



## FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

### 2023 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

## Table of contents

|  |    |
|--|----|
| 1. BASIC PROJECT DATA .....  | 2  |
| 2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE) ..... | 4  |
| 3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP) .....  | 11 |
| 4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS .....   | 14 |
| 5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS).....                                | 16 |
| 6. RISKS .....   | 19 |
| 7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION .....                     | 25 |
| 8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS .....  | 26 |
| 9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....   | 27 |
| 10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING.....  | 29 |
| 11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES .....  | 30 |
| 12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT .....                   | 31 |
| 13. CO-FINANCING TABLE.....  | 32 |

## 1. Basic Project Data

### General Information

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Region:</b>  | RAF   |
| <b>Country (ies):</b>   | Malawi  |
| <b>Project Title:</b>   | Transforming landscapes and livelihoods: A cross-sector approach to accelerate restoration of Malawi's Miombo and Mopane woodlands for sustainable forest and biodiversity management |
| <b>FAO Project Symbol:</b>  | GCP /MLW/078/GFF  |
| <b>GEF ID:</b>  | GEF ID: 10254   |
| <b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>   | MFA   |
| <b>Project Executing Partners:</b>  | Department of Forestry and National Local Government Finance Committee  |
| <b>Initial project duration (years):</b>  | 5 years   |
| <b>Project coordinates:</b><br><i>This section should be completed ONLY by:</i><br>a) Projects with 1st PIR;<br>b) In case the geographic coverage of project activities has changed since last reporting period. | YES.<br>The geocoded data in Annex 2  |

### Project Dates

|   |              |
|---|--------------|
| <b>GEF CEO Endorsement Date:</b>  | June 8, 2021 |
| <b>Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :</b>                            | 10-Sep-2021  |
| <b>Project Implementation End Date/NTE<sup>1</sup>:</b>                   | 30-APR-2026  |
| <b>Revised project implementation End date (if approved) <sup>2</sup></b> | 30-Nov-27    |

### Funding

|   |                |
|---|----------------|
| <b>GEF Grant Amount (USD):</b>  | USD 6,350,459  |
| <b>Total Co-financing amount (USD)<sup>3</sup>:</b>   | USD 47,702,324 |
| <b>Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD):</b>   | USD 1,500,321  |
| <b>Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD)<sup>4</sup>:</b> | USD 407,353    |
| <b>Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023<sup>5</sup></b>                          | USD 5,261,230  |

### M&E Milestones

|   |                 |
|---|-----------------|
| <b>Date of Last Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:</b> | 17 January 2023 |
|---|-----------------|

<sup>1</sup> As per FPMIS

<sup>2</sup> If NTE extension has been requested and approved by the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit.

<sup>3</sup> This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO Document/Project Document.

<sup>4</sup> The amount should show the values included in the financial statements generated by IMIS.

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

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Expected Mid-term Review date<sup>6</sup>:</b>   |  |
| <b>Actual Mid-term review date (if already completed):</b>  |  |
| <b>Expected Terminal Evaluation Date<sup>7</sup>:</b>   |  |
| <b>Tracking tools (TT)/Core indicators (CI) updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)</b> | <i>[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.]</i> |

**Overall ratings**

|  |                         |
|--|-------------------------|
| <b>Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):</b> | <i>Satisfactory (S)</i> |
| <b>Overall implementation progress rating:</b>   | <i>Satisfactory (S)</i> |
| <b>Overall risk rating:</b>  | <i>Moderate (M)</i>     |

**ESS risk classification**

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| <b>Current ESS Risk classification:</b> | Moderate |
|---|----------|

**Status**

|  |                     |
|--|---------------------|
| <b>Implementation Status (1<sup>st</sup> PIR, 2<sup>nd</sup> PIR, etc. Final PIR):</b> | 1 <sup>st</sup> PIR |
|--|---------------------|

**Project Contacts**

| <b>Contact</b>                                       | <b>Name, Title, Division/Institution</b> | <b>E-mail</b>  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Project Coordinator (PC)</b>                      | Nyuma Mughogho                           | <a href="mailto:nyumamughogho@googlemail.com">nyumamughogho@googlemail.com</a> |
| <b>Budget Holder (BH)</b>                            | Dr Zhijun Chen                           | <a href="mailto:Zhijun.Chen@fao.org">Zhijun.Chen@fao.org</a>                   |
| <b>GEF Operational Focal Point (GEF OFP)</b>         | Shamiso Najira Banda                     | <a href="mailto:Shamiso_b@yahoo.com">Shamiso_b@yahoo.com</a>                   |
| <b>Lead Technical Officer (LTO)</b>                  | Edward Kilawe                            | <a href="mailto:Edward.Kilawe@fao.org">Edward.Kilawe@fao.org</a>               |
| <b>GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)</b> | Sandra Corsi                             | <a href="mailto:Sandra.Corsi@fao.org">Sandra.Corsi@fao.org</a>                 |

<sup>6</sup> The Mid-Term Review (MTR) should take place after the 2<sup>nd</sup> 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.

<sup>7</sup> The Terminal Evaluation date should be discussed with OED 6 months before the project's NTE date.

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

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

| <i>Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.</i> |  |   |                                    |   |                                   |  |                                     |
|--|--|---|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Project or Development Objective</b>  | <b>Outcomes</b>  | <b>Outcome indicators<sup>8</sup></b>   | <b>Baseline</b>                    | <b>Mid-term TargetMid-term Target<sup>9</sup></b> | <b>End-of-project Target</b>      | <b>Cumulative progress<sup>10</sup> since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023</b>  | <b>Progress rating<sup>11</sup></b> |
|  | <b>Outcome 1</b>   |   |                                    |   |                                   |  |                                     |
|  | <b>Outcome 1.1:</b><br>Enhanced multisectoral and multilevel LDN governance. | (i) Level of increase in active participation of the NCCC&DRM inter-ministerial committee and sub-national government counterparts in cross-sectoral policy revision and coordination <sup>12</sup> . | (i)Level 1 of active participation | (i)Level 3 of active participation                | i)Level 4 of active participation | Level 2<br>Inception meetings at National and District level conducted<br>PSC meeting conducted, technical meetings with partners to agree on implementation of project activities conducted | S<br>On track                       |

<sup>8</sup> This is taken from the approved results framework of the project.

<sup>9</sup> 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.

<sup>10</sup> Please report on results obtained in terms of Global Environmental Benefits and Socio-economic co-benefits as well.

<sup>11</sup> Use GEF Secretariat required 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.

<sup>12</sup> NOTE: rating scale 1-4: Level 1: (i) National LDN Voluntary targets and LDN-related new policies and strategies (e.g. National FLR Strategy; National Charcoal Strategy; etc) available; (ii) NCCC&DRM established; Level 2: (i) NCCC&DRM membership adapted to the LDN policy improvement task; (ii) NCCC&DRM members and sub-national government counterparts aware and knowledgeable on LDN-related policies and legislation; Level 3: (i) Capacity of the NCCC&DRM and sub-national government counterparts on LDN mainstreaming into policies developed; (ii) Policy Influencing Plan (PIP) produced and adopted by NCCC&DRM; (iii) at least 4 capacity building workshops (e.g. Policy Accelerators) held; Level 4: PIP implemented through (i) at least 4 policy briefs approved by NCCC&DRM and used to advocate for law improvement and/or formulation; (ii) lessons learned from LDN practices in the target landscapes integrated in at least ten sectoral policies and regulations.

|  |           |   |                                |   |   |   |               |
|--|-----------|---|--------------------------------|---|---|---|---------------|
|  |           |   |                                |   |   | In a process of engaging 2 service providers WRI and CEPA |               |
|  |           | (ii) Gender-inclusive by-laws and regulations for land use and land tenure improvements introduced in at least 75% of the target communities.   | (ii) TBD at project inception. | (ii) Gender-inclusive by-laws and regulations introduced in at least 35% of the target communities. (50% of trained leaders on policy formulation in the villages of the target landscape are women). | (ii) Gender-inclusive by-laws and regulations introduced in at least 75% of the target communities. (50% of trained leaders on policy formulation in the villages of the target landscape are women). | Not started   | S<br>On track |
|  |           |   |                                |   |   |   |               |
| <b>GCP country docking support under Component 1</b> | (General) | <p>Provision of inception support package comprising of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Draft/example ToRs (PMU), including linkages to the GCP support structure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">National Project Coordinator</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Monitoring and Evaluation</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Knowledge management, stakeholder engagement, capacity development</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Technical Experts-CSB, GVC, Rural Advisory Services</a></li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Inception workshop documents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Draft agenda</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Annual workplan template</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Monitoring and Evaluation plan (GEB template, Results Framework Template, Financial tracking Template)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Draft Child Project PPT</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Draft Global &amp; Regional DSL IP PPT</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">ToRs national steering committee</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">OPIM PPT</a></li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Outreach starter package (for inception workshop) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roll up Banner (<a href="#">global</a> and child project)</li> <li>• <a href="#">DSL-IP Brochure</a></li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p>Linking the Malawi PMU and government focal points to the GCP implementation (country docking) structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Working Group (to support in M&amp;E, capacity development on M&amp;E assessment tools and approaches, ILM best practices, lessons learning and sharing among DSL-IP M&amp;E specialists)</li> </ul> |                                |   |   |   |               |

|   |  |   |   |   |                                      |               |
|---|--|---|---|---|--------------------------------------|---------------|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 deep scales results and findings with other child projects, regions and beyond the IP itself)</li> </ul> <p>Component 1 specific - Gender:</p> <p>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 behavioural change expert to conduct selected behaviour change studies (Malawi IFES) which will take gender aspects into close consideration.</p> |   |   |   |                                      |               |
| <b>Outcome 2</b>  |  |   |   |   |                                      |               |
| <b>Outcome 2.1:</b><br>Integrated Landscape Management Plans (ILMP) incorporating LDN objectives developed and under implementation in the Balaka, Ntcheu and Mangochi Districts. | (i) Area of landscapes under ILMP. (Contributing to GEF Core Indicator 4).   | (i) No landscapes with ILPMs supporting improved practices.               | (i) ILMPs developed in the three districts' landscapes covering 420,539 hectares. | (i) ILMPs under implementation in the three districts' landscapes covering 420,539 hectares.  | Consultant on board to develop ILMPs | S<br>On track |
|   | (ii) Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity and prevent the introduction of invasive species (GEF Sub Indicator 4.1):  | (ii) No landscape area under improved management to benefit biodiversity. | (ii) 15% of landscape area (63,000 ha).   | (ii) 30% of landscape area under improved management to benefit biodiversity (126,000 ha,, covering forest areas, buffer zones among them, and riparian corridors). | Not started                          | S<br>On track |
|   | (iii) Inclusion of Tsanya (Mopane) on the CITES list to improve the conservation status of threatened species.   | (iii) Tsanya not included in CITES list                                   |   | (iii) CITIES list updated to include Tsanya   | Not started                          | S<br>On track |
| <b>Outcome 2.2:</b><br>Climate-adaptive natural resources management systems and  | (i) # of ha of agriculture land restored and sustainably managed with diversification of agroforestry species (Contributing to GEF sub indicator 3.1)  | i) No restoration so far.   | (i) 3,000 ha of agriculture land restored and sustainably managed                 | (i) 7,845 ha of agriculture land restored and under SFM sustainably managed   | Not started                          | S<br>On track |

|   |  |  |   |  |   |               |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|---------------|
| technologies for resilient landscapes applied and sustainably financed.   | (ii) # of ha of forest areas restored and sustainably managed with diversification of key Miombo & mopane woody species (Contributing to GEF sub indicator 3.2)  | (ii) No restoration so far.  | (ii) 4,000 ha of forest land restored and sustainably managed   | (ii) 8,454 ha of forest land restored and sustainably managed  | Not started   | S<br>On track |
|   | (iii) # of regionally/nationally endangered/extinct Miombo & Mopane diverse woody species conserved/reintroduced and integrated in FLR interventions   | (iii) No endangered species integrated in SLM/SFM interventions.   | (iii) 15 Miombo & Mopane endangered/extinct/diverse woody species integrated in SLM/SFM interventions.  | (iii) 30 Miombo & Mopane endangered /extinct and diverse woody species integrated in SLM/SFM interventions.                                | Not started   | S<br>On track |
|   | (iv) New financial initiatives to sustainably support the long-term implementation of ILMPs.   | (iv) No new financial initiative   | (iv) At least 1 bankable project for a financial initiative to support the ILMPs long-term implementation submitted to donor.   |  | Not started   | S<br>On track |
| <b>Outcome 2.3</b><br>Increased presence of community-suited green value chains (GVC) in the targeted landscapes, whose commodities come from the supported SLM/SFM production systems. | i) # of members of producer organizations (POs) engaged in green agri-food value chains (gender disaggregated).  | (i) Estimated 197 HH members of POs commercialize SLM/SFM produced commodities from the target value chains. | (i) Additional 2,000 members of POs (at least 1/3 women) have adopted improved technologies & post-harvest practices that allow production to comply with GVC requirements. | (i) A total of additional 10,000 members of POs (at least 1/3 women) commercialize the target commodities complying with GVC requirements. | Farm and Forest Producer Organizations (FFPOs) assessment initiated | S<br>On track |
|   | (ii) % Increase in volume of production from target producer organizations that meet GVC requirements (e.g. derived from SLM/SFM, social-responsible, quality standards, certification, food safety, value-added accruing to producers). | (ii) TBD during project inception.   | (ii) 30% increase in volume of production   | (ii) 80% increase in volume of production.   | Not started   | S<br>On track |
|   | (iii) # of producer organizations and/or buyer companies engaged in existing business incubator  | (iii) Two buyer companies marketing commodities  | (iii) 2 additional producer organizations and/or buyer companies  | (iii) At least a total of 5 producer organizations   | Not started   | S<br>On track |

|   |   |  |   |  |  |               |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|---------------|
|   | and/or accelerator programmes.  | from the targeted GVC have attended business incubator and accelerator programmes. |   | and/or buyer companies   |  |               |
|   | (iv) # of community protocols developed   | (iv) none  | (iv) TBD  | (iv) TBD   | Not started  | S<br>On track |
|   | (v) # of access benefit sharing agreements  | (v) No agreements so far.  | (v) One community protocol on access and benefit-sharing developed on a selected NTFP resource                      | (v) One agreement on access and benefit-sharing negotiated with a company interested in the selected NTFP resource, based on the community protocol. | Not started  | S<br>On track |
| <b>GCP Country Docking support under Component 2</b>  | <p>1. Linking Malawi to the <b>MEL working group</b> structure, and conduct orientation calls for the child project's ILM work<br/>Review and alignment of Malawi CP ILM ToRs to ILAM</p> <p>2. As part of the KCOS working group preparatory work and subsequent country docking meetings took place to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raise awareness about the CGP Technical support structure</li> <li>• Define Malawi project's core theme (IFES) based on list of criteria</li> <li>• Integrate the GCP TA (Sustainable Landscape Production Framework) into the Malawi CP work plan</li> <li>• Finalize the FFPO assessment ToRs and initiate the assessment</li> <li>• Draft the first Integrated Capacity Development and Implementation Plan</li> </ul> <p>See summary table (<a href="#">meetings and related documents here</a>)</p> |  |   |  |  |               |
| <b>Outcome 3</b>  |   |  |   |  |  |               |
| <b>Outcome 3.1:</b><br>Framework in place for monitoring and the transfer of lessons learned on LDN to multi- | (i) Revised National FLR Monitoring Framework incorporating LDN indicators  | (i) Incomplete National FLRMF produced in 2017.                                    | (i) Set of LDN indicators defined and validated, and process started for their incorporation into the FLR strategy. | (i) At least 80% of LDN indicators incorporated in the National FLRMF and monitored in the target landscapes   | In process of engaging WRI which will work on the frame work | S<br>On track |



## 2023 Project Implementation Report

|  |  |   |   |   |  |   |                |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|---|----------------|
|  | level policies at the national and international levels.   | (ii) Participatory monitoring systems measuring LDN in place in each of the 3 target landscapes.  | (ii) No monitoring plans exist  | (ii) Participatory monitoring systems under development in the 3 target landscapes                | (ii) Participatory monitoring systems under implementation in the 3 target landscapes        | Not started   | S<br>On track  |
|  |  | (iii) # of people reached by the project's communication and dissemination work.  | (iii) No project communication and dissemination activities at start of project | (iii) 100,000 people reached  | (iii) At least 500,000 people reached  | Not started   | S<br>On track  |
|  | <b>Outcome 3.2:</b> National and sub-national measures to deliver LDN enhanced   | (i) # of proposals for transboundary and regional initiatives addressing common management challenges in the Miombo-Mopane region.                      | (i) No actions organized by REM so far.   | (i) Regional review and identification of priorities for transboundary and regional collaboration | (i) At least 1 proposal designed and submitted to donors by the end of the project.          | Not started   | S<br>On track  |
|  | through shared collaborative opportunities at regional and global levels.  | (ii) # of transboundary/regional business initiatives focusing on NTFP value chains.  | (ii) No actions organized by REM so far.  | (ii) REM assessment of market analysis and business opportunities for SLM/SFM products            | (ii) At least 1 transboundary/regional business initiative.                                  | Not started   |                |
|  |  | (iii) % of meetings, training and exchange visits organized by the REM attended by Malawi NCP staff, partners and beneficiaries (gender disaggregated). | (iii) No actions organized by REM so far.                                       | (iii) Malawi NCP has attended at least 40% of REM organized activities (at least 1/3 women).      | (iii) Malawi NCP has attended at least 85% of REM organized activities (at least 1/3 women). | Almost 100% Attendance to On line meetings organized by GCP and REM Attendance to Regional Stakeholder workshop in Harare | HS<br>On track |
|  |  |   |   |   |  |   |                |
|  |  |   |   |   |  |   |                |
| <b>GCP Country Docking Support Under Component 3</b> | <p><b>M&amp;E specialist and National Project Coordinator onboarded in the DSL-IP Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning Working Group (MEL WG).</b> <a href="#">PPT</a></p> <p><b>M&amp;E specialist trained currently supporting the participatory DSL-IP M&amp;E Dashboard.</b> <a href="#">Access here.</a></p> <p><b>GCP support to the refinement of project intervention areas and alignment with the DSL-IP Miombo-Mopane criteria.</b></p> <p><b>Project staff received inputs and guidance on M&amp;E standards and harmonization, as well as minimum requirements for reporting.</b> <a href="#">ToRs</a></p> <p><b>The project received baseline assessment results collected during project preparation for informed decision making and refinement of interventions.</b></p> <p><b>Malawi Project sites integrated into the DSL-IP Geospatial Platform to facilitate analysis of existing remote sensing products.</b> <a href="#">Access here.</a></p> <p><b>Transboundary priorities for Malawi and Southern Africa region identified during the DSL-IP Regional Workshop for Southern Africa.</b></p> |   |   |   |  |   |                |

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 <sup>13</sup>   | Indicators<br>(as per the Logical Framework)  | Annual Target<br>(as per the annual Work Plan) | Main achievements <sup>14</sup><br>(please DO NOT repeat results reported in previous year PIR) | Describe any variance <sup>15</sup> in delivering outputs   |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| <b>Outcome 1.1</b>   |   |  |   |   |
| <b>Output 1.1.1</b><br>The Malawi National Committee on Climate Change (NCCC&DRM) empowered to mainstream and harmonize LDN into sectoral policies, and to ensure their implementation through the introduction of cross-compliant regulations and incentives. | Number of technical meetings to harmonize and mainstream LDN into sectoral policies conducted                     | 2  | 0   | The Service Provider CEPA is not yet on board to carry out this activity as the drafting of letter of agreement is taking time since it has to be cleared by FAO HQ. However, the processes are almost in the final stages. |
|  | Number of field trips to harmonize and mainstream LDN into sectoral policies conducted                            | 2  | 0   |   |
|  | Number of cross-compliant regulations and incentive developed and implemented (check with UNCCD on LDN standards) | 0  | 0   |   |
| <b>Output 1.1.2</b><br>The capacity of concerned agencies/managing bodies in the three target districts is developed to become leading actors in the planning, implementation, and monitoring of LDN at the district level.                                    | Number of agencies trained in the planning, implementation, and monitoring of LDN at the district level           | tbd  |   |   |

<sup>13</sup> Outputs as described in the project Log frame or in any approved project revision.

<sup>14</sup> Please use the same unit of measurement of the project indicators as per the approved Implementation Plan or Annual Work plan. Please be concise (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

<sup>15</sup> Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

|  |  |     |   |   |
|--|--|-----|---|---|
|  | Number of trainings in planning, implementation and monitoring of LDN at the district level.   | tbd |   |   |
| <b>Output 1.1.3</b><br>Multi-sectoral and multi-level policies and regulations are improved and disseminated, using the knowledge generated and lessons learned through LDN practice.  | Number of policies and regulations improved and disseminated, using the knowledge generated and lessons learned through LDN practices                        | tbd |   |   |
| <b>Outcome 2.1</b>   |  |     |   |   |
| <b>Output 2.1.1</b><br><u>Integrated Landscape Management Plans (ILMPs) developed in the target landscapes of Mangochi, Ntcheu and Balaka districts.</u>   | Number of ILMPs in the target landscapes of Mangochi, Ntcheu and Balaka districts developed.   | 2   | 0 | Consultant has just been engaged and PMU will fast track the development of the ILMPs   |
|  | Area under sustainable forest management   | 0   | 0 | Implementation of these activities will start after the development of the ILMPs. The ILMPs will determine the actual areas to be put under SFM and SLM                                 |
|  | Number of ILMPs in the target landscapes of Mangochi, Ntcheu and Balaka districts developed.   | 2   | 0 | Consultant has just been engaged and PMU will fast track the development of the ILMPs   |
| <b>Outcome 2.2</b>   |  |     |   |   |
| <b>Output 2.2.1</b><br>Three pools of extension agents created in each target District and empowered to deliver training and extension support on climate-resilient restoration, adaptive management and conservation priorities to sustain ecosystem services at the landscape level. | Number of pools of extension agents created in each target District and empowered to deliver training and extension support on climate-resilient restoration | 3   | 0 | Discussions with Dept of Agriculture Extension Services for the development of framework agreement on FFS training initiated, review of the curriculum in progress and this is on track |
|  | Number of ToT trainings  |     |   |   |
|  | Number of extension workers trained at ToT in each district  | tbd |   |   |
| <b>Output 2.2.2:</b><br>Community SLM actions for the sustainable intensification of diversified agro-ecological food production systems.  | Areas under Community SLM actions for the sustainable intensification of diversified agro-ecological food production systems implemented.                    | 0   | 0 | This activity has not yet started. Waiting for agreement with DAES to be in place and it is still on track  |
|  | Number of community members with knowledge and awareness   | 0   | 0 |   |

|   |   |     |   |  |
|---|---|-----|---|--|
|   | on SLM and SFM practices through enhanced access to FFS and extension services  |     |   |  |
| <b>Output 2.2.4:</b><br>Long-term financial sustainability to implement ILMPs secured by harnessing existing domestic public finance and at least one new financial initiative to regain landscape resilience through payment for ecosystem services (PES). | Number of ILMPs mainstreamed in District development plans  | 2   | 0 | Not yet started, waiting for ILMPs to be developed but it is on track  |
|   | Number of bankable projects developed   | tbd |   |  |
| <b>Outcome 2.3</b>  |   |     |   |  |
| <b>Output 2.3.2:</b><br>Capacity development program implemented for producers' organizations in the target landscapes on product diversification, processing, value chain management, business planning, quality standards and marketing.                  | Number of producer organizations registered with the Registrar General  | tbd |   | FFPO assessment underway and activity on track   |
|   | Number of producer organization trained on product diversification, processing, VC management, business planning, quality standards and marketing | tbd |   | FFPO assessment underway and activity on track   |
|   | Number of trainings conducted on product diversification, processing, VC management, business planning, quality standards and marketing           | tbd |   | FFPO assessment is under way   |
|   | Number of processing plants established   | 0   | 0 | FFPO assessment is under and activity is on track  |
| <b>Outcome 3.1</b>  |   |     |   |  |
| <b>Output 3.1.4</b><br>Malawi project benefit from tailored technical support provided from the DSL-IP in alignment with the programmatic approach  | Number of technical support inputs received from the DSL-IP incorporated into the work plan by cluster  | tbd | 0 | Online Support has been provided from GCP and REM on annual work planning, country docking and M & E working group. Through Letter of Agreement with IIED, Malawi child project has received support on FFPO assessment exercise |

## 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)**

### Progress to Date:

**Under Outcome 1**, significant achievements include the development of Terms of Reference (ToRs) for engaging service providers CEPA and WRI, finalization of the Letter of Agreement (LoA) with CEPA, and the drafting of the LoA with WRI. National and district inception workshops and a Project Steering Committee (PSC) meeting were successfully conducted.

**Under Outcome 2**, major accomplishments include the engagement of a consultant to conduct baseline and Integrated Landscape Management Plans (ILMPs) with a contract signed. Local Management Committees (LMCs) were formed in all three districts, and the assessment of Forest and Farm Producer Organizations (FFPOs) was initiated. Landscape target areas were defined, and overlapping areas with the MWASIP project were identified for building synergy. Technical meetings were also held with other executive departments.

**Under Outcome 3**, significant progress was made in the development of output indicators and targets for select outputs. Annual work plans and budgets were prepared for the 2022 and 2023 fiscal years, and two progress reports and a project inception report were also prepared.

Procurement **under Project Management Component (PMC)** is being finalized.

The child project has benefitted from programmatic support provided by the Global Coordination project as part of the tailored country docking process. Summary of Malawi's country docking meetings/events can be found in annex3.

### Challenges:

- **Delayed release of funds to the Department of Forestry:** The project faced a delay in receiving funds after submitting a request for funds and a financial report in February 2023. As a result, the implementation of project activities was slowed down, and the project was only funded in mid-May.
- **Delays by the National Local Government Finance Committee:** The National Local Government Finance Committee is the other Operational Partner besides Department of Forestry which through the target districts will implement district and community level activities mainly under component 2. It signed the OPA in May 2022. The first funds request was submitted in May 2023. The delay was as a result of lack of technical support from PMU. This delayed request for funds has impacted the initiation of district-level activities, causing a delay in their implementation. The Department of Forestry through the PMU will technical and financial support the NLGFC to make sure that the project activities are implemented according to schedule. FAO will support NLGFC with training on OPIM for smooth request for funds and financial reporting.
- **Operationalization and setup of the Project Management Unit (PMU):** Although the project was endorsed on 8 June 2021, the operationalization and setup of the PMU were not completed until September 2022. The signing of the OPA was delayed due to back and forth processes. This resulted in a loss of 15 months for project startup and implementation, affecting the project timeline and progress. To catch up with the lost time, some of the activities will be fast tracked.

**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 <sup>16</sup> | FY2023 Implementation Progress rating <sup>17</sup> | Comments/reasons <sup>18</sup> justifying the ratings for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period  |
|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>            | <b>S</b>  | <b>S</b>  | <i>Ratings/Comments</i><br>Despite the project starting late, however, the project is on track. The delayed activities will be fast tracked to catch up with the lost time  |
| <b>Budget Holder</b>                            | <b>S</b>  | <b>S</b>  | <i>Ratings/comments</i><br>The project has started on a good note, The two OPs are getting the needed support to expedite the implementation of project activities on the ground. However, there is room for improvement on disbursement of funds to the OPs  |
| <b>GEF Operational Focal Point<sup>19</sup></b> | <b>S</b>  | <b>S</b>  | <i>Ratings/comments</i><br>The project met with normal kick off challenges. It is now on track and we expect fast tracked implementation of all the delayed activities.   |
| <b>Lead Technical Officer<sup>20</sup></b>      | <b>S</b>  | <b>S</b>  | <i>Ratings/comments</i><br>The project implementation has gained good momentum recently, though lots of time were lost to get signing of OPAs and establishment of PMU. With no further delays the project implementation has been now on track.  |
| <b>GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex FLO)</b>      | <b>S</b>  | <b>S</b>  | <i>Ratings/comments</i><br>Despite initial delays, the project is now on track and demonstrating promising progress. The team is actively working to expedite the implementation of delayed activities, and the recent momentum gained is a positive indicator of its trajectory. To ensure successful implementation, it is important to provide continued support in disbursing funds to operational partners (OPs) until it becomes a routine operation. |

<sup>16</sup> **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.

<sup>17</sup> **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.

<sup>18</sup> Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

<sup>19</sup> In case the GEF OFP didn’t provide his/her comments, please explain the reason.

<sup>20</sup> 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  |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| <b>ESS 1: Natural Resource Management</b>                         |  |  |  |   |
|   |  |  |  |   |
| <b>ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats</b>       |  |  |  |   |
|   |  |  |  |   |
| <b>ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture</b>    |  |  |  |   |
| Moderate  | Promotion of sustainable agricultural intensification through the diversification of agricultural production focusing on drought tolerant, nitrogen fixing and soil stabilizing pulses (including neglected and underutilized species)     | Activities that promotes sustainable agricultural intensification have not yet started.  | Once the ILMPs are produced, focus will be on promoting the diversification of agricultural production focusing on drought tolerant, nitrogen fixing and soil stabilizing pulses (including neglected and underutilized) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PMU</li> </ul>   |
|   | Support livelihoods diversification and income generation strategy based on the sustainable intensification of productive agricultural and forestry systems and the diversification of the economy with the support to green value chains, | Assessment of the various farm and forest producer organizations is underway. These will be supported with livelihoods diversification and income activities | Currently assessment of FFPOs is going on. The shortlisted FFPOS will be supported for livelihoods diversification and income generation   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PMU</li> <li>• NLGFC</li> <li>• District Councils</li> </ul> |



|  |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|
|  | <p>Community Seed Banks will serve as hubs where local communities can conserve and exchange seeds that can be used for diversifying the agricultural systems locally. The selected seeds and planting materials will be largely derived from locally adapted crops and varieties and will be suitable to local conditions and preferences of farmers and consumers.</p>   | <p>This activity has not yet started. It's waiting for the FFPOs to be in place.</p> | <p>The same expected mitigation measure applies. Community Seed Banks will serve as hubs where local communities can conserve and exchange seeds that can be used for diversifying the agricultural systems locally.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PMU</li> <li>• NLGFC</li> <li>• District Councils</li> </ul> |
|  | <p>The CSBs and associated trainings will enable the targeted farmers and their families to conserve local varieties of their preference, multiply seeds, and distribute them within across farming communities. Management of the CSBs will ensure that the seeds and planting materials are free from pests and diseases according to agreed standards and norms, especially guided by the standards of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC). The transfer of seeds across borders will take place, if needed, following international regulations on plant health under the IPPC and access and benefit-sharing (ABS) and Prior Informed Consent (PIC) guidelines, for example through a Standard Material Transfer Agreement (SMTA).</p> | <p>Not started</p>   | <p>The same expected mitigation measure applies.</p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PMU</li> <li>• NLGFC</li> <li>• District Councils</li> </ul> |

|   |  |             |   |   |
|---|--|-------------|---|---|
|   | The project includes national level analysis on the policy and legal environment of target countries in relation to access, benefit-sharing, conservation, use and exchange of seeds and planting materials in order to ensure that CSBs activities complement, and operate within the regulatory context of Malawi. | Not started | The same expected mitigation measure applies. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PMU</li> <li>• NLGFC</li> <li>• District Councils</li> </ul> |
| <b>ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture</b> |  |             |   |   |
|   |  |             |   |   |
| <b>ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management</b>   |  |             |   |   |
|   |  |             |   |   |
| <b>ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement</b>                                   |  |             |   |   |
|   |  |             |   |   |
| <b>ESS 7: Decent Work</b>   |  |             |   |   |
|   |  |             |   |   |
| <b>ESS 8: Gender Equality</b>   |  |             |   |   |
|   |  |             |   |   |
| <b>ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage</b>                                    |  |             |   |   |
|   |  |             |   |   |
| <b>New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY</b>                                     |  |             |   |   |
|   |  |             |   |   |

In case the project did not include an ESM Plan at CEO endorsement stage, please indicate:

| Initial ESS Risk classification<br>(At project submission) | Current ESS risk classification<br>Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid <sup>21</sup> . If not, what is the new classification and explain. |
|--|---|
| M  | M   |

|   |
|---|
| <i>Please report if any grievance was received as per FAO and GEF ESS policies. If yes, please indicate how it is being/has been addressed.</i> |
| None  |

<sup>21</sup> **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit ([Esm-unit@fao.org](mailto: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 reflects also 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 <sup>22</sup> | Identified in the ProDoc Y/N | Mitigation Actions   | Progress on mitigation actions   | Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit |
|---|---|---------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 1 | Lack of political will to improve/reform/ harmonize a cross-compliant LDN-related legislative and policy framework and establish a cross-sectoral coordination mechanism. Turnover and changes in decision makers and institutional arrangements beyond the control of the project may lead to a volatile environment that hampers the long-term success of the work. | M                         | Y                            | <p>Project priorities are aligned with the international commitment of the GoM and with the most recent national strategies, policies and legislation. Support for LDN will be further strengthened through implementation of components 1 and 3 focusing on policy development, monitoring and information and awareness-raising interventions.</p> <p>The leading role of the MoNREM and MoAIWD will build robust support to LDN among technical staff from key ministerial departments that enjoy a more stable position within the administration and reducing turnover volatility.</p> <p>The empowerment of the NCCC&amp;DRM committee including representatives from relevant governmental sectors and public and private stakeholders, and the improved governance and legislation framework conveyed under Component 1 will increase the chances of long term buy-in and conduciveness.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Engaged CEPA for policy harmonization, and mainstreaming LDN principles in sectoral policies</li> <li>Planning meeting with other executing partners</li> </ul> |   |

<sup>22</sup> 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 <sup>22</sup> | Identified in the ProDoc Y/N | Mitigation Actions   | Progress on mitigation actions  | Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit |
|---|---|---------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 2 | Insufficient capacity within the concerned ministerial departments of the GoM to successfully engage in a complex, comprehensive LDN multi-sectoral and multi-level program | L                         | Y                            | Component 1 will strengthen capacity at the national level to enable NCCC&DRM members to effectively engage and coordinate multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder ILM planning and implementation processes. Capacity development efforts will also be supported by Component 3, particularly through opportunities for learning and knowledge sharing among Miombo countries. | While progress on Component 1, aimed at strengthening capacity at the national level, has not yet commenced, preparations are underway to initiate this important phase. Additionally, Component 3 is expected to positively impact capacity development efforts by providing valuable opportunities for learning and knowledge sharing among Miombo countries. |   |
| 3 | The project is unable to secure the external expertise and technical assistance required for a proper and timely implementation of the work plan.                           | L                         | Y                            | The fact that the project is nested within the wider SFM-DSL IP, the pool of expertise made available by the Global Program and the implementing partners (FAO, UNEP, and IUCN), the involvement of the FAO Headquarters and Sub-Regional Office for Southern Africa will highly minimize this risk.   | Meeting with REM and GCP PMU are conducted regularly.   |   |

|   | Type of risk  | Risk rating <sup>22</sup> | Identified in the ProDoc Y/N | Mitigation Actions  | Progress on mitigation actions  | Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit |
|---|---|---------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 4 | Local communities are reluctant to engage in or abandon the adoption of SLM/SFM in their respective landscapes. | M                         | Y                            | The project design recognizes at the outset that capacity development is a long-term endeavour requiring long-term support throughout the right implementation process. The FFS continuous coaching of farmers through highly qualified peers, with the support of experts from public and private organizations, will help consolidate the long-term adoption of SLM/SFM by land users. - The participatory nature of the development of ILM plans and selection of LDN priority interventions, together with the accompanying capacity development actions and financial mechanism (Landscape Conservation and Development Fund) will maximize community buy in. - The fact that the project interventions are clearly aimed at improving the rural economy and creating business opportunities for the communities will encourage involvement of the grassroots beneficiaries. | Despite the delayed start, the project's commitment to long-term capacity development and community engagement will ensure the adoption of sustainable land management practices. Additionally, the project's focus on improving the rural economy and creating business opportunities will encourage active participation from the grassroots beneficiaries. |   |

|   | Type of risk  | Risk rating <sup>22</sup> | Identified in the ProDoc Y/N | Mitigation Actions   | Progress on mitigation actions | Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit |
|---|---|---------------------------|------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|---|
| 5 | Project interventions fail to be gender inclusive   | L                         | Y                            | <p>The project recognizes the gender constraints of women-headed households in terms land tenure rights, access to capacity enhancement programs, access to finance, technologies, inputs, labour, etc. Capacity enhancement interventions will address the specific role, constraints and needs of women in rural development, with concrete awareness raising and training activities to strengthen women leadership and secure their land rights and effective involvement in SLM/SFM/Green value chains.</p> <p>Gender balanced targets will be applied in capacity enhancement participation and access to finance for investments in SLM/SFM/Green VC.</p>   | Not started                    |   |
| 6 | Lack of effective and sustainable capacity enhancement interventions (organizational/institutional, enabling environment) | M                         | Y                            | <p>The project build on the assumption that collectively, forest and farm producers have the potential to achieve Sustainable Development Goals and to respond to climate change at the landscape scale. All capacity enhancement interventions at local level will provide support direct financial support and technical assistance to strengthen forest and farm producer organizations representing smallholders and women's groups. Access to finance through the Landscape Conservation and Development Fund will target trained women and men formally or informally participate or are members of forest and farm producers clubs, producers organizations, forest block management committees, etc.</p> | FFPO assessment initiated      |   |

|   | Type of risk   | Risk rating <sup>22</sup> | Identified in the ProDoc Y/N | Mitigation Actions   | Progress on mitigation actions            | Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit |
|---|--|---------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 7 | Current and future climate change impacts threaten the sustainability of SLM/SFM investments | M                         | Y                            | <p>The project seeks to restore and enhance the ecosystem services provided by resilient landscapes that support sustainable livelihoods. In doing so, the objective of strengthening resiliency to anticipated climate impacts will be embedded into ILM planning and all SLM/SFM investments. - The project SLM will support investments in drought-resistant crop species and varieties (pigeon pea and sorghum) that CC scenarios for Malawi consider the best climate-adapted to the target district. Additional tree enhancement in farmland and production diversification will strengthen producers' resilience. An analysis on the climate risks affecting the Miombo-Mopane region is available here:</p> <p><a href="https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Ng-VWBnviBbLVHTxccbN4msvHWUSnrOy/view">https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Ng-VWBnviBbLVHTxccbN4msvHWUSnrOy/view</a></p> | Recruited the consultant for ILM planning |   |

|   | Type of risk  | Risk rating <sup>22</sup> | Identified in the ProDoc Y/N | Mitigation Actions  | Progress on mitigation actions | Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit |
|---|---|---------------------------|------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|---|
| 8 | The private sector is reluctant to invest in LDN due to lack of information, experience, and un-conductive framework for LDN finance.             | L                         | Y                            | A key emphasis of Outcome 2.3 will be to strengthen links between national buyer companies and value chain actors in the target landscapes, so that investments in training and equipping local producer organizations with their members producing high quality commodities through SLM and SFM result in favourable conditions for solid contract agreements with national companies. On the other hand, the project will support the participation of selected buyer companies already trading with commodities from the target value chains in business incubator/accelerator initiatives to improve their ability to access green markets and enhance their social and environmental corporate responsibility. | Not started                    |   |
| 9 | The COVID-19 crisis extends over time and has operational impacts on the implementation and institutional/governance arrangements of the project. | M                         | Y                            | -Mitigate social distancing requirements by enhancing IT support and funding. Review and adjust implementation and stakeholder engagement arrangements to compensate staff shortages, reorientation of institutional priorities and social distancing. -Adjust stakeholders' engagement plans, adopt higher flexibility and adaptive management and use remote communication whenever possible.   | No longer a risk               |   |

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 |
|---------------|---------------|--|
|               | 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 <u>during this Fiscal Year</u> |
|--|---|
| Recommendation 1:                          | Not applicable                                      |
| Recommendation 2:                          | Not applicable                                      |
| Recommendation 3:                          | Not applicable                                      |

|  |                |
|--|----------------|
| Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please summarize | Not applicable |
|--|----------------|

## 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<sup>23</sup>. 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                             | None  |                                   |             |
| Components and cost                           | None  |                                   |             |
| Institutional and implementation arrangements | None  |                                   |             |
| Financial management                          | None  |                                   |             |
| Implementation schedule                       | Endorsed on June 21 but started Sept 2022 due to late signing of the OPAs and setting up of the PMU. The delays in signing the OPAs were due to back and forth processes of signing the OPA |                                   |             |
| Executing Entity                              | None  |                                   |             |
| Executing Entity Category                     | None  |                                   |             |
| Minor project objective change                | None  |                                   |             |
| Safeguards                                    | None  |                                   |             |
| Risk analysis                                 | None  |                                   |             |
| Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%    | None  |                                   |             |
| Co-financing                                  | None  |                                   |             |
| Location of project activity                  | None  |                                   |             |
| Other minor project amendment (define)        | None  |                                   |             |

<sup>23</sup> 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   |
| <b>Government institutions</b>   |                              |  |  |
| Dept of Agriculture Extension Services (DAES)<br>Christine Chidaya   | Implementation partner       | Discussions on FFS curriculum  | Smooth discussions were held regarding the FFS curriculum, and no significant challenges were encountered during the process.  |
| Dept of Environmental Affairs, Dept of National Parks and Wildlife, Dept of Fisheries, Dept of Land Resources Conservation, and DAES<br>Mphatso Kalembe, Davis Chogawana, Davis Kalima, Chikondi Pasani, Joseph Kanyangalazi, Christine Chidaya                | Implementation partner       | Technical planning meeting and discussing work plan activities   | The technical planning meeting was conducted successfully, and the discussions on work plan activities went smoothly without any notable challenges.   |
| National Local Government Finance Committee<br>Paul Chipeta, Stanley Chuthi, Linda Kapanda, Lloyd Sinoya   | Executing agency             | Work planning and budgeting  | Work planning and budgeting processes have been smoothly executed without encountering any significant challenges.   |
| District Councils of Mangochi, Balaka and Ntcheu<br><a href="#">Participants lists to Formation of LMCs.doc</a><br><a href="#">Participants to Formulation of M&amp; E Indicators.doc</a><br><a href="#">Participants to District Inception Workshops.docx</a> | Indirect beneficiaries       | Inception workshops, and formation of landscape management committees, formulation of M & E indicators | Encountered budget constraints for further engagement with the districts due to delays in release of funds.  |
| <b>NGOs<sup>24</sup></b>   |                              |  |  |
| CEPA<br>Herbert Mwalukomo<br>Alfred Kambwiri   | Service Provider through LoA | Developed and agreed on ToRs, drafted a letter of agreement for engaging CEPA                          | Took proactive steps in developing and finalizing Terms of Reference (ToRs) and successfully drafted a comprehensive letter of agreement to engage the CEPA (Community Engagement and Public Awareness) team. Overcame any potential challenges in this process. |
| WRI<br>Spencer Ngóma   | Service Provider through LoA | Developed and agreed on ToRs   | ToRs were successfully developed and agreed upon, despite facing some delays in engagement due to the tight  |

<sup>24</sup> Non-government organizations

|                                    |  |  |   |
|------------------------------------|--|--|---|
|                                    |  |  | timeframe for project inception and the rapid rollout of activities. The situation has stabilised now and effort are on expediting the engagement of the service Provider |
| <b>Private sector entities</b>     |  |  |   |
| -                                  |  |  |   |
| <b>Others<sup>25</sup></b>         |  |  |   |
| -                                  |  |  |   |
| <b>New stakeholders identified</b> |  |  |   |
| -                                  |  |  |   |
|                                    |  |  |   |

---

<sup>25</sup> 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.                          | yes  | The gender action plan was developed and is readily available for utilization, although it has not been implemented yet due to lack of expertise However, segregated and gender target indicators are under formulation.   |
| Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?                           | yes  | Yet to be initiated  |
| Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage): |  |  |
| a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources  | Component 2  | Activities not yet initiated CEPA has been commissioned to assess men and women's rights to land and make recommendations to address disparities.  |
| b) improving women's participation and decision making  | Component 1 and 3                                  | Activities not yet initiated. The Project's target is to build capacity of women for equitable representation and participation in all activities and decision making bodies to achieve 50% participation  |
| c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women   | Component 2  | Activities not yet initiated. The project will target gender responsive green value chains and equitable access to resources to be provide by the project  |
| M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?  | Indicators are available in the gender action plan | <i>Please provide progress on gender sensitive indicators of the project results framework.</i><br>The project result framework which is under formulation will include gender sensitive indicators as highlighted in the gender action plan                     |
| Staff with gender expertise   | none   | The project does not intend to recruit a gender expert. However, the Malawi child project will benefit from the knowledge hub on Community of Practice 3, WeCAN. The project staff will be trained on how to mainstream gender issues in the project activities. |
| Any other good practices on gender  | -  | -  |

### 11. Knowledge Management Activities

| Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval, during this reporting period.  |   |
|--|---|
| 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.   | The project is in the processing of recruiting the Knowledge Management and Communication Expert who will develop the strategy and document good practices. The project is in infancy stage hence no good practices to share yet  |
| Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges <b>this year</b> .  | CEPA will produce the communication strategy/ plan in first half of year 2  |
| 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. | Implementation of activities not yet started. Once the activities will start, successes stories especially those in line with the core theme which is the Integrated Food and Energy Systems and other focus areas will be shared |
| Please provide links to related website, social media account  | The link will be shared as soon as the website will be finalised.   |
| Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.  | The Country docking has information pertaining to Malawi child project and this is support by GCP   |
| Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's name and contact details   | The communication focal point is In the process of being recruited.   |

## 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.*

While local communities will be involved in the project, they are not yet actively engaged on the ground. Currently consultations are being conducted to ensure their meaningful participation in the project activities.

## 13. Co-Financing Table

| Sources of Co-financing <sup>26</sup> | Name of Co-financer                       | Type of Co-financing <sup>27</sup> | 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 |
|---------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| Recurrent Expenditure                 | Department of Forestry                    | In kind                            | US\$1,608,000                                  | USD321,600                                 |  | US\$1,608,000   |
| Recurrent Expenditure                 | Department of Land Resources Conservation | In kind                            | US\$838,000                                    | USD154,000                                 |  | US\$838,000   |
| Recurrent Expenditure                 | DAES                                      | In kind                            | USD740,000                                     | USD136,000                                 |  | USD740,000  |
| Recurrent Expenditure                 | Dept of National Parks and Wildlife       | In kind                            | USD456,000                                     | USD83,600                                  |  | USD456,000  |
| Recurrent Expenditure                 | Ministry of Local Government              | In kind                            | USD2,560,000                                   | USD512,000                                 |  | USD2,560,000  |
| Recurrent Expenditure                 | Dept of Environmental Affairs             | In kind                            | USD486,000                                     | USD97,200                                  |  | USD486,000  |
| Recurrent Expenditure                 | Dept of Fisheries                         | In kind                            | USD305,000                                     | USD56,000                                  |  | USD305,000  |
| Investment Mobilized                  | USAID and UKAID                           | Grant                              | USD3,460,000                                   | USD0                                       |  | USD3,460,000  |
|                                       |   | In kind                            | USD1,400,000                                   | USD0                                       |  | USD1,400,000  |
| Investment Mobilized                  | FAO                                       | Grant                              | USD31,300,000                                  | USD3,843,005                               |  | USD31,300,000   |
| Investment Mobilized                  | FAO                                       | Grant                              | USD4,549,324                                   | USD57,825                                  |  | USD4,549,324  |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                          |   |                                    | <b>USD47,702,324</b>                           | <b>USD5,261,230</b>                        |  | <b>USD47,702,324</b>                                  |

**Please explain any significant changes in project co-financing since Project Document signature, or differences between the anticipated and actual rates of disbursement?**  
 One of the project (Kulima project) that is co-financing this project is coming to an end in December 2023. So the co-finance will not be available as planned.

<sup>26</sup>Sources of Co-financing may include: GEF Agency, Donor Agency, Recipient Country Government, Private Sector, Civil Society Organization, Beneficiaries, Other.

<sup>27</sup>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](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_FI_GN_01_Cofinancing_Guidelines_2018.pdf)



## Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

| <b>Development Objectives Rating.</b> A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives. |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</b>  | Project is expected to achieve or exceed <b>all</b> its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”   |
| <b>Satisfactory (S)</b>  | Project is expected to achieve <b>most</b> of its <b>major</b> global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings  |
| <b>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</b>  | Project is expected to achieve <b>most</b> of its major <b>relevant</b> 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 |
| <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</b>  | Project is expected to achieve its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to <b>achieve only some</b> of its major global environmental objectives  |
| <b>Unsatisfactory (U)</b>  | Project is expected <b>not</b> to achieve <b>most</b> of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits   |
| <b>Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)</b>  | The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, <b>any</b> of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits  |

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

| <b>Risk rating</b> 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: |  |
|--|--|
| <b>High Risk (H)</b>   | There is a probability of greater than <b>75%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.                  |
| <b>Substantial Risk (S)</b>  | There is a probability of between <b>51%</b> and <b>75%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face substantial risks  |
| <b>Moderate Risk (M)</b>   | There is a probability of between <b>26%</b> and <b>50%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only moderate risk |
| <b>Low Risk (L)</b>  | There is a probability of up to <b>25%</b> 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                |
|--------------------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|--|
| <a href="#">Balaka</a>   | -15.0317759   | 35.062587    |             | Balaka District Inception workshop             |
| <a href="#">Ntcheu</a>   | -14.818227    | 34.767276    |             | Ntcheu District Inception workshop             |
| <a href="#">Mangochi</a> | -14.139548    | 35.022008    |             | Mangochi District Inception workshop           |
| <a href="#">Lilongwe</a> | -13.9875107   | 33.768144    |             | Lilongwe National Inception workshop           |
| <a href="#">Balaka</a>   | -15.0317759   | 35.062587    |             | Formation of LMCs in Balaka District           |
| <a href="#">Ntcheu</a>   | -14.818227    | 34.767276    |             | Formation of LMCs in Ntcheu District           |
| <a href="#">Mangochi</a> | -14.139548    | 35.022008    |             | Formation of LMCs in Mangochi District         |
| <a href="#">Mangochi</a> | -14.307734259 | 35.117773041 |             | Project Steering Committee Meeting in Mangochi |
| <a href="#">Mponela</a>  | -13.529718339 | 33.73712765  |             | Mponela motor vehicle bid evaluation           |

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

## Annex 3: Malawi-GCP Docking Reference

**Malawi-GCP Docking Reference**Link to Document: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/193jrI2Udr3dPE2DCdjl9K1IKdwdNeT3A3gWTZ0cXQoI/edit?usp=sharing>**Main Documents**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Summary of Global Coordination technical support provision | <a href="#">DSL-IP Country Docking Template - Malawi</a>                |
| Capacity Development Plan for FFPOs                        | <a href="#">Integrated Capacity Development and Implementation Plan</a> |

**Table 1. Country docking meetings**

| Meeting subject and date  | Summary objectives   | Links and materials   |
|---|--|---|
| <p><b>Overview of the GEF-7 Dryland Sustainable Landscape Impact Program (DSL-IP) Southern African Countries – from global to regional to country level</b></p> <p>12 July 2022</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Who is who (virtual round table introduction)</li> <li>Overview of the DSL IP Global, regional country level</li> <li>Regional Exchange Mechanism (REM)</li> <li>Core DSL-IP Themes (CoP + regional themes with country level examples from Zambia, Malawi, and Zimbabwe)</li> <li>Implementation arrangements (example Zimbabwe)</li> <li>Country Docking / MEL working group</li> </ol> | <p><a href="#">Minutes</a></p> <p><a href="#">PPT Presentation</a></p>  |
| <p><b>Meeting with Malawi-GEF 7 DSL IP-Update on Progress</b></p> <p>05-Oct-2022</p>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Status of PMU</li> <li>PSC Composition</li> <li>National Inception workshop</li> <li>OPA</li> </ol>   | <p><a href="#">Inception Package</a> (includes AWP template, and sample TORs for core technical experts-GVC expert, Rural advisory services specialists)</p> <p><a href="#">Minutes</a></p> |

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <p><b>Joint Call with Country Focal Points-GEF 7 DSL IP</b></p> <p>17-Oct-2022</p>                              | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To provide an update on the status of each Child Project.</li> <li>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).</li> <li>To introduce you to the Child Project Inception Support Package that the global and regional teams have compiled.</li> </ol>   | <p>Attendees: Angola, Botswana, Malawi, Namibia, Tanzania, and Zimbabwe</p>   |
| <p><b>Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning Working Group (MEL WG) Onboarding call.</b></p> <p>19-Oct-2022</p>   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Onboard the M&amp;E specialist and PMU members into the MEL Working Group</li> <li>Present and discuss the GEF project cycle.</li> <li>Provide M&amp;E Guidance (ToRs)</li> <li>Introduce the Integrated Landscape Assessment Methodology (ILAM) and hand over of baseline assessment reports</li> <li>Train the M&amp;E specialist on the <b>DSL-IP M&amp;E Dashboard</b> for participatory monitoring.</li> <li>MEV-CAM in Malawi</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2: <a href="#">MEL WG Presentation</a></li> <li>3: <a href="#">M&amp;E Terms of Reference</a></li> <li>4: ILAM <a href="#">Baseline Assessments</a></li> <li>5: <a href="#">DSL-IP M&amp;E Dashboard</a></li> <li>6: <a href="#">MEV-CAM Malawi PPT</a></li> <li>7: <a href="#">Minutes</a></li> </ol> |
| <p><b>Working session on “country docking” in preparation for the inception workshop</b></p> <p>18-Nov-2022</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Update from PMU members on preparation status and inception workshop date</li> <li>Clarifications of “country docking” package (see country docking template - links/material)</li> <li>Who-is-who PMU organogram</li> </ol>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">GCP PPT Presentation</a></li> <li><a href="#">Malawi CP PPT Presentation</a></li> <li><a href="#">DSL-IP Country Docking Template - Malawi</a></li> <li><a href="#">Country PMU Organogram</a></li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>MEL meeting in preparation of the inception workshop</b></p> <p>30-Nov-2022</p>                           | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2023 Work plan</li> <li>Sustainable Landscape Production Framework (SLPF) and Integrated Landscape Assessment Methodology (ILAM) integration</li> <li>M&amp;E framework finalization</li> </ol>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">Malawi M&amp;E PPT</a></li> <li><a href="#">Malawi AWP (Draft)</a></li> <li><a href="#">Malawi AWP PPT</a></li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>MEL bilateral- Malawi Assessment Work</b></p> <p>18-Jan-2023</p>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Present the Forest and Farm Producer Organizations (FFPOs) approach and ToRs for FFPO assessment</li> <li>Present CoP1 and Cluster 1 of the DSL-IP Technical Assessment Package (ILM)</li> <li>Alignment of M&amp;E matrix and indicators (revision and inclusion of an indicator to account for the technical support provided by the DSL-IP Global Coordination (GCP))</li> </ol>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">ToRs of FFPO Assessment</a></li> <li><a href="#">DSL-IP TA Assistance ToRs</a></li> <li><a href="#">Minutes</a></li> </ol>   |
| <p><b>Malawi-2nd Onboarding Call-DSL IP</b></p>   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Updates on (i) ILUPs consultancy, (ii) PSC meeting held on Jan 16/17 (iii) Any upcoming regional/national events that are of relevance to the DSL IP.</li> </ol>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">PPT presentation</a></li> <li><a href="#">Minutes</a></li> </ul>   |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| 16-Mar-2023  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Feedback/questions. Ref. document: <i>Country Docking template/Technical Assistance TORs</i>.</li> <li>3. Core Activities-FFPOs Assessment</li> </ol>   |   |
| <b>DSL IP Malawi-Follow-up Call-FFPOs Assessment Work</b><br><br>24-Mar-2023   | Forest and Farm Facility (FFF) team introduced Mr Stephen Mwangi, national consultant.<br>Share the refined roadmap with clear timelines.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Minutes</a></li> </ul>   |
| <b>DSL IP Malawi - SLPF Technical Backstopping Meeting</b><br><br>19-June-2023 | <p style="text-align: center;"><a href="#">Agenda</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jointly review and discuss the findings of the FFPO assessment</li> <li>• Develop FFPO selection criteria (rating table)</li> <li>• Identification of most eligible FFPOs (based on assessment results and consultation with PMU)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Preliminary Draft FFPOs Assessment Report Vo</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">FFPO Assessment List Malawi Rev (by IIED 14-Jun)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">DRAFT FFPO selection criteria</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">GEF 7 Target Area and Selection of Villages March 2023</a></li> </ul> |

**Table 2. Events**

| Event Title and Date   | Type (Internal*/External) and Agenda  | Audience  |
|--|---|---|
| <b>DSL-IP Learning Series: Integrated Land Use Planning</b><br><br>07-Mar-2023                 | <p style="text-align: center;">Internal</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><a href="#">Agenda</a></p>   | <p style="text-align: center;">11 child projects</p>                  |
| <b>Webinar “Sustainable management of pasture resources in Kazakhstan”</b><br><br>13-Apr-20223 | <p>Objective:</p> <p>Draw the attention of stakeholders and decision-makers to the importance of preventing the degradation of pastures and carrying out work to restore soil resources by addressing institutional issues in the field of pasture management</p> | <p style="text-align: center;"><a href="#">Agenda and content</a></p> |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <b>GEO-LDN Online Seminar: National approaches to mapping land degradation</b><br><br>25-Apr-2023   | Seminar topic directly related to DSL-IP Community of Practice 1 on LDN Assessment and Decision Making | <a href="#">Event info</a>   |
| <b>DSL-IP Regional Stakeholders Workshop for Southern Africa</b><br><b>22-26 May, Harare, Zimbabwe</b>  | Internal   | Angola, Botswana, Burkina Faso, <b>Malawi</b> , Mozambique, Namibia, Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. |
| <b>Desertification and Drought Day 2023 - "Her Land. Her Rights: Advancing Gender Equality and Land Restoration Goals"</b><br><br>Friday, 16 June 2023. | External (UNCCD)<br><br><a href="#">Agenda</a>   | 11 child projects  |
| <b>Innovation for drought and agriculture</b><br>Friday, 19 June 2023.  | External (FAO)<br><br><a href="#">Agenda</a>   | 11 child projects  |

\*Internal events are organized by the GCP.

## Key GCP Inputs per Component and Outcome

### 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 Malawi 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 (Malawi IFES) which will take gender aspects into close consideration.

#### **Component 2**

- Linking Malawi to the MEL working group structure, and conducting orientation calls for the child project's ILM work.

- Review and alignment of Malawi CP ILM ToRs to ILAM

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 Malawi project's core theme (IFES) based on list of criteria
- Integrate the GCP TA (Sustainable Landscape Production Framework) into the Malawi CP work plan
- Finalize the FFPO assessment ToRs and initiate the assessment
- Draft the first Integrated Capacity Development and Implementation Plan

### **Outcome 2.1**

The DSL-IP Global Coordination has reviewed the Terms of Reference of the service provided that will develop the project's Integrated Landscape Management Plans (ILMP) in the target landscapes of Mangochi, Ntcheu and Balaka districts. Inputs were provided to enhance its technical scope, as well as and leveraging on the Integrated Landscape Assessment Methodology (ILAM) reports for evidence-based decision making.

[ILAM - Baseline Assessments \(2019\)](#)

| <b>Assessment Type</b>                           | <b>Description</b>  | <b>Links to Documents</b>   |
|--|---|---|
| <b>Remote Sensing</b>                            | Landscape characterization using existing global layers through EarthMap  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">ILAM Malawi – EarthMap Watershed Characterization.docx</a></li> </ul>                              |
| <b>Remote Sensing</b>                            | Broader watershed/landscape and baseline locations according to DSL-IP criteria and endorsed project document   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Project Location PPT</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Watershed Google Earth Files (.kml)</a></li> </ul> |
| <b>Remote Sensing</b>                            | Open Foris Collect Earth Assessment using the <a href="#">Africa DEAL Methodology</a>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">ILAM Malawi – Collect Earth/Africa Deal Survey.docx</a></li> </ul>                                 |
| <b>Multi-stakeholder group (MSG) discussions</b> | Land degradation/sustainable land and forest management (LD/SLM/SFM) assessments in the Ntcheu: Dzonzi and Mangochi: Monkey Bay areas   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">ILAM Malawi - Land Degradation and SLM Assessment – Malawi.docx</a></li> </ul>                     |
| <b>Household Assessment</b>                      | The 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">ILAM Malawi – Household Survey (SHARP)</a></li> </ul>  |



|                               |  |   |
|-------------------------------|--|---|
| <b>Value Chain Assessment</b> | (i) Value chain recommendations, (ii) Markets analysis, (iii) Community visits, (iv) Alternative livelihood options, (v) Forestry management schemes, (vi) potential implementation partners and other stakeholders. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">ILAM Malawi – Value Chain Assessment.docx</a></li> </ul> |
| <b>LDN Checklist</b>          | List of LDN criteria met by the project.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Malawi LDN checklist.docx</a></li> </ul>                 |

### **Outcome 2.2 and 2.3**

#### *Malawi championing the Integration of food and energy systems in the project landscapes*

The Global Coordination, in exchange with the PMU in Malawi, have looked into land management system options in Malawi that could be leveraged by the program to counterbalance land degradation, improve livelihoods, and be upscaled through extension services and land use planning processes.

*Integrated Food and Energy System (IFES)* was taken up for the Malawi 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: [IFES](#).

#### *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 Malawi 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.

Link to document: [Malawi Integrated Capacity Development and Implementation Plan](#)

### **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).
- Malawi Results Framework and M&E system is integrated into the DSL-IP participatory M&E Dashboard. Link to M&E Dashboard: [Malawi M&E Dashboard](#)