Foster their equal participation of men, women and other excluded groups in institutions and decision-making processes. | | | |
| **ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage** | | | | |
| | N/A | | | |
| **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:**

| Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission) | Current ESS risk classification Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid[35]. If not, what is the new classification and explain. |
|---|---|
| Medium | No changes |

| *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.* |
|---|
| |

---

[35] **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit (Esm-unit@fao.org) should be contacted. The project shall prepare or amend an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) or other ESS instruments and management tools based on the new risk classification (please refer to page 13 https://www.fao.org/3/cb9870en/cb9870en.pdf )

# 6. Risks

The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and also reflects any new risks identified during the project implementation (including COVID-19 related risks). The last column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in the project, as relevant.

| | Type of risk | Risk rating[36] | Identified in the ProDoc Y/N | Mitigation Actions | Progress on mitigation actions | Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Insufficient ownership of the project by local communities prevents the project from being successful and sustainable. | Low | Y | Community mobilisation systems will be strengthened. Local authorities' capacity to conduct inclusive consultation processes will be increased. The mapping of land-degradation issues and preferred solutions will be refined in a participatory manner with local communities. Community members will be empowerment through the creation and strengthening of FFPOs. The grievance mechanism will enable to identify any weaknesses in the community engagement process. Project management team to ensure that communities have been adequately consulted before any decision or action is taken. | | |
| | Sectoral ministries do not manage to collaborate efficiently. | Low | Y | The respective roles, timeline of engagement, communication streams and frequency, and collaboration means will be refined at inception using a participatory approach. | | |

---

[36] Risk ratings means a rating of the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High. For more information on ratings and definitions please refer to Annex 1.

| | Type of risk | Risk rating[36] | Identified in the ProDoc Y/N | Mitigation Actions | Progress on mitigation actions | Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | The design and validation process for the ILUPs is slower than initially planned or delays are encountered which lead to delay in implementing these plans. | Low | Y | The participatory processes for the development of the ILUPs (involving government authorities and local communities) will raise awareness and capacity on SLM and SFM from the start of the implementation period. If delays are foreseen in the validation of the ILUPs, it will be possible to start working at the local level with local authorities and community groups and organisations on the implementation of preidentified SLM and SFM practices (based on PPG assessments, and existing plans that meet the project criteria e.g. climate-resilient, gender sensitive, integrated…). | Ward level environmental action plans developed and implemented through active stakeholders' involvement. | |
| 2 | The current planning and budgeting system in place hinder the timely implementation of the ILUP. | Medium | Y | It will be specified for each ILUPs budget lines which sector is responsible. The capacity of district-level authorities on sectoral coordination and budget validation in support of the ILUPs will be strengthened. | Engagement of all key institutions in the ILUP processes | |
| 3 | Existing governance structures prevent going beyond administrative boundaries. | Medium | Y | A stocktake of previous efforts in landscape-level planning will be undertaken to gather the lessons learned. The roles of provincial- and district-level authorities will be clarified and vertical and horizontal collaboration systems at provincial and district levels will be better defined and strengthened. | Stakeholder Mapping and Analysis consultant engagement process in progress. | |

| | Type of risk | Risk rating[36] | Identified in the ProDoc Y/N | Mitigation Actions | Progress on mitigation actions | Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | The SLM and SFM interventions under Component 2 take more time than expected to generate significant and measurable benefits which hinders efficient out scaling and upscaling of SLM and SFM before the end of the implementation period. | Medium | Y | SLM and SFM interventions will be carefully selected based on existing evidence-based information and on efficient current practices under implementation in the targeted sub basins to ensure their success. The selection of the SLM and SFM interventions will consider the timeline for measurable results to be achieved to prevent any delay in the implementation of the project. | Baseline data collection will extract information on high and quick impact practices. | |
| 5 | Current economic crisis and inflation rate in Zimbabwe leads to loss of monetary value for the implementation of the project. | Medium | Y | Safety measures to prevent monetary losses through conversion to local currency will be implemented (e.g. transfers to FAO country office and/or direct payment to service provider's systems. | N/A | |
| 6 | The demand for crop, forest and rangeland products reduces or is unstable because of changes of a national or international economic crisis. | Medium | Y | The impact of any significant changes in the national and international demand on a specific product for the benefitting FFPOs will be mitigated through supporting the adoption of a basket of diversified Value Chains linked to different markets rather than one. | N/A | |

| | Type of risk | Risk rating[36] | Identified in the ProDoc Y/N | Mitigation Actions | Progress on mitigation actions | Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | Climate-induced hazards such as droughts, floods, hailstorms or pest outbreaks affect agricultural productivity over one or several seasons. | Medium | Y | Climate resilience has been and will remain a primary selection factor for the project interventions (including inter alia resilient agricultural inputs, Value Chains, and climate-resilient practices for forest, farm and rangeland management). A climate risk analysis affecting the Miombo Mopane ecoregion is available: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Ng-VWBnviBbLVHTxccbN4msvHWUSnrOy/vi ew | Community awareness on the importance of traditional grain. Traditional grain seed multiplication. Siting of weather station in progress for weather monitoring. | |

| | Type of risk | Risk rating[36] | Identified in the ProDoc Y/N | Mitigation Actions | Progress on mitigation actions | Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | Reduced financial (co-financing) support from Government, development partners, and private sector, due to limited overall funding availability resulting from the COVID-19-related economic downturn, and/or the reorientation of available funding to actions directly related to COVID-19. | Medium | Y | If there are changes in co-finance, then partners to work closely to seek alternative options for co-financing and ensure continuity of resource allocation to ongoing initiatives in project target areas | N/A | |
| 9 | Government expenditure and prioritization of different programs and sectors, including agriculture, food security and natural resources might change. | Low | Y | It is anticipated that the project scope will help to support the Government's response to COVID-19 through its focus on food security and livelihoods diversification of vulnerable communities in coastal areas already impacted by climate risks and hazards. However, project activities will be further discussed with the Government to ensure that emerging priorities and responses, as a result of the pandemic, are well reflected in the project's target areas during implementation. | N/A | |

| | Type of risk | Risk rating[36] | Identified in the ProDoc Y/N | Mitigation Actions | Progress on mitigation actions | Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **10** | Closure of offices, transport etc. will delay launch of project and its implementation. | Low | Y | It is likely that periodic closures of transport and offices as well as restrictions on organizing meetings/ training with large number of people will impact project implementation. Therefore, the project will institute local mechanisms such as local facilitators in collaboration with each Operational Partner / work with local partners to ensure that some work can continue on the ground. Detailed planning will be done with the government operational partners to mobilize their field offices and others and the project will ensure that all recommended safe practice are followed by the project team and by communities where the project is working. | Local structures already active within the landscapes. | |

| | Type of risk | Risk rating[36] | Identified in the ProDoc Y/N | Mitigation Actions | Progress on mitigation actions | Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **11** | Potential or partial disruption of food system supply chains, such as logistics<br>• Increased losses and spoilage in high value commodities/perishables.<br>• Disruption of demand for products and markets, due to temporary closure of hotels and restaurants, and reduced purchasing power. | Low | Y | Close collaboration with private sector entities and logistic companies will be maintained throughout the implementation phase to understand emerging barriers related to the pandemic and adapt the project interventions accordingly.<br>• Producer organizations will be supported in linking with online markets where possible.<br>• Local production of required inputs for SLM and SFM (e.g. seeds, seedlings, indigenous breeds) and linkages with local markets and buyers will be increased to make farmers more resilient to national and international market restrictions. | N/A | |

| | Type of risk | Risk rating[36] | Identified in the ProDoc Y/N | Mitigation Actions | Progress on mitigation actions | Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | Higher dependence on natural ecosystems and dry land forest resources, as people who lose employment and income from other sectors depend more on illegal mining (gold panning), selling of firewood and charcoal, and poaching of wildlife for their livelihoods, thereby increasing pressures on these systems. | High | Y | FAO is planning to undertake more detailed analysis on the impacts of COVID-19. Based on this findings, the project will prioritize work in more impacted areas of the project sites to strengthen community management and alternative livelihoods | Assessments ongoing | |
| **New and emerging Risks** | | | | | | |
| 1 | Politically motivated instability | Medium | N | Maintain positive, transparent communication mechanisms with government stakeholders in relation to project implementation. Maintain a strongly non-partisan stance and avoid politically volatile tense situations. | Continuously scanning and engaging with relevant authorities | |

| | Type of risk | Risk rating[36] | Identified in the ProDoc Y/N | Mitigation Actions | Progress on mitigation actions | Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | Unstable economic situation (high inflation, currency instability) | High | N | Project funds will be maintained in foreign currency to maintain value. Encourage HH, group and ISALs to invest in productive assets that hold value. | Project funds are maintained in foreign currency.<br><br>Continuous monitoring of the economic environment | |
| 3 | Pandemics (e.g Cholera outbreak) | Medium | N | Raise cholera awareness and encourage practice of hygienic behaviors | Government has cholera preparedness plans<br><br>Strict adherence to health protocols | |

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

| FY2022 rating | FY2023 rating | Comments/reason for the rating for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period |
|---|---|---|
| L | M | |

## 7. Follow-up on Mid-term review or supervision mission (only for projects that have conducted an MTR)

If the project had an MTR or a supervision mission, please report on how the recommendations were implemented during this fiscal year as indicated in the Management Response or in the supervision mission report.

| MTR or supervision mission recommendations | Measures implemented during this Fiscal Year |
|---|---|
| Recommendation 1: | |
| Recommendation 2: | |
| Recommendation 3: | |
| Recommendation….. | |
| Recommendation….. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please summarize | |

# 8. Minor project amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines[37].  Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories and provide supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

| Category of change | Provide a description of the change | Indicate the timing of the change | Approved by |
|---|---|---|---|
| Results framework | | | |
| Components and cost | | | |
| Institutional and implementation arrangements | | | |
| Financial management | | | |
| Implementation schedule | | | |
| Executing Entity | | | |
| Executing Entity Category | | | |
| Minor project objective change | | | |
| Safeguards | | | |
| Risk analysis | | | |
| Increase of GEF project financing up to 5% | | | |
| Co-financing | | | |
| Location of project activity | | | |
| Other minor project amendment (define) | | | |

---

[37] Source: https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy-2020-update

## 9. Stakeholders' Engagement

**Please report on progress and results and challenges on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan) included at CEO Endorsement/Approval <u>during this reporting period</u>.**

| Stakeholder name | Type of partnership | Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement | Challenges on stakeholder engagement |
|---|---|---|---|
| Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) | Key GEF Lead IA Member of the PSC | Oversight role | None |
| *Government institutions* | | | |
| Ministry of Environment, Climate, Tourism and Hospitality Industry (MECTHI) | Key Chair of the PSC Hosts EMA, the Lead Execution Agency | Guided the project inception and work plan and budget development, approval, and monitoring implementation, | None |
| Environmental Management Agency (EMA) | Key Direct beneficiary and Lead Executing Agency | Hosting the PMU, providing oversight, supporting project implementation through co- financing. | None |
| Land Degradation Neutrality Technical Working Group (LDN TWG) | Key | Awareness of the project. | None |
| Forestry Commission (FC) | Key Member of the PSC and Operational Partner | Co- financing SFM activities and joint work planning. | Limited resources |
| Zimbabwe Parks & Wildlife Management Authority (ZPWMA) | Key Member of the PSC and Operational Partner | Co- financing SFM activities and joint work planning. | None |
| Ministry of Lands, Agriculture, Fisheries, Water, and Rural Development (MLARR) | Key Member of the PSC | Stakeholder training on SLM and Rangeland Management. | None |
| Agritex | Key | Stakeholder training on SLM and Rangeland Management. Development of the draft FFS/ APFS strategies. Participating in seed multiplication. | None |
| National Plant Genetic Resources Centre (NPGRC) | Primary | Highly involved in Seed Multiplication through CSB approach. | None |
| Zimbabwe National Water Authority (ZINWA) Save and Runde Catchment Councils & Sub Catchment Councils | Key Member of the PSC | Participating in Project planning meetings (PSC) | None |
| Climate Change Management Department | Primary | Siting of Weather Stations. Provision of weather-related information. | None |

| (CCMD) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ministry of Local Government, Public Works and National Housing (MLGPWNH) | Key | Chairing of the Environmental Committees. Custodians of the landscapes and environmental resources. Provision of land for project sites. | None |
| Ministry of Women Affairs, Community, Small and Medium Enterprises (MWACSMEs) | Key Member of the PSC | Participated in the project roll-out meetings. Key on gender mainstreaming strategies. | None |
| *NGOs[38]* | | | |
| Community Technology Development Trust (CTDT) | Key | Mapped out the seed banks and traditional grain species. Established CSBs' networks. | None |
| World Vision | Key | Assessments of possible financial institutions. | None |
| Local Initiatives and Development (LID) Agency | Secondary | Provision of lessons on SLM and SFM best practices | None |
| United Nations Development Program (UNDP) | Primary | Collaboration for lessons learned from GEF 6 project | None |
| *Private sector entities* | | | |
| FOTE | Primary | Participation in the PSC and participation in SFM programs | None |
| | | | |
| *Others[39]* | | | |
| Local communities including women and youth groups | Primary | Beneficiaries and important stakeholders of the project | None |
| Traditional leaders (Chiefs, Headman, and Village heads) | Primary | Community mobilization and engagement. Provision of land for project sites. | None |
| Media outlets (including online and print newspapers, radio, and TV) | Secondary | Publicizing the project through media articles | None |
| National FFPOs (e.g. Zimbabwe Organic Producers Association - ZOPA | Secondary | Participated in the selection of the FFPO consultant. | None |
| *New stakeholders identified* | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

---

[38] Non-government organizations
[39] They can include, among others, community-based organizations (CBOs), Indigenous Peoples organizations, women's groups, private sector companies, farmers, universities, research institutions, and all major groups as identified, for example, in Agenda 21 of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit and many times again since then

## 10.Gender Mainstreaming

**Information on Progress on Gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable) during this reporting period.**

| Category | Yes/No | Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period. |
|---|---|---|
| Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages. | No | Gender Expert engagement process in progress. |
| Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment? | Yes | Capacity development of OPs on gender ongoing. Involvement of women and girls in environmental planning and awareness sessions. |
| Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at the project design stage): | | |
| a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources | Yes | Related to all the components of the results to be achieved. |
| b) improving women's participation and decision making | Yes | Women's involvement in key committees. |
| c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women | Yes | Women participation in CSBs. |
| M&E system with gender-disaggregated data? | Yes | Tools already have SAAD Engagement of a Gender consultant to develop gender-sensitive indicators. |
| Staff with gender expertise | Yes | Staff qualified in gender and have attended training on gender mainstreaming. |
| Any other good practices on gender | No | N/A |

## 11. Knowledge Management Activities

| Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval, <u>during this reporting period.</u> |
|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| 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. | Knowledge Management Strategy in progress with active development. |
| Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges **this year**. | Communication Strategy fully developed and currently awaiting validation[40]. |
| 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. Please indicate any Socio-economic Co-benefits that were generated by the project. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits. | Engaged a consultant to develop a website. |
| Please provide links to related website, and social media account | Currently working with a consultant to develop a website. |
| Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web. | The following material have been produced and will be uploaded to the website once the website is up.<br><br>1. Chimanimani MEV-CAM Video https://drive.google.com/file/d/1gwwlOoXg46JZtLnNPtVTiAIMq66R4h6U/view?usp=drive_link<br><br>2.Masvingo MEV-CAM Video https://drive.google.com/file/d/14yyu6DEDze4OAO_IT1BOF9vyK-1v6Fa-/view?usp=drive_link<br><br>3. Factsheet https://drive.google.com/file/d/1LgibudrnV7g_6ObEmNxSGr8tb1fvIPGU/view?usp=drive_link |
| Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's name and contact details | Abisha Damba Abisha.Damba@ema.co.zw |

---

[40] https://drive.google.com/file/d/1VwLqxu4IMD2A0PKls_utBXT-Gni1WU6v/view?usp=drive_link

# 12.Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Involvement

**Are Indigenous Peoples and local communities involved in the project (as per the approved Project Document)? If yes, please briefly explain.**

If applicable, please describe the process and current status of on-going/completed, legitimate consultations to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with the indigenous communities.

Do indigenous peoples and or local communities have an active participation in the project activities? If yes, briefly describe how.

## 13. Co-Financing Table

| Sources of Co-financing[41] | Name of Co-financer | Type of Co-financing[42] | Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval | Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2023 | Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team) | Expected total disbursement by the end of the project |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Civil Society Organization | CTDO | In kind | $217,000.00 | - | N/A | $217,000.00 |
| | | Cash | $283,000.00 | $46,000 | N/A | $283,000.00 |
| Agency's funds | EMA | In kind | $13,785,000 | $63,863 | N/A | $13,785,000 |
| | | Cash | $4,215,000 | $16,900 | N/A | $4,215,000 |
| Commission's funds | Forestry Commission | In kind | $6,900,000 | | N/A | $6,900,000 |
| | | Cash | $3,100,000 | $6, 354 | N/A | $3,100,000 |
| Authority's funds | ZPWMA | In kind | $750,000 | $19,355 | N/A | $750,000 |
| | | Cash | $750,000 | - | N/A | $750,000 |
| World Vision | World Vision | In-kind | $50,925 | - | N/A | $50,925 |
| | | Cash | $138,948 | - | N/A | $138,948 |
| GEF Agency | FAO | Grant | $4,140,306 | | N/A | $4,140,306 |
| Donor Agency | IFAD | Grant | $25,500,000 | - | N/A | $25,500,000 |
| Recipient country government | MECHTI | In-kind | $900,000 | | | $900,000 |
| | | Grant | $100,000 | | | $100,000 |
| | | TOTAL | 60,830,179 | $152,472 | | $60,830,179 |

---

[41]Sources of Co-financing may include: GEF Agency, Donor Agency, Recipient Country Government, Private Sector, Civil Society Organization, Beneficiaries, Other.
[42]Grant, Loan, Equity Investment, Guarantee, In-Kind, Public Investment, Other (please refer to the *Guidelines on co-financing* for definitions
https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_FI_GN_01_Cofinancing_Guidelines_2018.pdf

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

## Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

| **Development Objectives Rating**. A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives. | |
|---|---|
| **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 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**. A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project's components and activities is in compliance with the project's approved implementation plan. | |
|---|---|
| **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. |

| **Risk rating** will assess the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale: | |
|---|---|
| **High Risk (H)** | There is a probability of greater than **75%** that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks. |
| **Substantial Risk (S)** | There is a probability of between **51%** and **75%** that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face substantial risks |
| **Moderate Risk (M)** | There is a probability of between **26%** and **50%** that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only moderate risk |
| **Low Risk (L)** | There is a probability of up to **25%** that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only low risks |

**Annex 2.**

## GEO LOCATION INFORMATION

**The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate. Web mapping applications such as OpenStreetMap or GeoNames use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: https://coordinates-converter.com Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking here**

| Location Name | Latitude | Longitude | Geo Name ID | Location & Activity Description |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Vanyoro village Community Seed Bank Site (Zaka District) | - 20.491040 | 31.324190 | | 3 in 1 site Zaka district for Community Seed Bank (CSB) Centre; Miombo/Mopane Nurseries and Solar powered Borehole (watering nursery and related domestic use). |
| Gunikuni village Community Seed Bank Site (Masvingo rural district) | -20.521111 | 30.790833 | | 3 in 1 site in Masvingo rural district for Community Seed Bank (CSB) Centre; Miombo/Mopane Nurseries and Solar powered Borehole (watering nursery and related domestic use) |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

**Please provide any further geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions is taking place as appropriate.**

## ANNEX 3 Zimbabwe-GCP Docking Reference

**Zimbabwe-GCP Docking Reference**

**Main Documents**

| | |
|---|---|
| Summary of Global Coordination technical support provision | **DSL-IP Country Docking Template - Zimbabwe** |
| Capacity Development Plan for FFPOs | To be developed |
| Project Management Unit | **DSL-IP Zimbabwe Organogram** |

**Table 1. Country docking meetings**

| Meeting subject and date | Summary objectives | Links and materials |
|---|---|---|
| **Overview of the GEF-7 Dryland Sustainable Landscape Impact Program (DSL-IP) Southern African Countries – from global to regional to country level**<br><br>12-Jul- 2022 | 1. Who is who (virtual round table introduction)<br>2. Overview of the DSL IP Global, regional country level<br>3. Regional Exchange Mechanism (REM)<br>4. Core DSL-IP Themes (CoP + regional themes with country level examples from Zambia, Malawi and Zimbabwe)<br>5. Implementation arrangements (example Zimbabwe)<br>6. Country Docking / MEL working group | Minutes<br><br>PPT Presentation |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **DSL-IP Zimbabwe Inception Workshop and Regional Support Package**<br><br>11-Oct-2022 | Objective:<br>To introduce you to the Child Project Support Package. | Draft agenda<br>Annual workplan template<br>Monitoring and Evaluation plan (GEB template, Results Framework Template, Financial tracking Template)<br>Draft Child Project PPT<br>Draft Global & Regional DSL IP PPT<br>ToRs national steering committee<br> OPIM PPT |
| **Joint Call with Country Focal Points-GEF 7 DSL IP**<br><br>17-Oct-2022 | 1. To provide an update on the status of each Child Project.<br>2. To share the plan and preparations for the upcoming Regional Inception Workshop to be held in Harare from 28-30 November 2022 (official invitations to be sent soon).<br>3. To introduce you to the Child Project Inception Support Package that the global and regional teams have compiled. | Attendees: Angola, Botswana, Malawi, Namibia, Tanzania and Zimbabwe |
| **MEV-CAM - WeCaN Participatory Training session: Looking at PV with gender-inclusive lens**<br>12-Dec-2022 | | |
| **DSL IP Zimbabwe- 1st Onboarding Call with PMU**<br>19-Jan-2023 | 1. Get updates from the PMU on the **progress** made since the inception in October, 2022. Also feel free to include **challenges**.<br>2. Introduce the inception support package (a.k.a **Technical Assistance TOR**) | 1. n/a<br>2. DSL-IP Country Docking Template - Zimbabwe<br>3. NTFPs Core Theme Criteria Table<br>4. n/a |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | 3. Discuss the "**Core Theme**" for Zimbabwe. N/B: Each DSL IP country will champion a core theme.<br>4. Provide updates on planned **regional and global events** | |
| **Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning Working Group (MEL WG) Onboarding call**<br><br>02-Feb-2023 | Agenda:<br><br>1. Zimbabwe M&E Plan and Workplan 2023<br>2. DSL-IP Monitoring and Evaluation framework<br>3. Zimbabwe Integrated Landscape Assessment Methodology (ILAM)<br>4. MEV-CAM in Zimbabwe<br>5. DSL-IP Participatory M&E Dashboard<br>6. Project Location | 1. n/a<br>2. MEL Presentation, M&E Terms of Reference<br>3. ILAM Baseline Assessments<br>4. MEV-CAM Presentation<br>5. DSL-IP M&E Dashboard<br>6. Project Sites Shapefile |
| **Forest and Farm Producer Organization assessment work in Zimbabwe.**<br><br>23-Mar-2023 (Harare, Zimbabwe) | Objective:<br><br>Introduction to the DSL-IP FFPO and Core Theme approach<br>Introduce the FFPO assessment consultant to the PMU | |

**Table 2. Events**

| Event Title and Date | Type (Internal*/External) and Agenda | Audience |
|---|---|---|
| **DSL-IP Learning Series: Integrated Land Use Planning**<br><br>07-Mar-2023 | Internal<br><br>Agenda | 11 child projects |
| **Webinar "Sustainable management of pasture resources in Kazakhstan'**' | Objective:<br><br>Draw the attention of stakeholders and decision-makers to the importance of preventing the degradation of pastures | Agenda and content |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 13-Apr-20223 | and carrying out work to restore soil resources by addressing institutional issues in the field of pasture management | |
| **GEO-LDN Online Seminar: National approaches to mapping land degradation**<br><br>25-Apr-2023 | Seminar topic directly related to DSL-IP Community of Practice 1 on LDN Assessment and Decision Making | [Event info](#) |
| **Virtual regional webinars on integrating tenure into land restoration initiatives -**<br><br>15-17 May 2023 | Raise awareness on the value of tenure security and its contribution to biodiversity conservation, sustainable land management, ecosystem restoration, and climate change mitigation and adaptation while improving food security and local livelihoods. | [Concept note and agenda](#) |
| **DSL-IP Regional Stakeholders Workshop for Southern Africa**<br><br>22-26 May 2023, Harare, Zimbabwe. | Internal | Angola, Botswana, Burkina Faso, **Malawi**, Mozambique, Namibia, Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. |
| **2023 Project Implementation Report (1st time PIR)** | Objective:<br><br>Provide an overview of the PIR exercise, to discuss reporting on project implementation progress and challenges; the progress in implementing the Stakeholders' Engagement Plan, the Gender Action Plan, Environment and Social Safeguards and Knowledge Management activities. | 1. [PIR template](#)<br>2. [Guidance - 2023 PIR Process](#)<br>3. [Detailed guidance on completing the PIR](#) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Desertification and Drought Day 2023 - "Her Land. Her Rights: Advancing Gender Equality and Land Restoration Goals"**<br><br>Friday, 16 June 2023. | External (UNCCD)<br><br>Agenda | 11 child projects |
| **Innovation for drought and agriculture**<br>Friday, 19 June 2023**.** | External (FAO)<br><br>Agenda | 11 child projects |

*Internal events are organized by the GCP.

**Key GCP Inputs per Component**

**Component 1**

Provision of inception support package comprising of:

1. **Draft/example ToRs (PMU), including linkages to the GCP support structure**
   · National Project Coordinator
   · Monitoring and Evaluation
   · Knowledge management, stakeholder engagement, capacity development
   · Technical Experts-CSB, GVC, Rural Advisory Services
2. **Inception workshop documents**
   · Draft agenda
   · Annual workplan template
   · Monitoring and Evaluation plan (GEB template, Results Framework Template, Financial tracking Template)
   · Draft Child Project PPT
   · Draft Global & Regional DSL IP PPT
   · ToRs national steering committee
   · OPIM PPT
3. **Outreach starter package (for inception workshop)**
   · Roll up Banner (global and child project)
   · DSL-IP Brochure

Linking the Zimbabwe PMU and government focal points to the GCP implementation (country docking) structure

·     Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Working Group (to support in M&E, capacity development on M&E assessment tools and approaches, ILM best practices, lessons learning and sharing among DSL-IP M&E specialists)

·     Knowledge, capacity , outreach Working Groups (to support in linking child projects to the technical support structures that have been established; tap into capacity development opportunities resulting from the technical support package; translating them into action and learning how to disseminate those actions in a way that up, out and deepscales results and findings with other child projects, regions and beyond the IP itself)

**4.        Gender**

The GCP and executing partner IUCN have hired a gender expert to conduct a comprehensive assessment of gender considerations in the global project and in the CPs. The results will be discussed in a global gender workshop (November 2023) and flow into a 2-year action plan to address the identified gender gaps including specific, demand-based technical backstopping. Moreover the GCP has hired a behavioral change expert to conduct selected behavior change studies which will take gender aspects into close consideration.

**Component 2**

- Linking Zimbabwe to the MEL working group structure, and conducting orientation calls for the child project's baseline assessment work
- Review and alignment of Zimbabwe CP M&E plan

2. As part of the Knowledge Management, Communications, and Outreach Strategy (KCOS) working group preparatory work and subsequent country docking meetings took place to:

- Raise awareness about the CGP Technical support structure
- Define Zimbabwe project's core theme (NTFPs) based on list of criteria
- Integrate the GCP TA (Sustainable Landscape Production Framework) into the Zimbabwe CP work plan
- Finalize the FFPO assessment ToRs and initiate the assessment
- Draf the first Integrated Capacity Development and Implementation Plan

ILAM - Baseline Assessments (2019)

| Assessment Type | Description | Links to Documents |
|---|---|---|
| **Remote Sensing** | Remote sensing identification of areas led by country project teams. | • Project Locations |
|  |  |  |

| Multi-stakeholder group (MSG) discussions | Stakeholder, Policy and Capacity Assessment | • ILAM Zimbabwe - Stakeholder, Policy and Capacity Assessment.docx |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| Household Assessment | Tailored SHARP survey included questions on food security and nutrition, the use of trees and forest products by land users, access to natural resources, as well as the impacts of land degradation at farm level. | • ILAM Zimbabwe – Household Survey (SHARP).docx |
| | | |
| Value Chain Assessment | (i) Value chain assessment, (ii) Baobab analysis, (iii) Groundnut analysis, (iv) Honey and free-range chicken analysis (v) Sorghum analysis, (vi) Natural oils analysis. | • ILAM Zimbabwe – Value Chain Assessment.docx |
| | | |
| Greenhouse Gases Balance | Ex-Act tool applied to estimate emission and removals from project interventions. | • Zimbabwe Ex-Act.xls |

*Zimbabwe championing NTFPs in the project landscapes*

The Global Coordination, in exchange with the PMU in Zimbabwe, have looked into land management system options in Zimbabwe that could be leveraged by the program to counterbalance land degradation, improve livelihoods, and be upscaled through extension services and land use planning processes.
*NTFPs (and NUS)* was taken up by the Zimbabwe project as a champion theme to be further explored, as it meets different criteria set by the program, and can contribute to tackling common management challenges across the DSL-IP landscapes in Southern Africa.
Stocktaking materials can be found here: NTFPs.

*Tailored capacity development for farmers*

Upon the selection of target beneficiaries, the project will work with farmers to tailor a comprehensive curriculum on SLM/SFM that includes value chain development and crop diversification.
The Integrated Capacity Development Implementation Plan (ICDIP) for Zimbabwe is currently being developed in partnership with the Forest and Farm Facility (FFF), the Farmer Field Schools (FFS), and the Community Seed Banks (CSB) teams in FAO and their partners.

**Component 3**

- The child project participates and contributes to the DSL-IP Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning Working Group (MEL WG) having received inputs on harmonization of indicators and baseline assessment approaches (ILAM).
- Zimbabwe Results Framework and M&E system is integrated into the DSL-IP participatory M&E Dashboard. Link to M&E Dashboard: Zimbabwe M&E Dashboard