

**General Project Information**

**Project Information**

<b>Project Title:</b>	<b>Eastern Province Jurisdictional Sustainable Landscape Program</b>		
<b>Region:</b>	<b>Zambia</b>	<b>GEF Project ID:</b>	<b>11101</b>
<b>Country(ies):</b>	<b>Zambia</b>	<b>Type of Project:</b>	<b>MSP</b>
<b>GEF Agency(ies):</b>	<b>World Bank</b>	<b>GEF Agency Project ID:</b>	<b>P155827</b>
<b>Project Executing Entity(s):</b>	<b>Ministry of Green Economy and Environment of Zambia</b>	<b>Project Executing Type:</b>	<b>Government</b>
<b>GEF Focal Area (s):</b>	<b>Land Degradation</b>	<b>Submission Date :</b>	<b>4/7/2023</b>
<b>Type of Trust Fund:</b>	<b>GET</b>	<b>Project Duration (Months):</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>GEF Project Grant: (a)</b>	<b>2,000,000.00</b>	<b>GEF Project Non-Grant: (b)</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Agency Fee(s) Grant: (c)</b>	<b>190,000.00</b>	<b>Agency Fee(s) Non-Grant: (d)</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Total GEF Financing: (a+b+c+d)</b>	<b>2,190,000.00</b>	<b>Total Co-financing:</b>	<b>22,000,000.00</b>
<b>PPG Amount: (e)</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>PPG Agency Fee(s): (f)</b>	<b>0.00</b>

<b>Total GEF Resources: (a+b+c+d+e+f)</b>	2,190,000.00		
<b>Project Tags:</b>	CBIT: No NGI: No SGP: No Innovation: No		
<b>Project Sector (CCM Only):</b>	AFOLU		
<b>Taxonomy:</b>	Focal Areas, Communications, Stakeholders, Land Degradation, Sustainable Land Management, Sustainable Agriculture, Improved Soil and Water Management Techniques, Restoration and Rehabilitation of Degraded Lands, Sustainable Livelihoods, Land Degradation Neutrality, Carbon stocks above or below ground, Land Cover and Land cover change, Forest, Forest and Landscape Restoration, REDD - REDD+, Climate Change, Climate Change Mitigation, Agriculture, Forestry, and Other Land Use, Climate Change Adaptation, Climate resilience, United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, Paris Agreement, Nationally Determined Contribution, Influencing models, Deploy innovative financial instruments, Local Communities, Behavior change, Awareness Raising, Type of Engagement, Participation, Beneficiaries, Gender Equality, Gender Mainstreaming, Gender results areas, Participation and leadership, Access to benefits and services, Women groups		
<b>Rio Markers</b>			
<b>Climate Change Mitigation:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No Contribution (0)	<input type="checkbox"/> Significant Objective (1)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Principal Objective (2)
<b>Climate Change Adaptation:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No Contribution (0)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Significant Objective (1)	<input type="checkbox"/> Principal Objective (2)
<b>Biodiversity:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Contribution (0)	<input type="checkbox"/> Significant Objective (1)	<input type="checkbox"/> Principal Objective (2)
<b>Land Degradation:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No Contribution (0)	<input type="checkbox"/> Significant Objective (1)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Principal Objective (2)

**Project Summary**

Provide a brief summary description of the project, including: (i) what is the problem and issues to be addressed? (ii) what are the project objectives, and if the project is intended to be transformative, how will this be achieved? (iii), how will this be

**achieved (approach to deliver on objectives), and (iv) what are the GEBs and/or adaptation benefits, and other key expected results. The purpose of the summary is to provide a short, coherent summary for readers. The explanation and justification of the project should be in section B "project description". (max. 250 words, approximately 1/2 page)**

Land degradation is a significant challenge in Zambia, fueled by poverty, climate change, and unproductive agriculture. Extreme weather events such as droughts and floods have negatively impacted food and water security and rural livelihoods. Human activities, including deforestation and unsustainable land use practices, have contributed to soil erosion and decreased productivity. As a result, rural communities are more vulnerable to external shocks. By 2050, temperatures in Zambia are projected to increase by 2.2°C, further exacerbating these challenges. The Eastern Province of Zambia is a key focus for the government's efforts to combat land degradation and poverty. The area has potential for sustainable, natural resource-based livelihoods, particularly in tourism, but is facing numerous challenges such as habitat fragmentation, deforestation, and illegal encroachment into protected areas. The forests in this region play a crucial role in driving economic growth, creating jobs, providing clean water, and supplying energy, but the high levels of poverty and reliance on agriculture and natural resources are perpetuating a cycle of poverty and resource degradation. The goal is to promote sustainable land management practices to enhance the region's potential for sustainable livelihoods.

The Emission Reductions Project (ER Project) is part of the Eastern Province Jurisdictional Sustainable Landscape Program, aiming to reduce emissions and promote sustainable land management practices. The program includes enabling activities, creating tradable Emission Reductions Certificates (ERC), and financing

**community-led activities using the proceeds from carbon transactions.** The objective of the ER Project is to generate payments for measured, reported, and verified Emission Reductions from reduced deforestation, forest degradation, enhancement of forest carbon stocks, agriculture, and other land use sectors, and to distribute the payments according to an agreed Benefit Sharing Plan.

The ER Project will provide financing to the program mainly through purchasing ERCs. In addition, the ER Project will support catalytic capacity-building activities to local communities, and the establishment for program management functions for the initial stages of implementation. These mechanisms will help to ensure the program's success in promoting long-term emissions reduction.

The ER Project will address the main sources of GHG emissions in Eastern Province, namely forest degradation and conversion, as well as poor soil management. The ER Project will strengthen the capacity of local communities and provide monetary incentives for conservation efforts. By promoting the adoption of climate-smart agricultural techniques and forest protection and enhancement measures such as mulching, composting, agroforestry, and afforestation, the project will effectively mitigate slash-and-burn practices, improve soil fertility, decrease soil erosion, and increase forest biomass. Through the

strengthening of capacity in 250 communities, the project aims to restore approximately 350,000 hectares of land in the Eastern Province, bringing about a significant positive impact on the region's environment and ecosystems.

## Project Description Overview

### Project Objective

To generate payments for measured, reported, and verified Emission Reductions from reduced deforestation, forest degradation, enhancement of forest carbon stocks, agriculture, and other land use sectors, and to distribute the payments according to an agreed Benefit Sharing Plan.

Project Components	Component Type	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Co-Financing(\$)
Component 1: Emission Reductions payments distributed in accordance with agreed Benefit Sharing Plan	Investment	Verified Emission Reductions achieved through land-based carbon removals and Emission Reductions payments distributed in accordance with agreed Benefit Sharing Plan	<p>1. Emissions reductions achieved through land-based carbon removals from standing forests and reduced forest degradation, changes in vegetation cover, reforestation and afforestation, and climate-smart agriculture practices.</p> <p>2. Benefits sharing plan operationalized and emission reductions payments distributed to key beneficiary groups</p>	GET		21,000,000.00

Project Components	Component Type	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Co-Financing(\$)
Component 2. Strengthening communities and governance for sustainable land management	Technical Assistance	Technical and governance capacity for sustainable land management strengthened among 250 communities	<p>1. Improved methods and tools for sustainable land management introduced to beneficiary communities and disseminated through extension activities</p> <p>2. Community members and scouts, with a special focus on women and youth, trained to prevent encroachment, logging, and poaching.</p> <p>3. Collaborative platforms established to facilitate dialogue and engagement between different stakeholders.</p> <p>4. Training and capacity building to enhance women's skills and knowledge in sustainable land management, including:</p>	GET	2,000,000.00	

Project Components	Component Type	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Co-Financing(\$)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- women's leadership and entrepreneurship training conducted</li> </ul>			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- women's networks/forums established to promote open dialogue, sharing of ideas and experiences, and community-building</li> </ul>			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- prize scheme developed to recognize the outstanding contributions of women in the jurisdiction</li> </ul>			



Project Components	Component Type	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Co-Financing(\$)
Component 3: Program Management (startup funding)	Technical Assistance	Management functions required for the program's success established	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PIU established</li> <li>- ER MRV system operationalized for relevant land-use categories (land use change, forest degradation, agriculture)</li> <li>- Knowledge sharing through learning networks, workshops and field visits</li> <li>- Results and lessons learned shared through TV, radio, social media and print publications</li> </ul>	GET		700,000.00

---

**Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)**

Project Components	Component Type	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Co-Financing(\$)
M&E	Technical Assistance	Effective project monitoring and evaluation	- data collection for monitoring against indicators in the project results framework  - midterm review  - final evaluation	GET		30,000.00
				<b>Sub Total (\$)</b>	<b>2,000,000.00</b>	<b>21,730,000.00</b>

**Project Management Cost (PMC)**

	GET		270,000.00
<b>Sub Total(\$)</b>	<b>0.00</b>		<b>270,000.00</b>
<b>Total Project Cost(\$)</b>	<b>2,000,000.00</b>		<b>22,000,000.00</b>

Please provide justification

**PROJECT OUTLINE**

**A. PROJECT RATIONALE**

**Describe the current situation: the global environmental problems and/or climate vulnerabilities that the project will address, the key elements of the system, and underlying drivers of environmental change in the project context, such as population growth, economic development, climate change, sociocultural and political factors, including conflicts, or technological changes. Describe the objective of the project, and the justification for it.**

**(Approximately 3-5 pages) See guidance here**

Note: as per agreement with the GEF Secretariat (see email correspondence uploaded to the portal) and consistent with the World Bank harmonized templates, the World Bank is exempt from filling out sections

in the GEF-8 one-step MSP template that are not included in the World Bank harmonized template. This section is addressed in the World Bank project document uploaded to the portal.

## **B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

**This section asks for a theory of change as part of a joined-up description of the project as a whole. The project description is expected to cover the key elements of good project design in an integrated way. It is also expected to meet the GEF's policy requirements on gender, stakeholders, private sector, and knowledge management and learning (see section D). This section should be a narrative that reads like a joined-up story and not independent elements that answer the guiding questions contained in the guidance document.(Approximately 3-5 pages) see guidance here**

Note: as per agreement with the GEF Secretariat (see email correspondence uploaded to the portal) and consistent with the World Bank harmonized templates, the World Bank is exempt from filling out sections in the GEF-8 one-step MSP template that are not included in the World Bank harmonized template. This section is addressed in the World Bank project document uploaded to the portal.

**Institutional Arrangement and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project.**

**Please describe the Institutional Arrangements for the execution of this project, including financial management and procurement. If possible, please summarize the flow of funds (diagram), accountabilities for project management and financial reporting (organogram), including audit, and staffing plans. (max. 500 words, approximately 1 page)**

Note: as per agreement with the GEF Secretariat (see email correspondence uploaded to the portal) and consistent with the World Bank harmonized templates, the World Bank is exempt from filling out sections in the GEF-8 one-step MSP template that are not included in the World Bank harmonized template. This section is addressed in the World Bank project document uploaded to the portal.

**Will the GEF Agency play an execution role on this project?**

**If so, please describe that role here and the justification.**

**Also, please add a short explanation to describe cooperation with ongoing initiatives and projects, including potential for co-location and/or sharing of expertise/staffing (max. 500 words, approximately 1 page)**

This ER Project aims to reduce emissions and is part of a larger program called the Eastern Province Jurisdictional Sustainable Landscape Program. The program is designed to promote climate-positive interventions in the Eastern Province and is comprised of three groups of activities: enabling activities and underlying investments, creating Emission Reductions Certificates (ERC), and financing livelihood improvements and income-generating activities.

Among the enabling activities and underlying investments, there are various projects and institutions that work together with the ER Project to achieve the program's goals. Some examples of these interventions are the Zambia Growth Opportunities Program-for-Results; the Zambia Integrated Landscape Project (ZIFLP); the Community Markets for Conservation (COMACO); the REDD+ project by the BioCarbon

Partners (BCP); the Inclusive Land Use Planning for Thriving Wildlife Habitats in Nyalugwe Chiefdom Project; the Zambia Sustainable Land Regeneration Project; the Strengthening climate resilience of agricultural livelihoods in Agro-Ecological Regions I and II in Zambia Project; the Climate Change Adaptation in Forest and Agricultural Mosaic Landscapes Project ? Eastern and Western Zambia; and the Increased Climate Resilience in Energy & Agriculture Systems and Entrepreneurship Project. Financiers of these initiatives are, among others, the World Bank, USAID, FAO, and the governments of Germany, Australia and Sweden.

The ER Project will actively seek collaboration with these existing initiatives by facilitating information and knowledge exchange, encouraging the adherence to the social and environmental management tools of the Jurisdictional Program, and by ensuring significant contributions to the collective efforts aimed at promoting sustainable land management practices. This collaborative approach will foster a shared understanding of the challenges and opportunities faced by the community and allow for the development of joint strategies to address them.

The Eastern Province Jurisdictional Sustainable Landscape Program was designed with the goal of achieving sustainable landscape management and reducing emissions. The program's principles provide the necessary flexibility to add more interventions and investments that contribute to these goals. The program aims to maximize synergies and impact by accommodating a variety of climate-positive interventions and investments that focus on carbon sequestration or avoided deforestation and land conversion. By expanding the opportunities for synergies and collaboration with future investments and projects, the program can continue to make progress towards its goals. For example, projects focused on sustainable agriculture can be included in the program, as they can contribute to the reduction of emissions and the promotion of sustainable landscape management practices. The program's approach enables it to achieve continuous emission reductions, which in turn generates a stream of carbon revenues that ensure the sustainability of the efforts. These revenues can be reinvested into the program to support further interventions and investments, which can in turn contribute to the generation of additional emission reductions and carbon revenues. Overall, the program's principles and flexible design allow for the inclusion of a wide range of interventions and investments that can contribute to reducing emissions and promoting sustainable landscape management practices. This approach not only helps achieve the program's goals, but also opens up opportunities for collaboration with other initiatives and investments focused on climate-positive interventions. The program's ongoing success will depend on its ability to continue to attract new interventions and investments that align with its principles and contribute to its goals.

## Core Indicators

**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	350000.00	0.00	0.00

**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)
	350,000.00		

**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)

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

Title

Submitted

**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>
<b>Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (direct)</b>	0	29416004	0	0
<b>Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (indirect)</b>	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>
<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 6.2 Emissions Avoided Outside 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>
<b>Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (direct)</b>		29,416,004		
<b>Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (indirect)</b>				
<b>Anticipated start year of accounting</b>		2023		
<b>Duration of accounting</b>		8		

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

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

<b>Technology</b>	<b>Capacity (MW) (Expected at PIF)</b>	<b>Capacity (MW) (Expected at CEO Endorsement)</b>	<b>Capacity (MW) (Achieved at MTR)</b>	<b>Capacity (MW) (Achieved at TE)</b>
-------------------	--	--	--	---------------------------------------

**Indicator 11 People benefiting from GEF-financed investments**

	<b>Number (Expected at PIF)</b>	<b>Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)</b>	<b>Number (Achieved at MTR)</b>	<b>Number (Achieved at TE)</b>
<b>Female</b>		75,000		
<b>Male</b>		175,000		
<b>Total</b>	0	250000	0	0

Explain the methodological approach and underlying logic to justify target levels for Core and Sub-Indicators (max. 250 words, approximately 1/2 page)

Area of landscapes under improved practices, 350,000 ha: It results from roughly multiplying 57 chiefdoms by an average of 7,000 ha in each chiefdom expected to be under better land management practices through the GEF supported activities and the incentives generated through the carbon revenues. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated, 29,416,004 tCO<sub>2</sub>e avoided over the 8 year-period 2023-2031. This target is derived from the detailed GHG inventory and accounting that was carried out for the Emissions Reduction Program Document (ERPD) and is uploaded as an annex to the portal. The forecast includes projections of carbon removals and avoided emissions for forestland remaining forestland, forestland converted to other land uses, cropland and settlement converted to forestland, and cropland remaining cropland. ER activities are detailed in Annex 2 of the PAD. The generation and verification of ERs is subject to a rigorous MRV system, also described in the PAD. People benefitting from GEF financing investments, 250,000 with 30% women: It results from multiplying 250 communities by an average of 1,000 beneficiaries per community. 30% women is a conservative estimate based on comparable projects. The estimated number of 250,000 people would represent approximately half of the total beneficiaries of the ER Project. The target of 250 communities approximately result from multiplying 57 chiefdoms by an average of 5 communities being benefitted in each chiefdom.

## Risks to Project Implementation

Summarize risks that might affect the project implementation phase and what are the mitigation strategies the project will undertake to address these (e.g. what alternatives may be considered during project implementation-such as in terms of delivery mechanisms, locations in country, flexible design elements, etc.). Identify any of the risks listed below that would call in question the viability of the project during its implementation. Please describe any possible mitigation measures needed. (The risks associated with project design and Theory of Change should be described in the ?Project description? section above).

The risk rating should reflect the overall risk to project outcomes considering the country setting and ambition of the project. The rating scale is: High, Substantial, Moderate, Low.

Risk Categories	Rating	Comments
Climate	Moderate	The project location is categorized as having a high exposure to climate change risks, particularly extreme temperature, extreme precipitation and flooding, drought, and strong winds, which can lead to land degradation, bushfires, infrastructure damage, and reduced accessibility. These impacts can ultimately result in soil erosion, destruction of vegetation, and a reduced capacity to produce emission reductions. As a result, the project's physical infrastructure and assets face a high level of risk. These risks are mainly concentrated in the supported crops and land management practices. To reduce these risks, the project includes a variety of strategies such as strengthening monitoring, disseminating resilient-enhancing practices to protect soils and vegetation, and increasing community awareness and preparedness through effective disaster response plans. Women have been identified as particularly vulnerable to the various impacts of climate change and geophysical hazards. Therefore, the project includes interventions aimed at reducing these risks for women. Despite the high risks associated with this project location, by implementing the appropriate precautions and strategies, the project can effectively manage and mitigate the risks associated with climate change and ensure its sustainability of the program for years to come.



<p><b>Environment and Social</b></p>	<p>Substantial</p>	<p>The ER project faces substantial environmental and social risks due to inadequate enforcement of natural resource management, low cross-sectoral coordination, and specific social risks related to elite capture and gender-based violence. The project has updated existing environmental and social instruments from the ZIFLP project and prepared new ones with mitigation measures to address potential risks and impacts. Institutional and implementation arrangements for environmental and social risk management established during the implementation of the ZIFLP project will be maintained and strengthened during the ERPA period. The arrangements rely on existing government institutions at the province level with distinct accountabilities and decision-making roles based on existing mandates.</p>
<p><b>Political and Governance</b></p>	<p>Substantial</p>	<p>Sudden shifts in political direction and competing interests and conflicts at the grassroots level could pose significant risks to the program's effectiveness, potentially undermining the reduction of emissions in the region by promoting excessive use of fertilizers, agricultural expansion, or deforestation. Additionally, conflicts could lead to a loss of interest from beneficiaries. To mitigate these risks, both the ER project and Eastern Province (EP) Program are managed by the leading authority on climate change policies, in close coordination with multisectoral climate change committees. This will enhance the likelihood of coherent policies that enable positive climate action in the EP. Strict implementation of the BSP and Component 2 activities on strengthening communities and governance systems will solidify the basis for collaboration and local governance. Despite these mitigation measures, substantial residual risks remain, given the national government's track record of policy changes and weak governance.</p>
<p><b>Macro-economic</b></p>	<p>Substantial</p>	<p>The country's debt distress and delicate macroeconomic situation pose risks to the effectiveness of the EP Program. Unfavorable policy decisions that promote development activities that increase emissions, such as deforestation and exploitation of natural resources, are among the risks. Although the ER Project does not have specific mitigation measures, the recently secured Extended Credit Facility (ECF) from the IMF can help restore macroeconomic stability and foster growth, thereby reducing some of these risks. Nonetheless, a residual risk remains substantial due to potential factors like inflation and drops in commodity prices. Achieving macroeconomic stability will depend on consistent and coordinated efforts for several years, involving progress in debt restructuring and fiscal consolidation.</p>
<p><b>Strategies and Policies</b></p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Both the ER project and EP Program are managed by the leading authority on climate change policies, in close coordination with multisectoral climate change committees. This will enhance the likelihood of coherent policies that enable positive climate action in the EP.</p>

<p><b>Technical design of project or program</b></p>	<p>Substantial</p>	<p>The ER project's innovative approach, sophisticated MRV requirements, high data quality standards, and complex configuration of public and private actors in a jurisdictional approach pose risks. Errors and delays in carbon accounting can set back the program, undermine financial flow, and damage the program's credibility by causing delayed payments to communities. However, mitigation measures are in place to address these risks. The PIU is well-equipped to handle technical challenges and has received training and support from the ZIFLP and World Bank team. The World Bank will continue to support innovative technical solutions and training for multisectoral MRV data collection. Substantial residual risks remain due to potential calculation errors or gaps in data, as well as staff turnover leading to loss of institutional memory in the PIU.</p>
<p><b>Institutional capacity for implementation and sustainability</b></p>	<p>Substantial</p>	<p>The implementation of the ER Project is challenging due to its complex nature and the strict policies regarding the carbon transaction and other operational aspects. It requires high capacity and coordination from multiple actors for the implementation and for data collection and reporting. The risk of having insufficiently qualified or overwhelmed staff lacking understanding in critical areas such as methodology or operational policies may lead to errors or noncompliance that could hinder the project. To mitigate these risks, the project has start-up funding for program management to ensure a strong team with expertise in the early stages of program implementation. The PIU will also facilitate capacity-building activities for partner institutions to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the project. Despite these measures, residual risks remain significant, as external factors beyond the government's control, such as inaction of the private sector or communities, can undermine project quality, and staff turnover in governmental institutions may occur. Furthermore, once the ER transactions begin, the program management will be fully financed by the government using carbon revenues. However, any delays in receiving these funds or receiving lower amounts than expected could significantly impact the ability to maintain the program management structure.</p>
<p><b>Fiduciary: Financial Management and Procurement</b></p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>The team at MGEE has had experience with World Bank-financed projects and are therefore familiar with Bank's fiduciary procedures. However, they have not implemented projects having the specificities of the Emission Crediting Transaction related to the distribution of ER payments. Another risk is associated with the country risk and the continuing COVID-19 pandemic. To mitigate these risks, the following will be carried out: (i) engagement of specialists with expertise to manage fiduciary activities associated with Emission Crediting Transaction (ii) use of a BSP Operation Manual that will be approved by the World Bank before implementation; (iii) carrying out periodic training in FM, and disbursement for fiduciary staff; and (iv) engagement of an independent verification agent to audit ER payments and distribution as per the BSP.</p>

<b>Stakeholder Engagement</b>	Substantial	Implementation of the project faces significant challenges due to the diverse nature of the stakeholders involved and the inherent challenges of distributing the proceeds from the carbon transaction transparently. Failure to adhere to the Beneficiary Selection Procedure (BSP) can quickly lead to conflicts, which could set back the entire program and undermine its credibility, making it difficult for external institutions to participate. The success of the long-term program depends on creating a favorable environment for external institutions such as development partners, non-governmental organizations, and the private sector to support positive climate action and further emission reductions. To mitigate these risks, Component 2 is crucial in bringing all actors together, creating a shared understanding and values, and coordinating actions. Despite these measures, residual risks remain high given the large number of actors involved, and even small errors or delays in implementing the BSP can cause conflicts. In addition, the first carbon payments are not expected until mid-2025, after the monitoring phase, and delays in payments at the Chiefdom and village levels are likely. Moreover, the cost of processing the BSP could significantly reduce the actual amount going to the communities, leading to frustration.
<b>Other</b>		
<b>Financial Risks for NGI projects</b>		N/A
<b>Overall Risk Rating</b>	Substantial	Substantial rating is mainly due to risks arising from the political and governance environment, macroeconomic and fiscal environment, technical design, as well as institutional capacity, stakeholders, and social and environmental risks.

### **C. ALIGNMENT WITH GEF-8 PROGRAMMING STRATEGIES AND COUNTRY/REGIONAL PRIORITIES**

**Explain how the proposed interventions are aligned with GEF- 8 programming strategies and country and regional priorities, including how these country strategies and plans relate to the multilateral environmental agreements.**

**For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), please identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and explain how.**

**Confirm if any country policies that might contradict with intended outcomes of the project have been identified, and how the project will address this. (max. 500 words, approximately 1 page)**

The Project aims to address drivers of environmental degradation by strengthening the capacity of local communities and providing monetary incentives for conservation efforts through payments for ERs.. Through its support for the adoption of climate smart agriculture practices and landscape restoration, the project is aligned with the GEF-8 Land Degradation focal area strategic priorities, namely Objective 1. Avoid and reduce land degradation through sustainable land management, and Objective 2. Reverse land degradation through landscape restoration. The Project will contribute to reducing greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture, forests, and land use and protecting biodiversity. This will ultimately lead to more sustainable livelihoods for local communities and the preservation of natural resources for future generations.

The ER Project is a critical initiative that will aid in fulfilling Zambia's Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) goals, as expressed in the country's updated NDC. Zambia aims to cut its greenhouse gas emissions by 25% from the Business As Usual (BAU) level of international support in 2015 and eventually reach a reduction of 47% compared to 2010 levels with significant international backing. The ER Project is, therefore, a crucial undertaking towards achieving these ambitious targets.

Zambia aims to restore 2 million hectares of degraded land by 2030 through the ER project, which will contribute to Zambia's land degradation neutrality (LDN) targets, aligned with SDG 15.3. Zambia aims to achieve LDN to maintain or enhance natural capital and ecosystem functions and services, supported by national programs, policies, and development plans. The LDN targets include reducing deforestation, promoting alternative energy sources, maintaining/improving soil organic carbon content, adopting good agricultural practices, halting land use change of wetlands/ecologically sensitive areas, and integrating LDN values into national planning processes by 2030. This achievement will also support various forest and landscape restoration initiatives to which the country is a party, including the AFR100 initiative, Bonn Challenge, the African Resilient Landscapes Initiative (ARLI), the African Union Agenda 2063, and the Sustainable Development Goals.

The ER project's impact also aligns with Zambia's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, which aims to address biodiversity loss and enhance ecosystem services. The strategy seeks to mainstream biodiversity into government policies, safeguard genetic diversity, and enhance

implementation through participatory planning and capacity building, building on the 1999 strategy and international agreements. The ER project will play a critical role in achieving these goals by restoring degraded ecosystems and promoting sustainable land use practices.

## **D. POLICY REQUIREMENTS**

**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment:**

**We confirm that gender dimensions relevant to the project have been addressed during Project Preparation as per GEF Policy and are clearly articulated in the Project Description (Section B).**

Yes

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

Yes

If the project expects to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment, please indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:

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

**Improving women's participation and decision-making; and/or**

Yes

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

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

TBD

## Stakeholder Engagement

**We confirm that key stakeholders were consulted during Project Preparation as required per GEF policy, their relevant roles to project outcomes has been clearly articulated in the Project Description (Section B) and that a Stakeholder Engagement Plan has been developed before CEO endorsement.**

Yes

**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; Yes

Other (Please explain)

**Private Sector**

**Will there be private sector engagement in the project?**

Yes

**And if so, has its role been described and justified in the section B "project description"?**

Yes

**Environmental and Social Safeguards**

**We confirm that we have provided information regarding Environmental and Social risks associated with the proposed project or program, including risk screenings/ assessments and, if applicable, management plans or other measures to address identified risks and impacts (this information should be presented in Annex E).**

Yes

Please provide overall Project/Program Risk Classification

**Overall Project/Program Risk Classification**

**PIF**

**CEO Endorsement/Approval**

**MTR**

**TE**

---

**High or Substantial**



## E. OTHER REQUIREMENTS

### Knowledge management

We confirm that an approach to Knowledge Management and Learning has been clearly described during Project Preparation in the Project Description and that these activities have been budgeted.

Yes

### Benefits

**Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels, as appropriate and these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCF, SCCF). This section identifies the direct beneficiaries from the project.**

Note: as per agreement with the GEF Secretariat (see email correspondence uploaded to the portal) and consistent with the World Bank harmonized templates, the World Bank is exempt from filling out sections in the GEF-8 one-step MSP template that are not included in the World Bank harmonized template. This section is addressed in the World Bank project document uploaded to the portal.

### ANNEX A: FINANCING TABLES

#### GEF Financing Table

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

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/Regional/Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Grant / Non-Grant	GEF Project Grant(\$)	Agency Fee(\$)	Total GEF Financing(\$)
World Bank	GE T	Zambia	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation: LD-1	Grant	2,000,000	190,000	2,190,000.00
<b>Total GEF Resources(\$)</b>						<b>2,000,000.00</b>	<b>190,000.00</b>	<b>2,190,000.00</b>



**Sources of Funds for Country Star Allocation**

<b>GEF Agency</b>	<b>Trust Fund</b>	<b>Country/ Regional/Global</b>	<b>Focal Area</b>	<b>Sources of Funds</b>	<b>Total(\$)</b>
World Bank	GET	Zambia	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	2190000
<b>Total GEF Resources(\$)</b>					<b>2,190,000.00</b>

**Focal Area Elements**

<b>Programming Directions</b>	<b>Trust Fund</b>	<b>GEF Project Financing(\$)</b>	<b>Co-financing(\$)</b>
LD-1	GET	2,000,000.00	22,000,000.00
<b>Total Project Cost (\$)</b>		<b>2,000,000.00</b>	<b>22,000,000.00</b>

**Confirmed Co-financing for the project, by name and type**

**Please include evidence for each co-financing source for this project in the tab of the portal**

<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>
GEF Agency	World Bank BioCF	Other	Investment mobilized	22,000,000.00
<b>Total Co-financing(\$)</b>				<b>22,000,000.00</b>

**Please describe the investment mobilized portion of the co-financing**

The investment mobilized will come from a \$22 million firm commitment from the BioCarbon Fund, administered by the World Bank, of which \$21 million will be used to purchase emissions reduction credits (ERCs) and \$1 million will be provided as grant for technical assistance. The amount provided by the BioCarbon Fund to purchase ERCs may increase by \$9 million to achieve a total co-financing of \$31 million, subject to the performance of the project.

**ANNEX B: ENDORSEMENT**

**GEF Agency(ies) certification**

<b>GEF Agency Coordinator</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Project Contact Person</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>Email</b>
GEF Agency Coordinator	4/5/2023	Francisco Obrequé		fobreque@worldbank.org

**Record of Endorsement of GEF Operational Focal Point(s) on Behalf of the Government(s) :**

Please attach the Operational Focal Point endorsement letter(s) with this template.

<b>Name of GEF OFP</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Ministry</b>	<b>Date (Month, day, year)</b>	
Godwin Fishani Gondwe	Director, Environment Management Department	Ministry of Green Economy and Environment	1/24/2023	<input type="checkbox"/>

## ANNEX C: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Please indicate the page number in the Project Document where the project results and M&E frameworks can be found. Please also paste below the Project Results Framework from the Agency document.

### Results Framework

COUNTRY: Zambia

Eastern Province Jurisdictional Sustainable Landscape Program - Emissions Reduction Project

#### Project Development Objectives(s)

To generate payments to the Program Entity for (i) measured, reported, and verified Emission Reductions (ERs) from reduced deforestation, forest degradation, enhancement of forest carbon stocks (REDD+), agriculture, and other land use sectors, and to distribute the payments in accordance with an agreed Benefit Sharing Plan (BSP).

#### Project Development Objective Indicators

RESULT\_FRAME\_TBL\_PDO

Indicator Name	PBC	Baseline	End Target
<b>Emission Reductions payments distributed in accordance with agreed Benefit Sharing Plan</b>			
Emission Reductions payments distributed in accordance with agreed Benefit Sharing Plan (Yes/No)		No	Yes
Volume of CO2e Emission reductions that have been measured and reported by the Program Entity, and verified by a Third Party (Metric ton)		0.00	6,000,000.00
MRV systems set up and functional for all relevant land-use sectors (forest degradation, agriculture, and land-use change) (Yes/No)		No	Yes

PDO Table SPACE

#### Intermediate Results Indicators by Components

RESULT\_FRAME\_TBL\_IO

Indicator Name	PBC	Baseline	End Target
<b>ISFL and GEF Indicators</b>			
Chiefdoms with signed Chiefdom Emission Reduction Performance Agreements (CERPAs) that have received monetary and nonmonetary benefits from the emission reductions payments (Number)		0.00	57.00
Number of people in forested areas and adjacent communities with monetary and nonmonetary benefits from forest (Number)		0.00	150,000.00
Number of people in Farmer Groups, Cooperatives involved in forestry and agriculture-related income generating activities and receiving benefits from the project (disaggregated by gender) (Number)		0.00	245,000.00
Number of people in private sector schemes adopting improved agricultural practices (Number)		0.00	150,000.00
Volume of for-profit private sector finance leveraged through Benefit Sharing Mechanism to contribute to ISFL objectives (Amount(USD))		0.00	11,000,000.00
Volume of not-for-profit finance (public or private) leveraged to contribute to ISFL objectives (Amount(USD))		0.00	3,000,000.00
Land area under sustainable landscape management practices (CRI, Hectare(Ha))		0.00	350,000.00
Communities with strengthened capacity for sustainable land management (Number)		0.00	250.00

**Monitoring & Evaluation Plan: PDO Indicators**

Indicator Name	Definition/Description	Frequency	Dataprovider	Methodology for Data Collection	Responsibility for Data Collection
Emission Reductions payments distributed in accordance with agreed Benefit Sharing Plan	This indicator seeks to capture the development aspects of the transaction. ERPA payments have to be distributed based on agreed Benefit Sharing Plan (BSP) that has been deemed acceptable to the World Bank. To be deemed acceptable to the World Bank, a BSP must meet all of the requirements, as detailed in criterion 3.6 of the ISFL ER Program Requirements. ER Monitoring Reports will have to provide evidence satisfactory to the World Bank Group that the Benefits have been shared in accordance with the BSP.	Reporting periods as set in the Emissions Reduction Purchase Agreement	ER Monitoring	Review of Progress Reports and spot checks	World Bank

Volume of CO2e Emission reductions that have been measured and reported by the Program Entity, and verified by a Third Party	This indicator measures the Volume (i.e., ERs) aspect of the transactions in CO2e. It is conditioned on the existence and operation of a National GHG Monitoring system to measure and report the ERs generated by the ER Program, from both the forestry and agriculture sectors. All ERs generated by the ER Program during each Reporting Period are subject to Verification by an Independent Reviewer contracted by the World Bank Group in consultation with the Program Entity.	Reporting periods are as set in the Emissions Reduction Purchase Agreement .	National MRV system	Review of ER Monitoring Report and conclusions of the Third Party Verification	ZEMA, PIU and implementing partners
MRV systems set up and functional for all relevant land-use sectors (forest degradation, agriculture, and land-use change)	This indicator will monitor the performance on the creation of MRV infrastructure to effectively monitor ERs from all relevant land-use sectors	Reporting periods as set in Emissions Reduction Purchase Agreement	National MRV system	Review of ER Monitoring Reports	ZEMA and PIU with support of Forestry Department, Ministry of Agriculture and other implementing partners

ME PDO Table SPACE

**Monitoring & Evaluation Plan: Intermediate Results Indicators**

Indicator Name	Definition/Description	Frequency	Datasource	Methodology for Data Collection	Responsibility for Data Collection
----------------	------------------------	-----------	------------	---------------------------------	------------------------------------



Chiefdoms with signed Chiefdom Emission Reduction Performance Agreements (CERPAs) that have received monetary and nonmonetary benefits from the emission reductions payments	This indicator measures the number of Chiefdoms receiving monetary and nonmonetary benefits from the Program	Reporting periods as set out in the Emissions Reduction Purchase Agreement	ER Monitoring Report including reports on payment distribution to communities as guided by the BSP	Review of data from ER Monitoring report and payment distribution reports	PIU
Number of people in forested areas and adjacent communities with monetary and nonmonetary benefits from forest	Number of people in forested areas and adjacent communities receiving monetary and nonmonetary benefits from forest as a result of Program interventions (disaggregated by gender)	Reporting periods as set out in the Emissions Reduction Purchase Agreement	ER Monitoring Report including reports on payment distribution to communities as guided by the BSP	Review of data from ER Monitoring report and payment distribution reports	PIU
Number of people in Farmer Groups, Cooperatives involved in forestry and agriculture-related income generating activities and receiving benefits from the project (disaggregated by gender)	This ISFL mandatory indicator measures the beneficiaries in Farmer Groups and Cooperatives involved in forestry and agriculture-related income generating activities and receiving benefits from the Program (disaggregated by gender)	Reporting periods as set out in ERPA	ER Monitoring Report and payment distribution reports as guided by the BSP	Review of data from BSP section of ER Monitoring report, looking at the registered cooperatives in which payments have been made that aim to generate income.	PIU

Number of people in private sector schemes adopting improved agricultural practices	This indicator measures the number of farmers adopting improved agricultural practices due to the project	Reporting periods as set out in ERPA	ER Monitoring Report	Review of data from ER Monitoring report	PIU
Volume of for-profit private sector finance leveraged through Benefit Sharing Mechanism to contribute to ISFL objectives					
Volume of not-for-profit finance (public or private) leveraged to contribute to ISFL objectives	The indicator measures the dollar amount not-for profit financing (public or private) leveraged to contribute to ISFL objectives	Reporting periods as set out in ERPA	ER Monitoring Report	Review of data from ER Monitoring report	PIU

<p>Land area under sustainable landscape management practices</p>	<p>The indicator measures, in hectares, the land area for which new and/or improved sustainable landscape management practices have been introduced. Land is the terrestrial biologically productive system comprising soil, vegetation, and the associated ecological and hydrological processes; Adoption refers to change of practice or change in the use of a technology promoted or introduced by the project; Sustainable landscape management (SLM) practices refers to a combination of at least two technologies and approaches to increase land quality and restore degraded lands for example, agronomic, vegetative, structural, and management measures that, applied as a combination, increase the connectivity between protected areas, forest land, rangeland, and agriculture land.</p>	<p>Reporting periods as set out in the GEF Grant Agreement.</p>	<p>Project Progress Report</p>	<p>Review of Project Progress report</p>	<p>PIU</p>
---	--	---	--------------------------------	--	------------

Communities with strengthened capacity for sustainable land management	This indicator measures the number of villages whose capacities have been developed in sustainable landscape management through GEF financing	Reporting periods as set out in GEF Grant Agreement	Project Progress Report	Review of data from Project Progress Report	PIU
--	---	---	-------------------------	---	-----

#### ANNEX D: STATUS OF UTILIZATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT (PPG)

Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GET/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)		
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent To date	Amount Committed
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

#### ANNEX E: PROJECT MAP AND COORDINATES

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

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	Geo Name ID	Location & Activity Description
Kasenengwa	-13.582290 S	32.516409 E	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Chama	-11.182178 S	32.991321 E	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Nyamba	-14.410234 S	30.438733 E	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>

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



---

**Title****GEF\_Project\_Budget\_ER Project (rev June 22)** **Please explain any aspects of the budget as needed here**

Note that GEF financing will be used only to support component 2 activities to strengthen communities' capacity and governance for sustainable land management.

Project management costs, M&E costs, and knowledge management will be covered by co-financing for the first two years (and thereafter by a share of the revenues generated from Emission Reductions payments).

Project M&E costs are as follows:

	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Year 4</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Total</b>
Consultants	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	50,000
Data collection	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	25,000
Mid-Term Review			20,000			20,000
Final Evaluation					20,000	20,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>15,000</b>	<b>15,000</b>	<b>35,000</b>	<b>15,000</b>	<b>35,000</b>	<b>115,000</b>

*Source of financing*

ISFL TF (Comp. 1 - Start up financing)	15,000	15,000				30,000
Carbon revenues			35,000	15,000	35,000	85,000

Communications and knowledge management is budgeted at \$20,000/year for the first two years.