

## MID-TERM REVIEW

Project ID:	10192
Project Name:	Ecosystem conservation and community livelihood enhancement in North Western Zambia
Countr(ies):	Zambia
Implementing Agency:	UNEP

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**I. OVERVIEW .....3**

**A. Description .....3**

**B. Key Dates .....3**

**II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES .....3**

**A. Main MTR Findings .....3**

**B. Stakeholder Engagement .....4**

**C. Gender Equality .....4**

**D. Knowledge Management .....4**

**III. CORE INDICATORS .....4**

**IV: CO FINANCING .....8**

**V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS .....9**

**VI. ANNEX .....9**

## I. Overview

### A. Description

Project name

Ecosystem conservation and community livelihood enhancement in North Western Zambia

Country

Zambia

GEF ID

10192

Implementing Agency

UNEP

Executing Entity

The Nature Conservancy

Trust Fund

GET

Project Type

FSP

Objective

To strengthen community-based sustainable management of forest landscapes, and provide improved livelihood opportunities for targeted forest-dependent rural communities in Zambia's North West Province.

### B. Key Dates

CEO Endorsement/Approval

6/1/2021

Agency Approval

8/19/2021

Implementation Start

8/20/2021

First Disbursement

9/14/2021

Expected MTR

8/31/2024

MTR Submission

3/25/2026

Actual MTR

9/27/2024

Expected Completion

8/31/2027

## II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES

### A. Main MTR Findings

Overall, although much delayed in start-up, the implementation of the ECCLC project got underway briskly in 2022. The project is aligned with the Zambian Government, UNEP and GEF priorities, it is well managed and is progressing well. At the local level, the beneficiaries, the local communities, are engaged and demonstrate ownership and willingness to embrace community forestry. Substantive efforts have been made to integrate gender equality, and tangible achievements are visible on the ground. At the strategic level, weaknesses in

project design have impeded progress, and the project will need to review some of the fundamental underpinnings of CFM modelling and mainstreaming. Provided a timely closure through strategic consolidation and phased exit is ensured, the proposed consolidation of activities, risk and strategic reviews and sustainability planning are undertaken expediently, the ECCLE project stands a fair chance to achieve a successful outcome, contribute significantly to community forestry development in Zambia and its expected long-term biodiversity and livelihood impacts (V Conclusions).

### B. Stakeholder Engagement

The ECCLE project performance at mid-point rates stakeholder engagement as satisfactory, based on the assessment of partnerships (B), participation (H3), and ownership (H6). The project has mobilised stakeholders widely, though some duty-bearers are not fully aware of their role and responsibilities for effective engagement. As the project is coming towards its end, an updated stakeholder engagement plan will be needed to support the development of local sustainability strategies, with clarification of key duty bearer post-project roles and responsibilities. Clarification on co-financing will also be needed.

### C. Gender Equality

The ECCLE project performance at mid-point rated gender-responsive measures and gender result areas as satisfactory (H4). The project's approach to gender has been proactive, in line with national aspirations. Appropriate consolidation of strategies, further modelling of gender responsive Community Forest Management as part of Knowledge Management, and the continued innovative use of gendered strategies (e.g., 'gender champions') will enhance achievements further.

### D. Knowledge Management

The ECCLE Knowledge Management (KM) Component got underway, but was substantially delayed due to difficulties in consultant and partner identification and contracting. Re-prioritisation was not done. At the MTR point, the project still aimed to deliver on a rather demanding set of deliverables, much behind schedule. A key event, the 2nd KM Review, intended to be held just before and to support the MTR, did not take place. Due to the delayed start, the communication and sharing of KM products had only partially commenced (C2; H7). The MTR proposes to consolidate and refocus efforts towards supporting the development of "CFM models for mainstreaming" in synergy with output 1.5. (Recommendation 7).

## III. Core Indicators

### Indicator 1 Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	60000	60000	

### Indicator 1.1 Terrestrial Protected Areas Newly created

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

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)

### Indicator 1.2 Terrestrial Protected Areas Under improved Management effectiveness

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
	60000	60000	

Name of the Protected Area	WDP A ID	IUCN Category	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
Chibwika-Ntambu Game Management Area	4086	Protected Landscape/Seascape		50,000.00	50,000.00		53.00	86.00	
Kasonso-Busanga Game Management Area	4082	Protected Landscape/Seascape		10,000.00	10,000.00		61.00	79.00	

### Indicator 3 Area of land and ecosystems under restoration

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
5000			

#### Indicator 3.1 Area of degraded agricultural lands under restoration

Disaggregation Type	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
Cropland	5,000.00			

#### Indicator 3.2 Area of forest and forest land under restoration

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 woodland under restoration

Disaggregation Type	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

#### Indicator 3.4 Area of wetlands (including estuaries, mangroves) under restoration

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

### 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)
100000	70000	250563	

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

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

**Indicator 4.2 Area of landscapes under third-party certification incorporating biodiversity considerations**

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

**Type/Name of Third Party Certification**

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

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
20,000.00	10,000.00	3,563.00	

**Indicator 4.4 Area of High Conservation Value or other forest loss avoided**

Disaggregation Type	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
High Conservation Value Forest	80,000.00	60,000.00	247,000.00	

**Indicator 4.5 Terrestrial OECMs supported**

Name of the OECMs	WDPA-ID	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)

**Documents (Document(s) that justifies the HCVF)**

Title
Justification of Targeted Sites in Northwestern Province to qualify as HCVFs

**Indicator 5 Area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity (excluding protected areas)**

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

**Indicator 5.1 Fisheries under third-party certification incorporating biodiversity considerations**

Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)

**Type/name of the third-party certification**

### Indicator 5.2 Large Marine Ecosystems with reduced pollution and hypoxia

Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)

  

LME at PIF	LME at CEO Endorsement	LME at MTR	LME at TE

### Indicator 5.3 Marine OECMs supported

Name of the OECMs	WDPA-ID	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)

### Indicator 6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
<b>Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (direct)</b>		5837315	6857861	
<b>Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (indirect)</b>				

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

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
<b>Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (direct)</b>		5,837,315	6,857,861	
<b>Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (indirect)</b>				
<b>Anticipated start year of accounting</b>		2041	2025	
<b>Duration of accounting</b>			4	

### 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)
<b>Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (direct)</b>				
<b>Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (indirect)</b>				
<b>Anticipated start year of accounting</b>				
<b>Duration of accounting</b>				

### 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)
<b>Target Energy Saved (MJ)</b>				

### 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 People benefiting from GEF-financed investments

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
<b>Female</b>	500	4,000	1,050	
<b>Male</b>	500	6,000	1,950	
<b>Total</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>3,000</b>	<b>0</b>

### IV: Co Financing

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Anticipated at CEO(\$)	Materialized at MTR(\$)
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	7,200,000.00	22,220,457.00
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Agriculture	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,900,000.00	544,867.00
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Tourism and Arts	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	750,000.00	7,765.00
Civil Society Organization	The Nature Conservancy (TNC)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	300,000.00	
Civil Society Organization	The Nature Conservancy (TNC)	Grant	Investment mobilized	1,700,000.00	1,161,330.00
Civil Society Organization	World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	3,780,000.00	
Civil Society Organization	Trident Foundation Ltd for Kalumbila Minerals Limited	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	2,250,000.00	4,387.00
Private Sector	First Quantum Minerals	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	2,500,000.00	

Civil Society Organization	West Lunga Conservation Project	In-kind		274,901.00
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>20,380,000.00</b>	<b>274,901.00</b>
Comments				

## V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS

### Overall Project/Program Risk Classification

PIF	CEO Endorsement/Approval	MTR	TE
	Low	Low	

Measures to address identified risks and impacts

The ECCLE project risk ratings have mostly been assessed as low throughout the project period, and no variation had been reported at the MTR review point (December 2024). The MTR findings support the low risk assessment for the ECCLE project execution, but observe that issues of social, financial, and institutional sustainability (G2, Annex 20), as well as externalities such as the “Kasempa Gold Rush”, pose a risk to conservation efforts in the long run, to attaining project outcomes and contributing intermediate states. The MTR therefore recommends a risk review to accompany the proposed strategic review, together with the drafting of plans for structured consolidation, transition, and project extension and sustainability (Recommendations 1, 3, 13).

## VI. ANNEX

Uploaded Document

Document Category	Prefix	Title
M and E Document	Mid-term Review (MTR)	ECCLE MTR Final Version_March 2026
Project Supporting Document	ESS Supporting Document	Annex P_GEF 7 Zambia NWP_Stakeholder Engagement Assessment and Plan_revised May 2021
Project Supporting Document	ESS Supporting Document	Annex M_ESERN for GEF7 Zambia NWP_signed