



## **Integrated landscape management to reverse degradation and support the sustainable use of natural resources in the Mopane-Miombo belt of Northern Namibia**

### **Part I: Project Information**

#### **Name of Parent Program**

**Sustainable Forest Management Impact Program on Dryland Sustainable Landscapes**

#### **GEF ID**

**10251**

#### **Project Type**

FSP

#### **Type of Trust Fund**

GET

#### **CBIT/NGI**

CBIT

NGI

#### **Project Title**

Integrated landscape management to reverse degradation and support the sustainable use of natural resources in the Mopane-Miombo belt of Northern Namibia

#### **Countries**

Namibia

**Agency(ies)**

FAO

**Other Executing Partner(s):**

Ministry of Environment, Forestry and Tourism (MEFT), Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Land Reform (MAWLR)

**Executing Partner Type**

Government

**GEF Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Taxonomy**

Focal Areas, Forest, Forest and Landscape Restoration, REDD - REDD+, Drylands, Climate Change, Climate Change Mitigation, Technology Transfer, Agriculture, Forestry, and Other Land Use, Financing, Biodiversity, Financial and Accounting, Payment for Ecosystem Services, Conservation Finance, Biomes, Tropical Dry Forests, Desert, Grasslands, Protected Areas and Landscapes, Productive Landscapes, Terrestrial Protected Areas, Community Based Natural Resource Mngt, Mainstreaming, Forestry - Including HCVF and REDD+, Agriculture and agrobiodiversity, Land Degradation, Land Degradation Neutrality, Carbon stocks above or below ground, Land Productivity, Land Cover and Land cover change, Sustainable Land Management, Ecosystem Approach, Restoration and Rehabilitation of Degraded Lands, Community-Based Natural Resource Management, Sustainable Agriculture, Sustainable Fire Management, Drought Mitigation, Improved Soil and Water Management Techniques, Income Generating Activities, Sustainable Pasture Management, Sustainable Forest, Integrated and Cross-sectoral approach, Sustainable Livelihoods, Influencing models, Convene multi-stakeholder alliances, Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making, Demonstrate innovative approach, Transform policy and regulatory environments, Deploy innovative financial instruments, Stakeholders, Private Sector, Individuals/Entrepreneurs, Large corporations, Financial intermediaries and market facilitators, SMEs, Capital providers, Beneficiaries, Civil Society, Community Based Organization, Academia, Non-Governmental Organization, Local Communities, Type of Engagement, Participation, Consultation, Information Dissemination, Partnership, Communications, Behavior change, Education, Awareness Raising, Indigenous Peoples, Gender Equality, Gender results areas, Access to benefits and services, Access and control over natural resources, Capacity Development, Knowledge Generation and Exchange, Participation and leadership, Gender Mainstreaming, Sex-disaggregated indicators, Women groups, Gender-sensitive indicators, Capacity, Knowledge and Research, Knowledge Generation, Targeted Research, Learning, Theory of change, Indicators to measure change, Adaptive management, Innovation

**Rio Markers**

**Climate Change Mitigation**

Climate Change Mitigation 1

**Climate Change Adaptation**

Climate Change Adaptation 1

**Submission Date**

6/18/2019

**Expected Implementation Start**

5/1/2021

**Expected Completion Date**

4/30/2026

**Duration**

60In Months

**Agency Fee(\$)**

551,725.00

**A. FOCAL/NON-FOCAL AREA ELEMENTS**

<b>Objectives/Programs</b>	<b>Focal Area Outcomes</b>	<b>Trust Fund</b>	<b>GEF Amount(\$)</b>	<b>Co-Fin Amount(\$)</b>
IP SFM Drylands	Dryland Landscapes Sustainably managed	GET	6,130,275.00	172,550,000.00
			<b>Total Project Cost(\$)</b>	<b>172,550,000.00</b>

**B. Project description summary**

**Project Objective**

To initiate a transformational shift towards sustainable, integrated management of multi-use dryland landscapes in northern Namibia, building on Land Degradation Neutrality principles

<b>Project Component</b>	<b>Financing Type</b>	<b>Expected Outcomes</b>	<b>Expected Outputs</b>	<b>Trust Fund</b>	<b>GEF Project Financing(\$)</b>	<b>Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
COMPONENT 1 Developing enabling frameworks for applying LDN at national and landscape levels	Technical Assistance	<p><b>Outcome 1.1</b> LDN policy, regulatory and participatory planning frameworks developed or strengthened and harmonized.</p> <p><b>Outcome 1.2</b> Integrated land-use planning for LDN applied to landscapes.</p>	<p><b>1.1.1</b> LDN stakeholder participatory structures and processes strengthened/ established at national level, with vertical integration to multi-sectoral Landscape Management Committees in the sub-basins.</p> <p><b>1.1.2</b> National and landscape level policy, regulatory and participatory planning frameworks for effectively upscaling SLM/SFM interventions reviewed and revised.</p> <p><b>1.2.1</b> Project sites and interventions confirmed, based on expanded and deepened landscape assessments using ILAM.</p> <p><b>1.2.2</b> Capacity and partnerships in integrated land-use planning improved at national and landscape levels, through training on ILAM/ILUP and collaborative agreements with partners.</p> <p><b>1.2.3</b> Integrated Land-Use Plans developed for target landscapes in northern Namibia, using participatory consultation processes to apply LDN response hierarchy.</p>	GET	470,833.00	28,823,491.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
COMPONENT 2 Strengthening implementation and enabling scaling out of SLM/SFM	Investment	<p><b>Outcome 2.1</b> SLM/SFM practices aligned with ILUP priorities and demonstrated in target landscapes</p> <p><b>Outcome 2.2</b> SLM/SFM improved with support from green enterprises and value chains in target landscapes</p>	<p><b>2.1.1</b> Gender sensitive SLM/SFM practices appropriate for target areas identified/developed</p> <p><b>2.1.2</b> Organizational structures and knowledge among land and resource users/managers improved to enhance SLM/SFM practices</p> <p><b>2.2.1</b> Community-based initiatives and Forest and Farm Producer Organizations supported through tools, facilities and other resources to adopt and promote improved SLM/SFM practices</p> <p><b>2.2.2</b> Green Value Chains strengthened or developed</p>	GET	4,534,308.00	113,722,517.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
COMPONENT 3 Strengthening knowledge, learning and collaboration to support progress towards achieving national LDN targets	Technical Assistance	<p><b>Outcome 3.1</b> National land information framework strengthened to inform LDN-related policy, planning and management at landscape, national and global levels.</p> <p><b>Outcome 3.2</b> Knowledge and awareness enhanced to support progress towards achieving national LDN targets.</p> <p><b>Outcome 3.3</b> Collaboration and exchange at regional and global levels enhanced to support national and sub-national efforts to deliver LDN.</p>	<p><b>3.1.1</b> National and sub-national LDN assessment, monitoring and reporting systems and tools, including LDN knowledge, developed and operational, with relevant reporting to global level.</p> <p><b>3.1.2</b> Capacity development program designed and delivered to support national LDN reporting by improving assessment, monitoring and analysis among key stakeholders at national and sub-national levels.</p> <p><b>3.2.1</b> Project knowledge management, communication and dissemination framework and strategy developed and implemented.</p> <p><b>3.2.2</b> Project M&amp;E framework, supporting lesson learning and guiding adaptive management, developed and operational from national through to community levels.</p> <p><b>3.3.1</b> Actions and investments identified to address transboundary land and environmental degradation priorities in Miombo-Mopane Ecoregion and bi-/multi-</p>	GET	669,117.00	21,400,000.00



Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
M&E	Technical Assistance	n/a	n/a	GET	164,100.00	
<b>Sub Total (\$)</b>					<b>5,838,358.00</b>	<b>163,946,008.00</b>
<b>Project Management Cost (PMC)</b>						
				GET	291,917.00	8,603,992.00
<b>Sub Total(\$)</b>					<b>291,917.00</b>	<b>8,603,992.00</b>
<b>Total Project Cost(\$)</b>					<b>6,130,275.00</b>	<b>172,550,000.00</b>

**C. Sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type**

<b>Sources of Co-financing</b>	<b>Name of Co-financier</b>	<b>Type of Co-financing</b>	<b>Investment Mobilized</b>	<b>Amount(\$)</b>
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Environment, Forestry and Tourism (MEFT)	Public Investment	Investment mobilized	9,700,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Land Reform (MAWLR)	Public Investment	Investment mobilized	103,400,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Trade and Industry (MTI)	Public Investment	Investment mobilized	8,200,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Environment Investment Fund (EIF)	Public Investment	Investment mobilized	16,000,000.00
Donor Agency	KfW – KASA regional project	Grant	Investment mobilized	35,100,000.00
GEF Agency	FAO Namibia Country Office	Grant	Investment mobilized	100,000.00
GEF Agency	FAO Namibia Country Office	In-kind	Investment mobilized	50,000.00
			<b>Total Co-Financing(\$)</b>	<b>172,550,000.00</b>

**Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified**

The selection of programs, projects and initiatives that comprise the financial baseline and co-financing for the project are based on geographic and/or thematic relevance), duration and opportunity, according to GEF guidance. Four of them constitute public investment funds of the Government of Namibia based on the State's Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF 2019/20 - 2021/22) [1] under the National Development Program, and two relate to donor agency grants. Funding from the above Government programs by default excludes recurrent expenditure – meaning that 100% of the baseline and co-financing amounts from Government correspond to investments, as currently prioritized in the MEFT and State budget for 2019. The following method was used to calculate the public investments shown in the table above:

- Government programs were selected on the basis of their thematic and geographical relevance vis-à-vis the subject matter of the project.
- The baseline calculus for each individual program was initially based on budgetary figures in Namibian dollars (NAD) for the relevant programs as published in the MTEF 2019/20 - 2021/22. Amounts in NAD were converted to USD and, where relevant, extrapolated for the duration of the project, using conservative coefficients for discounting future uncertainties. Such uncertainties include: possible currency devaluations, non-realization of investments, and COVID-19 pandemic impacts.
- By discounting the future in the baseline calculus, it is grounded in potential risks being realized. On a more optimistic note, there is also the

possibility of mobilizing additional investments. • For baseline amounts, more flexibility on the exact amounts considered was applied (e.g. FY2019/2020 was included as a valid baseline, but not always as co-financing, because the investment would be made when the project starts). For co-financing amounts, the validity of public investment was stricter and considered only what is currently planned for FY2020/2021 onwards, plus some extrapolation for the period that will follow, after which the current MTEF will be superseded by a new one. Thus, co-financing amounts tend to be lower than the baseline. FAO is providing \$150,000 as co-financing from funds leveraged from its own resources in order to underpin project management activities with secure essential operational expenses. These funds are classified as investment mobilized. FAO's allocation of these funds would not have been made, was it not for the project. While the above assumptions and the calculus remain generally solid, they were based on official figures available in late-2019/early-2020 and pre-dates the COVID-19 pandemic. The potential impact of the pandemic on public investment in Namibia was not taken into consideration. FAO and the GoN will monitor the situation, as it develops. Public investment may need to be recalibrated. Besides public investment from three ministries (MAWLR, MEFT and MTI), other baseline and co-financing sources include: NAMSIP (funded by AfDB and GoN), two GCF projects managed by the Environment Investment Fund (EIF) and the KASA regional project funded by KfW. [1] Source: <https://www.bon.com.na/CMSTemplates/Bon/Files/bon.com.na/9d/9d98205f-0a79-4a2a-b1f0-ebaab1f54560.pdf>

**D. Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds**

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Trust Fund</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Focal Area</b>	<b>Programming of Funds</b>	<b>Amount(\$)</b>	<b>Fee(\$)</b>
FAO	GET	Namibia	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	3,642,627	327,837
FAO	GET	Namibia	Climate Change	CC STAR Allocation	444,223	39,980
FAO	GET	Namibia	Multi Focal Area	IP SFM Drylands Set-Aside	2,043,425	183,908
<b>Total Grant Resources(\$)</b>					<b>6,130,275.00</b>	<b>551,725.00</b>

**E. Non Grant Instrument**

NON-GRANT INSTRUMENT at CEO Endorsement

---

Includes Non grant instruments? **No**

Includes reflow to GEF? **No**

**F. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)**

PPG Required

**PPG Amount (\$)**

200,000

**PPG Agency Fee (\$)**

18,000

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Trust Fund</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Focal Area</b>	<b>Programming of Funds</b>	<b>Amount(\$)</b>	<b>Fee(\$)</b>
FAO	GET	Namibia	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	118,840	10,696
FAO	GET	Namibia	Climate Change	CC STAR Allocation	14,493	1,304
FAO	GET	Namibia	Multi Focal Area	IP SFM Drylands Set-Aside	66,667	6,000
<b>Total Project Costs(\$)</b>					<b>200,000.00</b>	<b>18,000.00</b>

## Core Indicators

### Indicator 3 Area of land restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------

0.00	200.00	0.00	0.00
------	--------	------	------

### Indicator 3.1 Area of degraded agricultural land restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------

	200.00		
--	--------	--	--

### Indicator 3.2 Area of Forest and Forest Land restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------

--	--	--	--

### Indicator 3.3 Area of natural grass and shrublands restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------

--	--	--	--

### Indicator 3.4 Area of wetlands (incl. estuaries, mangroves) restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------

0.00	360000.00	0.00	0.00
------	-----------	------	------

### Indicator 4 Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------

0.00	360000.00	0.00	0.00
------	-----------	------	------

**Indicator 4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (hectares, qualitative assessment, non-certified)**

<b>Ha (Expected at PIF)</b>	<b>Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)</b>	<b>Ha (Achieved at MTR)</b>	<b>Ha (Achieved at TE)</b>
-----------------------------	---	-----------------------------	----------------------------

200,000.00
------------

**Indicator 4.2 Area of landscapes that meets national or international third party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations (hectares)**

<b>Ha (Expected at PIF)</b>	<b>Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)</b>	<b>Ha (Achieved at MTR)</b>	<b>Ha (Achieved at TE)</b>
-----------------------------	---	-----------------------------	----------------------------

**Type/Name of Third Party Certification**

**Indicator 4.3 Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems**

<b>Ha (Expected at PIF)</b>	<b>Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)</b>	<b>Ha (Achieved at MTR)</b>	<b>Ha (Achieved at TE)</b>
-----------------------------	---	-----------------------------	----------------------------

160,000.00
------------

**Indicator 4.4 Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided**

<b>Ha (Expected at PIF)</b>	<b>Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)</b>	<b>Ha (Achieved at MTR)</b>	<b>Ha (Achieved at TE)</b>
-----------------------------	---	-----------------------------	----------------------------

**Documents (Please upload document(s) that justifies the HCVF)**

<b>Title</b>	<b>Submitted</b>
--------------	------------------

**Indicator 6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated**

<b>Total Target Benefit</b>	<b>(At PIF)</b>	<b>(At CEO Endorsement)</b>	<b>(Achieved at MTR)</b>	<b>(Achieved at TE)</b>
-----------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------

Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e (direct)	0	1301476	0	0
Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e (indirect)	0	0	0	0

**Indicator 6.1 Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided in the AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) sector**

<b>Total Target Benefit</b>	<b>(At PIF)</b>	<b>(At CEO Endorsement)</b>	<b>(Achieved at MTR)</b>	<b>(Achieved at TE)</b>
-----------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------



Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e (direct)		1,301,476		
Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e (indirect)				
Anticipated start year of accounting		2021		
Duration of accounting		20		

Indicator 6.2 Emissions Avoided Outside AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) Sector

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e (direct)				
Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e (indirect)				
Anticipated start year of accounting				
Duration of accounting				

Indicator 6.3 Energy Saved (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)

Total Target Benefit	Energy (MJ) (At PIF)	Energy (MJ) (At CEO Endorsement)	Energy (MJ) (Achieved at MTR)	Energy (MJ) (Achieved at TE)
Target Energy Saved (MJ)				

Indicator 6.4 Increase in Installed Renewable Energy Capacity per Technology (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)

Technology	Capacity (MW) (Expected at PIF)	Capacity (MW) (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Capacity (MW) (Achieved at MTR)	Capacity (MW) (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 11 Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female		4,000		
Male		6,000		
Total	0	10000	0	0

Provide additional explanation on targets, other methodologies used, and other focal area specifics (i.e., Aichi targets in BD) including justification where core indicator targets are not provided

145,000 ha of croplands under improved SLM, having reduced LD through agricultural improvement interventions. (300,000 ha is Community Conservancy, of which 80,000 ha is Forest Conservancy.) · 15,000 ha under sustainable rangeland or grazing management will be subject to reduced LD; · 200,200 ha of forest/woodlands, of which 85,000 ha is or will be under active forest protection and conservation management measures to avoid LD, 115,000 ha will be subject to LD reduction measures, and 200 ha of rivers banks will be under restoration. Which translates to: 160,000 under core indicator 4/4.3 200 for restoration under core indicator 3 200,000 under core indicator 4/4.1

## **Part II. Project Justification**

### **1a. Project Description**

### **1b. Project Map and Coordinates**

**Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.**

### **1c. Child Project?**

**If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.**

### **2. Stakeholders**

**Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase:**

**Civil Society Organizations**

**Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities**

**Private Sector Entities**

**If none of the above, please explain why:**

**Please provide the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent assessment.**

In addition, provide a summary on how stakeholders will be consulted in project execution, the means and timing of engagement, how information will be disseminated, and an explanation of any resource requirements throughout the project/program cycle to ensure proper and meaningful stakeholder engagement.

**Select what role civil society will play in the project:**

**Consulted only;**

**Member of Advisory Body; Contractor;**

**Co-financier;**

**Member of project steering committee or equivalent decision-making body;**

**Executor or co-executor;**

**Other (Please explain)**

### **3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Provide the gender analysis or equivalent socio-economic assesment.**

**Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment?**

**Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;**

**Improving women's participation and decision making**

**Generating socio-economic benefits or services or women**

**Does the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators?**

### **4. Private sector engagement**

**Elaborate on the private sector's engagement in the project, if any.**

#### **5. Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.(table format acceptable):**

#### **6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination**

**Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.**

#### **7. Consistency with National Priorities**

Describe the consistency of the project with national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions from below:

NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc.

#### **8. Knowledge Management**

**Elaborate the "Knowledge Management Approach" for the project, including a budget, key deliverables and a timeline, and explain how it will contribute to the project's overall impact.**

#### **9. Monitoring and Evaluation**

**Describe the budgeted M and E plan**

#### **10. Benefits**

**Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels, as appropriate. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?**

## 11. Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS) Risks

Provide information on the identified environmental and social risks and potential impacts associated with the project/program based on your organization's ESS systems and procedures

### Overall Project/Program Risk Classification\*

PIF

CEO Endorsement/Approval

MTR

TE

Medium/Moderate

#### Measures to address identified risks and impacts

Elaborate on the types and risk classifications/ratings of any identified environmental and social risks and impacts (considering the GEF ESS Minimum Standards) and any measures undertaken as well as planned management measures to address these risks during implementation.

#### Section B: Environmental and Social risks from the project – ESM Plan

The project is reclassified from low to moderate risk, mostly due to the fact that although the foreseen environmental and social impacts of project are likely to be positive considering the nature of the interventions, the project includes the following risks factors under the Environmental and Social Risk Identification Screening Checklist:

- (i) **ESS 1 - Natural resources management:** The project will work to improve land tenure security and access rights through policy dialogue and multi-stakeholder policy and support implementation of participatory land use planning. This may result in changes to existing tenure rights (formal and informal) of individuals, communities or others to land, fishery and forest resources which triggers ESS 1.
- (ii) **ESS 3 - Plant and Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture:** The project interventions on crop diversification and community seed banks will involve the provision and transfer of seeds and planting material for cultivation which triggers ESS 3.
- (iii) **ESS 9 – Indigenous People:** The project interventions will be in sites where some indigenous groups reside, which triggers ESS 3.

The identified risks are mostly temporal, localized and reversible. Considering the impact, appropriate mitigation measures have been developed to address and mitigate the identified risks above. The developed risk management plan in the table below will allow managing risks by monitoring mitigation actions throughout implementation.

The risks to the project have been identified and analyzed during the project preparation phase and mitigation measures have been incorporated into the project design (see Table 1 below). With the support and oversight of FAO, the Project Steering Committee (PSC) will be responsible for managing these risks as well as the effective implementation of mitigation measures. The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system will serve to monitor outcome and output indicators, risks to the project and mitigation measures. The PSC will also be responsible for monitoring the effectiveness of mitigation measures and adjusting mitigation strategies accordingly, as well as identifying and managing any new risks that have not been identified during Project preparation, in collaboration with Project partners.

The six-monthly Project Progress Reports (PPR) are the main tool for risk monitoring and management. The PPRs include a section covering the systematic monitoring of risks and mitigation actions that were identified in the previous PPRs. The PPRs also include a section for the identification of possible new risks or risks that still need to be addressed, risk rating and mitigation actions, as well as those responsible for monitoring such actions and estimated timeframes. FAO will closely monitor project risk management and will support the adjustment and implementation of mitigation strategies. The preparation of risk monitoring reports and their rating will also be part of the Annual Project Implementation Review Report (PIR) prepared by FAO and submitted to the GEF Secretariat.

**NOTE:** Refer to [Additional Annex X-4: Report on the implementation of the Free, Prior and Informed Consent \(FPIC\) Process](#) for further details on marginalized and indigenous communities.

**Table 1:** Environment and Social Risks management plan

Risk identified	Risk Classification	Mitigation Action (s)	Indicators	Progress on mitigation action
-----------------	---------------------	-----------------------	------------	-------------------------------

<p>ESS 1 Natural Resources Management  Tenure</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>During implementation, the project activities will address tenure rights by applying an integrated landscape/territorial approach resolving insecure or inequitable tenure (right to use and benefits of ecosystem services), weak common property regimes, and natural resources management institutions. Conflict resolution measures to address land conflicts and boundary disputes will be applied as part of an inclusive engagement of all relevant stakeholders in this process. For this purpose, the project will follow the stakeholder engagement plan (Annex I2) as well as core elements of the Integrated Landscape Assessment and Management Methodology (ILAM) (Outcome 1.2), in particular the multi-stakeholder workshop approach which was successfully applied during the project's preparation.</p> <p>The project will apply and adhere to the principles/framework of the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VGGT) and stakeholders will be trained in its use.</p>	<p># of beneficiaries trained on the implementation of the VGGT</p> <p>Level of influence and engagement with government around the principles enshrined in the VGGT</p> <p># of land use plans in place and regulations effectively implemented</p> <p># of communities with secure tenure rights to land, with legally recognized documentation(CCROs) and who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and by type of tenure</p> <p># of land based conflicts resolved and # of people that have actively participated in the conflict resolution activities (disaggregated by gender)</p>	<p>N/A</p>
---	-----------------	---	--	------------



<p>ESS 3 Plant and Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>As part of the integrated landscape management approach the project will promote sustainable agricultural intensification through the diversification of the agricultural production. The focus will be on drought tolerant, nitrogen fixing and soil stabilizing pulses (and other neglected and underutilized species/NUS) to increase resilience and productivity, strengthening sustainable local food systems and mitigating the negative effects of land degradation and climate change.</p> <p>Community Seed Banks (CSB) 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 material 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>The CSB 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. The CSB management will ensure that the seeds and planting materials are free from pests and diseases according to agreed norms, especially the IPPC. The transfer of seeds across borders will take place, if needed, following international regulations on plant health (IPPC) and access and benefit-sharing, for example through a Standard Material Transfer Agreement (SMTA).</p> <p>The project (with support of the Regional Exchange Mechanism) will further support communities' increased access to genetic diversity and greater knowledge of their own national programs, other countries and international organizations.</p> <p>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 in order to ensure that CSBs activities complement, and operate within the regulatory context of target countries. As such, guidance will be provided within the context of the ITPGRFA and capacity development activities on Farmers' Rights are key planned activities.</p>	<p># of smallholder farming households who are applying sustainable agricultural intensification and diversifying their production.</p> <p># of farmers involved in CSB activities and benefiting in resources</p> <p># of crops and varieties per crops conserved and exchanged through the CSB.</p> <p># of training beneficiaries (management of CSB and seed conservation, Participatory Plant Breeding (PPB), small-scale seed production and climate change adaptation strategies)</p> <p>National level analysis and recommendations produced on policy and legal environment in relation to access and benefit-sharing, conservation, use and exchange of germplasm.</p> <p># of training beneficiaries on the mutual implementation of ITPGRFA and Nagoya Protocol and national implementation of Farmers' Rights)</p>	<p>N/A</p>
---	-----------------	---	---	------------

<p>ESS9 Indigenous People</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>During the PPG, the presence of indigenous peoples was confirmed within the targeted wider project landscape. The process of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) was initiated with its first 3 steps being put into practice according to the procedures outlined in the FAO FPIC Manual for project practitioners. The identified community groups are represented in the Kunene Cuvelai basin (Sub-basin 1) area, while the San and disabled people communities also occur in the Etosha and the Kavango basin areas. Consultations were carried out by the PPG Capacity Institutions and Policy consultant with assistance from local officials at each project site in order to: a) collect relevant demographic and geographic information; b) disclose project information in a transparent way through participatory communication and c) document indigenous peoples' needs in relation to the proposed project.</p> <p>The actual project intervention sites with direct SLM/SFM interventions on the ground will still be agreed upon with the government at project start as explained in the project document. In case the sites fall within the vicinity of indigenous peoples identified, the project will conduct the remaining FPIC steps comprising of (i) reaching an agreement with concerned communities on the proposed project activities, (ii) the participatory monitoring and evaluation of the agreement and (iii) subsequent documentation of lessons learned and disclosure of achievements. The project will hence respect the cultural characteristics of the identified indigenous peoples in the implementation of its interventions. To this end, the project will work closely with identified community organizations and will take advantage of existing spaces for dialogue. To ensure the empowerment of indigenous peoples, their organizations and representatives will be invited to participate in the planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation stages of the project. Participatory dialogue and coordination will be established with communities to report, motivate, raise awareness and receive systematic feedback on the project.</p>	<p>Stakeholder engagement plan # of beneficiaries belonging to indigenous peoples # of consultations sessions held with indigenous peoples' communities # of FPIC agreements endorsed by the concerned communities</p>	<p>FPIC being conducted during PPG (steps 1 to 3)</p>
---------------------------------------	-----------------	---	--	---

**Supporting Documents**

Upload available ESS supporting documents.

Title	Module	Submitted
Annex X-4 Baseline FPIC	CEO Endorsement ESS	

Title	Module	Submitted
<b>Annex J Indigenous Peoples</b>	<b>CEO Endorsement ESS</b>	
<b>Annex I1 Risk certification and climate risks</b>	<b>CEO Endorsement ESS</b>	

**ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).**

Annex A1: Project Results Framework

Result Chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-Term Milestone	End of Project Targets	Means of verification	Assumptions
Project Objective: <hr/> To initiate a transformational shift towards sustainable, integrated management of multi-use dryland landscapes in northern Namibia, building on Land Degradation Neutrality principles	(01) Area of managed production system landscapes where 'LDN response hierarchy' is applied to target intervention areas: <sup>[1]</sup> (1a) AVOID: (1b) REDUCE: (1c) REVERSE:	(01a) 0 ha (01b) 0 ha (01c) 0 ha	(01a) 40,000 ha (01b) 135,000 ha (01c) 100 ha	( (01a) 85,000 ha (01b) 275,000 ha (01c) 200 ha	ILAM/ILUP reports Project Implementation Reports Prototype LMUs database targeted by Project, to develop into a GIS. MTR and TE reports Convention reporting to UNCCD and UNFCCC PRODOC Annex F: GEF TF / LDCF/ SCCF Core Indicator Worksheet	NA
	(02) Number of people directly benefiting from improved land management practices in project landscapes [at least 40 % of which are women] <sup>[2]</sup>	(02) 0 people	(02) 5,000 people, of which 40 % women	(02) 10,000 people, of which 40 % women <sup>[3]</sup>	ILAM/ILUP reports Project Implementation Reports SHARP Assessment (reapply during implementation) Population Census MTR and TE reports	NA

Result Chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-Term Milestone	End of Project Targets	Means of verification	Assumptions
	(03) Number of GHG emissions sequestered or avoided directly attributed to project interventions using Ex-ACT tool (tCO <sub>2</sub> -equivalent sequestered over 20 years) <sup>[4]</sup>	(03) Potential carbon benefit for landscapes Sub-basin 1 zero tCO <sub>2</sub> e Sub-basin 2 zero tCO <sub>2</sub> e Sub-basin 3 zero tCO <sub>2</sub> e	(03) Potential carbon benefit for landscapes Sub-basin 1 M tCO <sub>2</sub> - eq Sub-basin 2 M tCO <sub>2</sub> - eq Sub-basin 3 M tCO <sub>2</sub> - eq	(03) Potential carbon benefit for landscapes Sub-basin 1 521,753 tCO <sub>2</sub> e Sub-basin 2 456,103 tCO <sub>2</sub> e Sub-basin 3 323,400 tCO <sub>2</sub> e	Application of ExACT Tool ILAM/ILUP reports Project Implementation Reports MTR and TE report	NA
<b>COMPONENT 1 – Developing enabling frameworks for applying LDN at national and landscape scales</b>						
Outcome 1.1) LDN policy, regulatory and participatory planning frameworks developed or strengthened and harmonized.	(04) Number of revised policy, regulatory and planning frameworks into which LDN principles are mainstreamed	(04) 0	(04) To be refined during project inception	(04) To be refined during project inception	Project Implementation Reports MTR and TE reports UNCCD and UNFCCC convention reporting PRODOC Annex F: GEF TF / LDCF/ SCCF Core Indicator Worksheet	[A.1] No major changes are made in the government that could result in decreased political will to engage, collaborate and ensure successful project implementation and program coordination.
	(05) Number of bylaws developed in support of implementation of ILUPs in target areas	(05) 0 bylaws	(05) 3-4 bylaws	(05) X bylaws (5-6)	National Gazette	
<b>Outputs under Outcome 1.1)</b>						
1.1.1) LDN stakeholder participatory structures and processes strengthened/ established at national level, with vertical integration to multi-sectoral Landscape Management Committees in the sub-basins.						
1.1.2) National and landscape level policy, regulatory and participatory planning frameworks for effectively upscaling SLM/SFM interventions reviewed and revised						
Outcome 1.2) Integrated land-use planning for LDN applied to landscapes	(06) Gender-responsive, coordinated and harmonized Integrated Landscape Use Plans (ILUP) developed and under implementation	(06) No ILUPs in place, IRLUP in Sub-Basin 3	(06) ILUP gender-responsive plans developed	(06) ILUP gender-responsive plans developed and under implementation in three project landscapes	Project Implementation Reports MTR and TE reports	[A.2] Local institutions are committed to improve their capacity to engage and implement sustainable

Result Chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-Term Milestone	End of Project Targets	Means of verification	Assumptions
	(07) Existing landscape plans in target areas incorporating the LDN response hierarchy	(07) To be refined during project inception	(07) To be refined during project inception	(07) To be refined during project inception	LDN Checklist as applied at Mid-Term and End-of-Project MTR and TE reports	and integrated management of multi-use dryland landscapes in the country
<b>Outputs under Outcome 1.2)</b>						
1.2.1 Gender sensitive SLM/SFM practices appropriate for target areas identified/developed.						
1.2.2) Organizational structures and knowledge among land and resource users/managers improved to enhance SLM/SFM practices						
<b>COMPONENT 2 - Strengthening implementation and enabling scaling out of SLM/SFM</b>						
Outcome 2.1) SLM/SFM practices aligned with ILUP priorities and demonstrated in target landscapes	(08) Number of households <sup>[5]</sup> actively involved in sustainable land management practices aligned with landscape ILUPs	(08) 150 households involved in sustainable land management practices in the landscapes, of which 35% are women-led <sup>[6]</sup>	(08) 500 households involved in sustainable land management practices in the landscapes, of which 40% are women—led	(08) At least 1,000 households involved in sustainable land management practices in the landscapes, of which 45% are women-led	LMU prototype database tracks LUS and households	[A.3] Local communities are willing to engage with project team to implement project activities and adopt SLM/SFM practices at the project target landscapes.
	(09) Sustainable forest and land management practices applied in project's productive landscapes, aligned with ILUPs	(09) Limited scope of existing sustainable forest management practices	(09) To be refined during project inception	(09) Sustainable forest management practices in 130,000 ha of forest	Project Implementation Reports Prototype LMUs database targeted by Project, to develop into a GIS. MTR and TE reports	[A.4] Government allocates sufficient budget to field offices to ensure their involvement in the implementation of landscape level activities.
<b>Outputs under Outcome 2.1)</b>						[A.5] Project solutions are considered more attractive financially, environmentally, sustainably and socially by land users than destructive 'business as
2.1.1) Gender sensitive SLM/SFM practices appropriate for target areas identified/developed						
2.1.2) Organizational structures and knowledge among land and resource users/managers improved to enhance SLM/SFM practices						
Outcome 2.2 Strengthening implementation and enabling scaling out of SLM/SFM	(10) Increased promotion of SLM and SFM compliant products by project	(10) To be refined during project inception	(10) To be refined during project inception	(10) Production systems in target landscapes supported by 6 dryland GVCs [total confirmed during project inception]	(10) To be refined during project inception	

Result Chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-Term Milestone	End of Project Targets	Means of verification	Assumptions
	(11) Increased percentage of farmers (at least 40% women) engaged in green value chains (GVCs)	(11) Limited numbers of farmers engaged in GVCs: 89% did not manage to sell in markets, main barrier being low production rates. Only 12% of farmers transform crops after harvesting and agricultural certification schemes are absent [exact communities to be defined during the inception when target areas fully agreed]	(11) 15% increase over baseline in farmers involvement in GVCs	(11) 30% increase in farmers involvement in GVCs (at least 15% women)	ILAM/ILUP reports Project Implementation Reports SHARP Assessment (reapplied during implementation) Population Census MTR and TE reports	usual' land and natural resource use practices. [A.6] Private sector is willing to invest in SLM/SFM/LDN activities, encouraged by a supportive regulatory and financial environment.
	(12) Number of partnerships/ enterprises developed by project to support SLM/SFM	(12) 0	(12) At least one new partnership/enterprise under development per target landscape	(12) At least one new partnership/enterprise per target landscape supported by project	MTR and TE reports Project Implementation Reports	
<b>Outputs under Outcome 2.2)</b>						
2.2.1) Community-based initiatives and Forest and Farm Producer Organizations supported through tools, facilities and other resources to adopt and promote improved SLM/SFM practices						
2.2.2) Green Value Chains strengthened or developed.						
<b>COMPONENT 3 - Strengthening knowledge, learning and collaboration to support progress towards achieving national LDN targets</b>						

Result Chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-Term Milestone	End of Project Targets	Means of verification	Assumptions
Outcome 3.1) National land information framework strengthened to inform LDN-related policy, planning and management at landscape, national and global levels.	(13) Publicly accessible web-based national LDN platform hosting information on SLM/SFM/LDN operational and reporting on progress towards LDN targets	(13) National LDN platform not established/fully functional	(13) Each child project design team to complete expected progress by mid-term	(13) National LDN platform reporting on LDN targets and feeding information into national LDN reporting	Usage tracking data from platform Interviews with target stakeholders on use of platform information Policy, planning and management documents referring to LDN platform National UNCCD reports LDN national reports	LDN information framework continues to be used and supported across sectors.  Buy-in and engagement from national, regional (sub-national) and local authorities in monitoring and assessing LDN.  Institutional framework and capacity to carry out LDN assessment, monitoring and reporting ensured by continuing in-country political stability.  In face of full lockdown Covid-19 pandemic restrictions, project and DSL-IP able to apply effective rapid response strategy, including stakeholders having access to virtual assistance, meetings and training tools.
	(14) % LDN indicators (defined under national LDN framework) incorporated into agriculture, forestry and biodiversity conservation sector development plans (or equivalent strategies, plans and programmes)	(14) 0% (LDN indicators not incorporated into sector development plans or their equivalents)	(14) Set of LDN indicators defined, validated, and process started for their incorporation into targeted agriculture, forestry and biodiversity conservation sector development strategies, plans and programs	(14) At least 80% of agreed LDN indicators incorporated into respective agriculture, forestry and biodiversity conservation sector development plans (or equivalent strategies, plans and programs)	Revised national strategies, plans and programmes with LDN indicators Reports, publications, on-line information of monitored LDN indicators under revised national strategies, plans and programs National UNCCD reports LDN national reports	
	(15). Number of participatory landscape monitoring action plans (LMAPs) with LDN indicators (defined under the national LDN framework) operational	(15) Zero No monitoring plans exist	(15) Participatory LDN-LMAPs under development for project target landscapes (within the framework of their ILMP implementation)	(15) X participatory LDN-LMAPs approved and under implementation (within the framework of their ILMP implementation)	Participatory landscape monitoring action plans Project progress reports (PIR, FAO PPR) Local authority reports	



Result Chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-Term Milestone	End of Project Targets	Means of verification	Assumptions
<b>Outputs under Outcome 3.1)</b>						
3.1.1) National and sub-national LDN assessment, monitoring and reporting systems and tools, including LDN knowledge, developed and operational, with relevant reporting to global level.						
3.1.2) Capacity development program designed and delivered to support national LDN reporting by improving assessment, monitoring and analysis among key stakeholders at national and sub-national levels.						
Outcome 3.2) Knowledge and awareness enhanced to support progress towards achieving national LDN targets.	(16) Number of project knowledge products (lessons learned/best practices, policy briefs, guidelines, etc.) accessible through: (a) National (LDN) platform (b) Regional and global platforms	(16) Zero Project is yet to begin.  Information sharing is mainly happening face-to-face between sectors at national level, and the data available on regional and global platforms only covers part of the experience held in the target countries. Such information is not visible and accessible enough to many government and non-government stakeholders.	(16) Each child project design team to complete	(16) Each child project design team to complete	Annual report of national LDN platform with statistics on downloads of project knowledge documents Project progress reports (PIR, FAO PPR)	Existing regional and global knowledge hubs focused on dryland ecosystems continue to function and are utilized by decision-makers.  National actors are receptive to project outreach and communication products.  Willingness of project stakeholders (particularly government authorities) to engage with adaptive management processes and make changes based on lesson learned and best practices for LDN identified by project and DSL-IP.
	(17) Child project knowledge products (policy briefs, guidelines, best practice recommendations, etc.) referenced/cited in national LDN-related policy and planning forums and decision documents and by stakeholder publications (including government and private sector, CSO/NGO community)	(17) Each child project design team to complete	(17) Each child project design team to complete	(17) Each child project design team to complete	Policy and planning documents Minutes of meetings of relevant decision-making forums Institutional (public and private) press releases, reports, etc. Reports on events e.g. commodity value chain events	In face of full lockdown Covid-19 pandemic restrictions, project and DSL-IP able to apply effective rapid response strategy, including stakeholders having access to virtual

Result Chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-Term Milestone	End of Project Targets	Means of verification	Assumptions
	(18) Project M&E system status and progress in reporting project contributions to GEF-7, LDN and SDG targets	(18) Zero No M&E system established as project not yet operational	(18) M&E system operational, with capacity to report on results framework targets for Mid-term Review	(18) Project M&E and reporting on project contributions to GEF-7, LDN and SDG indicator targets	MTR and TE reports Annual PIR and 6-monthly FAO PPR Project communication documents and briefs	assistance, meetings and training tools.
<b>Outputs under Outcome 3.2)</b>						
3.2.1) Project knowledge management, communication and dissemination framework and strategy developed and implemented.						
3.2.2) Project M&E framework, supporting lesson learning and guiding adaptive management, developed and operational from national through to community levels.						
Outcome 3.3) Collaboration and exchange at Miombo-Mopane Ecoregion and global levels enhanced to support national and sub-national efforts to deliver LDN.	(19) Number of inter-government policy related agreements (e.g. joint declarations) designed to facilitate common action on SLM/SFM and LDN across Miombo-Mopane Woodlands Ecoregion	(19) 0	(19) Discussions held on potential international initiatives designed to facilitate joint action on SLM/SFM and LDN across the Miombo-Mopane Woodlands Ecoregion	(19) At least 1 international initiative designed to facilitate joint action on SLM/SFM and LDN across the Miombo-Mopane Woodlands Ecoregion	Letters of Agreement between countries Joint project proposals Documents detailing joint management activities	National authorities and other key international stakeholders willing and able to engage in trans-boundary collaboration and coordination  Good collaboration framework between project and national authorities can be developed and maintained
	(20) Number of new transboundary /regional or global business initiatives (e.g. public-private partnerships, agreements, contracts), focusing on SLM/SFM green value chains developed	(20) N/A REM not established	(20) REM assessment of market analysis and opportunities for promoting SLM/SFM products through GVCs	(20) At least one transboundary /regional GVC initiative involving Namibia	Market assessments Strategic documents Minutes of meetings and workshops Business proposals Private sector company reports	Private sector businesses and producers have capacity and willingness to collaborate
	(21) Number of regional and global LDN policy dialogue platforms (SADC, GGWI-S, AFR100, other multi-stakeholder dialogues) to which Namibia contributes its child project results – recommendations (lessons learned, best practice etc.)	(21) N/A	(21) Each child project design team to complete	(21) Each child project design team to complete	Minutes of global meetings Project implementation reports/back to office reports References to project results (lessons learned, models, best practice, etc.) in policy dialogue documents	In face of full lockdown Covid-19 pandemic restrictions, project and DSL-IP able to apply effective rapid response strategy, including stakeholders having access to virtual assistance, meetings and training tools.

Result Chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-Term Milestone	End of Project Targets	Means of verification	Assumptions
	<p><b>3.3.1)</b> Actions and investments identified to address transboundary land and environmental degradation priorities in Miombo-Mopane Ecoregion and bi-/multi-lateral initiatives strengthened/ established to progress towards LDN.</p> <p><b>3.3.2)</b> Collaborative actions undertaken to support business and market development for SLM/SFM products across Miombo-Mopane region.</p> <p><b>3.3.3)</b> Opportunities for national and landscape-level stakeholders to exchange knowledge, experiences and lessons learnt at regional and global levels identified, developed and supported.</p>					

<sup>[1]</sup> Direct contribution to national LDN target. Note the total of 1a and 1b equates to GEF Core indicator 4 (area of landscapes under improved practices); 1c (reversal of land degradation) equates Core Indicator 3 (area of land restored).

<sup>[2]</sup> Note that this indicator tracks GEF Core Indicator 11 (number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment). Direct beneficiaries to be defined during project inception phase.

<sup>[3]</sup> This is an estimate – to be refined during project inceptions, following confirmation of final boundaries of target intervention areas.

<sup>[4]</sup> Corresponds to GEF Core Indicator 6 (greenhouse gas emissions mitigated).

<sup>[5]</sup> Average household size for rural population is 5,1 according to 2011 Census.

<sup>[6]</sup> Based on PPG estimates. The exact number to be refined during project inception.

## **ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).**

*1a Applicable STAP Comments at the IP Approval Stage and FAO's response*

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/11BRZ-5juZkbZc8Z3SjwaKseKU3LLDipL/view?usp=sharing>

*1b GEF Council Comments at PIF Stage and FAO's response*

Not applicable

**ANNEX C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG). (Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:**

<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GETF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
(5013) Consultants	107,424	137,620	(30,196)
(5014) Contracts	3,750	-	3,750
(5020) Locally Contracted Labour	5,828	246	5,582
(5021) Travel	48,524	43,601	4,923
(5023) Training	25,000	153	24,847
(5024) Expendable Procurement	4,500	1,048	3,452
(5025) Non Expendable Procurement	-	2,504	(2,504)
(5028) General Operating Expenses	4,974	9,825	(4,851)
<b>Total</b>	<b>200,000</b>	<b>194,997</b>	<b>5,003</b>

**ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)**

**Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Trust Funds or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)**

n/a

**ANNEX E: Project Map(s) and Coordinates**

Please attach the geographical location of the project area, if possible.

Please refer to separate Annex E uploaded in the Documents section of the Portal.

### ANNEX F: Project Budget Table

Please attach a project budget table.

	Budget Category	Budget per Outcome (USD)							PMC	Total
		1.1	1.2	2.1	2.2	3.1	3.2	M&E		
5013	Consultants	10'000	-	819'333	963'433	181'667	-	43'200	119'917	2'137'550
5014	Contracts	90'000	20'000	921'250	919'307	20'000	70'500	86'550	120'000	2'247'607
5021	Travel	-	83'333	104'333	25'000	64'333	-	-	-	277'000
5023	Training / workshop / meeting	130'000	80'000	157'650	160'000	107'350	-	24'350	-	659'350
5024	Expendable Procurement	-	-	208'333	-	29'167	-	10'000	-	247'500
5025	Non-expendable Procurement	45'000	-	235'000	-	171'100	-	-	40'000	491'100
5028	General Operating Expenses (GOE)	12'500	-	-	20'668	25'000	-	-	12'000	70'168
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>287'500</b>	<b>183'333</b>	<b>2'445'900</b>	<b>2'088'408</b>	<b>598'617</b>	<b>70'500</b>	<b>164'100</b>	<b>291'917</b>	<b>6'130'275</b>
<i>% of total GEF Funding</i>		5%	3%	40%	34%	10%	1%	3%	5%	100%

METF-Managed (OP 1)	MAWLR-Managed (OP 2)	NACSO-Managed	NBRI-Managed	UNAM-Managed	Service Provider/ NGO	FAO-Managed	Total
1'066'300	647'000	10'000	-	-	-	414'250	2'137'550
140'000	1'173'099	20'000	332'958	-	375'000	206'550	2'247'607
54'333	122'667	-	-	-	-	100'000	277'000
154'350	205'000	220'000	60'000	20'000	-	-	659'350

97'500	150'000	-	-	-	-	-	247'500
347'500	60'000	-	-	83'600	-	-	491'100
32'668	12'500	-	-	25'000	-	-	70'168
<b>1'892'651</b>	<b>2'370'266</b>	<b>250'000</b>	<b>392'958</b>	<b>128'600</b>	<b>375'000</b>	<b>720'800</b>	<b>6'130'275</b>
31%	39%	4%	6%	2%	6%	12%	100%