Integrated Watershed Management for Improved Agro-pastoral Livelihoods in the Sepabala Sub-catchment

Part I: Project Information

GEF ID
10020

Project Type
FSP

Type of Trust Fund
GET

Project Title
Integrated Watershed Management for Improved Agro-pastoral Livelihoods in the Sepabala Sub-catchment

Countries
Lesotho

Agency(ies)
UNDP

Other Executing Partner(s)
Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC)

Executing Partner Type
Government

GEF Focal Area
Land Degradation

Taxonomy
Focal Areas, Land Degradation, Sustainable Land Management, Sustainable Pasture Management, Restoration and Rehabilitation of Degraded Lands, Integrated and Cross-sectoral approach, Sustainable Livelihoods, Community-Based Natural Resource Management, Improved Soil and Water Management Techniques, Land Degradation Neutrality, Land Cover and Land cover change, Carbon stocks above or below ground, Land

Productivity, Influencing models, Convene multi-stakeholder alliances, Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making, Transform policy and regulatory environments, Demonstrate innovative approache, Stakeholders, Local Communities, Communications, Public Campaigns, Education, Awareness Raising, Behavior change, Civil Society, Non-Governmental Organization, Community Based Organization, Type of Engagement, Information Dissemination, Consultation, Participation, Partnership, Beneficiaries, Gender Equality, Gender results areas, Access and control over natural resources, Participation and leadership, Capacity Development, Knowledge Generation and Exchange, Gender Mainstreaming, Women groups, Sex-disaggregated indicators, Gender-sensitive indicators, Capacity, Knowledge and Research, Innovation, Knowledge Exchange, Learning, Indicators to measure change, Theory of change, Adaptive management, Enabling Activities, Knowledge Generation

Rio Markers

Climate Change Mitigation

Climate Change Mitigation 0

Climate Change Adaptation

Climate Change Adaptation 1

Duration

48In Months

Agency Fee($)

199,673.00

A. Focal Area Strategy Framework and Program

Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	GEF Amount($)	Co-Fin Amount($)
LD-1_P1	Outcome 1.1: Improved agricultural, rangeland and pastoral management Indicator 1.1 Land area under effective agricultural, rangeland and pastoral management practices and/or supporting climate-smart agriculture (34,500 ha)	GET	2,101,826.00	3,400,000.00
		Total Project Cost($)	**2,101,826.00**	**3,400,000.00**

B. Project description summary

Project Objective

To mainstream sustainable rangeland management and restoration into the use of watersheds to combat land degradation, enhance the flow of agro-ecosystem goods and services and improve the livelihoods of agro-pastoral communities in the Sebapala Sub-catchment in the Lower Senqu Basin.

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing($)	Confirmed Co-Financing($)

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing($)	Confirmed Co-Financing($)
Component 1: Institutional capacity at national and local levels for integrated watershed management	Technical Assistance	**Outcome 1:** Integrated Watershed Management (IWM) plan, with community action plans, facilitates implementation of landscape restoration, soil and water conservation, and Sustainable Land Management (SLM) in the Sebapala Watershed. *Indicators:* *a) Institutional arrangements for coordination of IWM planning, implementation and monitoring in place* *b) Integrated Watershed Master Plan for Sebapala Watershed (with community action plans for land restoration, soil and water conservation and SLM in production landscapes) developed and*	*Output 1.1: Institutional arrangements for coordination, planning, implementation and monitoring of the Sebapala IWM master Plan and community action plans.* *Output 1.2 Integrated Watershed Master Plan , complemented by sub-catchment-level community action plans, to facilitate implementation of land rehabilitation, soil and water conservation, and SLM practices in productive landscapes in the Sebapala Watershed (Tosing Community Council)*	GET	375,000.00	1,140,475.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing($)	Confirmed Co-Financing($)
Component 1: Institutional capacity at national and local levels for integrated watershed management	Technical Assistance	**Outcome 2:** District level technical officers, local authorities, and resource management institutions capacitated (empowered) to implement Integrated Watershed Management Plans and enforce rules to prevent land and ecosystem degradation; *Indicators:* *a)Number of effective bylaws providing legal basis for local level implementation of IWM Plan and community action plans* *b) Improved capacity scores of key resource management institutions responsible for implementation of the IWM Master Plan and community action plans, using the UNDP Capacity*	*2.1: Community Council by-laws developed to enforce implementation of Community Action Plans for integrated watershed management* *2.2: Establishment and strengthening of community-level resource user groups (water user associations,, Farmers? Associations, Grazing Associations)* *2.3: District technical officers, village-level institutions, farmers? associations, and members of the community trained on SLWM practices for application at landscape and farm levels*	GET	156,585.00	400,000.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing($)	Confirmed Co-Financing($)
Component 2: Integrated Watershed Management practices in the Sebapala sub-catchment	Technical Assistance	**Outcome 3:** Integrated Watershed Management practices (including SLM and SWM) effectively implemented over at least 34,500 ha in the Sebapala River Watershed, with ecosystem and livelihood benefits Indicators: *Area of land under rehabilitation and improved land use practices, measured in total and disaggregated for: agricultural lands, grasslands and shrublands (incorporating rangelands), and wetland and riparian habitats* *Targeting 34,500 ha under direct practices including: 8,000 ha agricultural lands, 25,000 rangelands (10,000 under improved soil*	*Output 3.1: Soil and water conservation measures implemented to combat soil erosion and promote water infiltration (including hillside terracing, stone-bunding, gully rehabilitation, re-seeding, tree-planting and soil improvement)* *Output 3.2: Rangeland rehabilitation measures implemented to promote improved productivity and vegetative cover (measures including enforcement of rotational grazing plans, selective reseeding, resting and natural regeneration, removal of invasive species, pasture resting).* *Output 3.3: SLWM practices piloted by land users at selected sites to improve agricultural productivity and*	GET	1,375,154.00	1,403,096.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing($)	Confirmed Co-Financing($)
Component 3: Gender mainstreaming, Knowledge Management, and M&E	Technical Assistance	**Outcome 4:** Lessons learnt by the project through gender mainstreaming, knowledge management and participatory M&E are used to promote SLWM in the wider Sebapala Watershed and nationally Indicators: *a) Ratio of women/men benefitting from project interventions in accordance with Gender Action Plan* *Number of manuals, policy briefs, reports, and lessons-learnt shared, and learning exchanges convened*	*Output 4.1: Project gender strategy and action plan implemented, monitored and reported on* *Output 4.2: Knowledge management system to facilitate participatory M&E, ongoing learning and adaptive management in the watershed and nationally, with active participation of key project stakeholders and project partners*	GET	95,000.00	235,000.00
				Sub Total ($)	**2,001,739.00**	**3,178,571.00**

Project Management Cost (PMC)

Project Management Cost (PMC)		
GET	100,087.00	221,429.00
Sub Total($)	**100,087.00**	**221,429.00**
Total Project Cost($)	**2,101,826.00**	**3,400,000.00**

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

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount($)
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC) - Department of Soil and Water Conservation	In-kind	2,500,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Conservation (MTEC) - Department of Environment	In-kind	500,000.00
Recipient Country Government	District Council of Qhuting	In-kind	200,000.00
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	200,000.00
		Total Co-Financing($)	**3,400,000.00**

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

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	NGI	Amount($)	Fee($)
UNDP	GET	Lesotho	Land Degradation		No	2,101,826	199,673
				Total Grant Resources($)		**2,101,826.00**	**199,673.00**

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 **false**

PPG Amount ($)

100,000

PPG Agency Fee ($)

9,500

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	NGI	Amount($)	Fee($)
UNDP	GET	Lesotho	Land Degradation		No	100,000	9,500
				Total Project Costs($)		**100,000.00**	**9,500.00**

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	11500.00	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)

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)
	10,000.00		

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)
	1,500.00		

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	23000.00	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 that meets national or international third party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations (hectares)

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)
	23,000.00		

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

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

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

Title	Submitted

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		7,298		
Male		7,299		
Total	0	14597	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

PART II: Project JUSTIFICATION

1. Project Description

A1: 1: The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed:

The PIF identified the key driver of land degradation in Lesotho, and, by inference the project area, as ?resource mining? which has reached or surpassed its ecological limits ? this is due to overgrazing (as a result of overstocking), over-cultivation and over-harvesting of natural resources. The role of climate, and its interaction with inherent topographic and physiographic features of the landscape in Lesotho, was noted as a source of vulnerability to soil erosion and resultant land degradation. The assessment of adaptation problems, threats, barriers and root causes undertaken during the project formulation indicated the need to elevate the importance given to the social and ecological vulnerability of the project area, caused by the impacts of climate change and deep-rooted poverty - this is consistent with the comments received form the STAP at PIF stage.

Currently, declining soil fertility and loss of land productivity in the Sebapala watershed, compounded by complex and changing market forces, is undermining the viability of the agro-pastoral livelihoods on which most people in this area depend. This is driving people to adopt coping responses that cause damage to ecosystems, land degradation and desertification. In turn, people are becoming increasingly vulnerable to food and water shortages, making them ill-prepared to cope with the additional hazards of climate change. The result is a downward spiral of poverty-environmental degradation-vulnerability.

The vulnerability mapping that was undertaken in Tosing Community Council in 2015[1][1], showed that the Sebapala Watershed faces a high risk of drought and soil erosion. The climate is likely to get warmer, with less rainfall overall, a shift in the onset of good rains to later summer or autumn, and higher precipitation (with more severe snowfalls) in winter - this will shorten the growing season for crops, and limit the time for which livestock can be grazed in the high-altitude pastures, placing more pressure on mid-to-lower reaches of the watershed where competition between settlement, cultivation and livestock farming is highest. Clearly, to address this the project must deliver benefits across all three dimensions that can address the root causes of degradation. Informed by lessons learnt from other landscape restoration initiatives,[2][2] project outputs and activities have been designed to yield the greatest combined benefits for halting degradation, improving land productivity and strengthening either climate adaptation or mitigation. Under Outcome 3, the strategy is to focus on those SLWM measures that improve soil stability and condition, water-use efficiency (by increasing basal cover and other methods for reducing water runoff and improving infiltration) and access to water for food production. This, in itself, is expected to reduce the vulnerability of communities and incentivize adoption of SLM practices. It is beyond the scope of this relatively small project to identify and develop alternative livelihoods and income streams, but, under Output 3.2, the project will implement an incubation pilot to test the use of indigenous grass seeds for

restoring exposed soil through reseeding. This holds potential to yield far greater environmental and productivity benefits than re-seeding using commercially-produced lovegrass seed (which has to be bought from South Africa and is expensive when used over larger areas). It may also present new opportunities for the development of small enterprises (collection, processing, packing and distribution of seed), which would be of particular benefit to women and youth (See pg. 32, Prodoc) - these benefits might not be realized in the lifespan of this project.

A.1: 2 - The baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects

There have been some important developments in the baseline scenario since the PIF was approved. These have included:

? The second (implementation) phase of *Lesotho?s National Integrated Catchment Management Programme* will be launched in 2020. At PIF stage, the preparatory phase of this programme had been underway, with an investment of Some Euro 78 million from the European Union (EU), and a second phase was under development, with an expected investment of Euro 2 million through GiZ. The Government of Lesotho has now set up a technical cooperation agreement with the Government of Germany under their SADC transboundary water management programme, to support the implementation phase of the National ICM Programme. This will be implemented by GiZ, with a joint investment of Euro 39 million (Euro 28 from the EU, Euro 6 from BMZ and parallel financing of Euro 5 from the Government of Lesotho. Under this technical cooperation project, the national ICM planning guidelines will be finalized and adopted; institutional arrangements for ICM governance and coordination at national, catchment and sub-catchment level will be launched; national ICM gender priorities will be identified; formal ICM training programmes and knowledge-sharing platforms will be established, and a community-led advocacy programme will be developed; and, Community Action Plans for ICM will be piloted in 6 prioritized sub-catchments in the Upper Senqu and Mohokare catchments (although the focus in the first year is on setting up the enabling institutional and policy framework at national level, and it is likely that the Sebapala project will still be among the first to test the guidelines and protocols for doing this kind of work).

The Sebapala IWM project has been designed to complement and feed into the National Programme, and budgeted opportunities for participating in knowledge-exchange and lesson sharing have been built into the project design. A representative of the GiZ project team, and the ICM coordination team in the Ministry of Water will be invited to serve on the Technical Planning Secretariat that will be set up under the Sebapala project (See Output 1.1).

? Since PIF approval, the *FAO-led (EU/SDC-funded) Land Cover Project* has produced the Land Cover Atlas of Lesotho. This is a remarkable resource that provides a comprehensive set of landcover maps for the whole country, supported by data that is accessible to users via a web-based platform. The maps and data can be used to conduct landcover change analyses, develop disaster risk maps and erosion risk assessments, undertake rangeland monitoring and generate data for inclusion in ICM monitoring frameworks, among other things. This will be an important resource for the development of the Sebapala IWM Plan. The availability of the resource also gave direction to investments that will be made under Outcome 2 of the project - technical officers of the Quthing district and extension services will be trained in its use (which will better enable them to monitor the impact of implementation of the IWM Plan, and land degradation in general), and the capacity of the District Office of the Ministry of Forestry, Rangelands

and Soil Conservation (MFRSC) to use this resource effectively will be built through provision of appropriate hardware and GIS-enabled software (which is currently lacking).

? The GEF-financed, UNDP-supported Reducing Vulnerability from Climate Change project, which is being implemented by the MFRSC in Mohale?s Hoek District (adjacent to Quthing District, which houses Tosing Community Council), is now 18 months into implementation. This project is making significant investments in strengthening the country?s Land Rehabilitation Programme, through implementation of SLM measures and climate-smart agriculture, though not in an ICM context. The project has piloted the implementation of the Farmer Field School model of peer-learning and this will be replicated in the Sebapala Watershed under Output 2.2 and Output 3.3. It has also acquired on-the-ground experience on the conditions for uptake of various SLM and climate-smart agriculture technologies and this will help shape the chice of technologies to be used in the Sebapala project.

? In 2018, the Government of Lesotho embarked on its *Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) Programme (2018 - 2025).* Supported by the Global Mechanism of the Secretariat to the UNCCD, and working in collaboration with multiple partners, Lesotho has already set its Voluntaryy LDN Targets - these focus on improving soil carbon stocks, rehabilitation of degraded rangelands, halting conversion of wetlands and reducing the rate of soil erosion. The Sebapala?s focus on rangeland rehabilitation , protection of wetlands and soil conservation is well aligned with the LDN targets. At Output level, the Sebapala project?s M&E framework will track changes in soil condition and stability, improved basal cover, and land productivity, as these are important indicators for land degradation neutrality.

? *The GEF-financed, UNDP-supported Development of Cornerstone Public Policies and Institutional Capacities to accelerate Sustainable Energy for All* (*SE4ALL*). This project, which is operating in Quthing District, including in the Sebapala Sub-catchment, aims to catalyze investments in renewable energy-based mini-grids and Energy Centres to reduce GHG emissions, and contribute to the achievement of Lesotho?s Vision 2020 and SE4All goals. It catalyzes private sector financing to establish renewable energy technology businesses and village Energy Centres in selected areas, including the Sebapala sub-catchment. The project will link communities in the Sebapala sub-catchment (project area) to the SE4ALL project to gain awareness on the alternative energy technologies available, including how to access them. This project should help address one of the drivers of land degradation in the Sebapala watershed, which is limited access to fuelwood. This leads to people removing woody, riparian vegetation which makes river-banks prone to erosion. Alternative, sustainable energy sources will, therefore contribute to alleviating one of the drivers of degradation (spanning the food-energy-water nexus).

A1.3: The proposed alternative scenario

There has been no departure from the project?s original objective, or the substance of its outcomes and outputs, and the budget remains distributed as in the approved PIF. There has, however been a need to redefine the project?s geographic scope, and formulate outcomes and outputs in a way that responds more explicitly to the issues of climate and poverty, and that enables the project to interface well with the National Integrated Catchment Management Programme. This has resulted in slight adjustments to the phrasing of Outcome 1 and its Outputs (Component 1), and the wording of Outcome 3. It has also influenced strongly the choice of measures and interventions that the project will put in place.

Defining the project domain: During stakeholder consultations, it became quickly apparent that the terms ?watershed?catchment,?, and ?sub-catchment?are often used interchangeably in Lesotho, and even the literature and technical reports relating to ICM in the country do not always apply the terms consistently (See Prodoc, after the list of Acronyms for definitions as they are being applied in this project). In the approved PIF, the project title refers to the ?Sebapala Sub-catchment,? the objective and Outcome 1 in Table B (and text elsewhere) refer to the ?Sebapala Watershed,? and elsewhere (e.g. page 11 of the PIF), the project domain is referred to as the Sebapala Catchment (sub-catchment #54 in the national catchment map, which is appended to the PIF as Annex 2). The National Catchment Map of Lesotho, which was published in 2016, defines 6 major catchments (one of which is the Lower Senqu) and 74 sub-catchments (one of which is the Sebapala Sub-catchment, #54). This sub-catchment, which has a total land area of 49,525 ha, is located in the upper reaches of the Sebapala River Watershed (the lower reaches falling into another sub-catchment).

The need to expand the project domain beyond the boundaries of SC54, was indicated by the following:

? SC54 has a population of only 2,397 people - this would restrict the number of beneficiaries to only 15 percent of those envisaged in the PIF.

? More than 80 percent of the land in SC54 is used for grazing livestock. Some 62 percent of the landscape is high-altitude grassland and herders from across Quthing district bring their herds to graze in summer - this means that to address issues such as overgrazing (and other aspects of natural resource use), it is necessary to engage with communities who live outside of SC54. Further, although there are concerning hotspots of degradation in these rangelands, which give rise to the headwaters of the Sebapala River, some of the worst degradation in the watershed takes place at mid and lower altitudes, outside of SC54.

? Only 612 ha in the sub-catchment is under cultivation. The vulnerability mapping exercise *(ibid*.) undertaken in this area (which falls into the Tosing Community Council) in 2015, showed that it is the cultivated lands that are the most vulnerable to erosion, drought and floods (three of the climate hazards assessed during the mapping exercise), which means that improving farming practices is essential for building climate resilience in the Sebapala Watershed. If the project were to restrict its work to sub-catchment 54, it would not be able to meet the targets set in the PIF for introducing SLM in cultivated lands (8,000 ha), and this would undermine the contribution the project can make to building climate resilience.

? The national guidelines for ICM (which are due to be finalized and adopted during 2020), recognize that integrated watershed management provides the holistic framework needed to address the complex and interlinked drivers of land degradation in Lesotho, and developing IWM plans is preferred to developing stand-alone landscape restoration plans. IWM plans should be developed at the scale of whole catchments or watersheds, to enable consistent management across the drainage basin, thus addressing up- and down-stream linkages.

Considering this context, the framing of the Sebapala IWM project was adjusted slightly to: (a) Develop an Integrated Watershed Management Master Plan (which will incorporate landscape restoration) for the whole Sebapala River Watershed. This is aligned more or less with the boundaries of the Tosing

Community Council - an area of 121,996 ha, and a population of 23,839 people. This will facilitate consistent management of the watershed under a single administrative entity. It will also allow for a more holistic approach to addressing land use, with more opportunities for introducing SLM on cultivated lands (of which there are some 8,180 ha within the broader watershed), and reaching a larger number of beneficiaries. (b) Use Sebapala Sub-catchment (SC54) to pilot the development of Community Action Plans under the IWM Master Plans. Under Outcome 3, several of the on-the-ground interventions will be piloted in SC54, especially for rangeland restoration and management, with later expansion into other areas in the watershed, based on priorities identified in the IWM Master Plan.

The PIF correctly identified one of the key barriers to uptake of IWM in Lesotho as a lack of institutional capacity to coordinate cross-sectoral planning and action, and limited capacity to design and implement appropriate programmes. Whilst the concept of IWM in Lesotho is not new, in practice, approaches have remained strongly sectoral, with IWM perceived to be the mandate of the water sector, and land degradation as the mandate of the ?land? sector. Up until now, there has been no formal governance structure for coordinating the action of the many different roleplayers operating in government, civil society and at grassroots level - and this remains the case in the Sebapala Watershed at present. Under the National ICM Programme, the Government of Lesotho will finalize and adopt in 2020 a proposed institutional governance structure for ICM, which will introduce a National ICM Committee (at senior government level), national and catchment-level technical secretariats, Catchment Management Joint Committees, and sub-catchment Coordination Units (CPUs). This system will be rolled out in a phased process and it is not known when it will reach the Sebapala watershed.

In the interim, both to ensure effective coordination of the IWM planning process during this project, and to help foster collaboration and build the foundation for establishment of the new ICM governance structures, a specific output has been introduced to the project under Outcome 1 - this will involve establishment of a Technical Planning Secretariat (for the Sebapala IWM Master Plan) and a team of Stakeholder Coordinators (see Output 1.1, Outcome1).

Table 1. below compares the outcomes and outputs at PIF and CEOR stages.

Only those outcomes and outputs that have been re-worded or added are shown.

Outcome/Outputs at PIF approval	Outcomes/Outputs at CEO ER	Brief explanation

Outcome 1: Landscape restoration plan (including plan for watershed rehabilitation, reforestation and rangeland management) for Sebapala watershed covering 34,500 ha developed to mainstream SLWM principles Budget US$ 375,000	**Outcome 1**: Integrated Watershed Management Plan, with Community Action Plans, facilitates implementation of landscape restoration, soil and water conservation, and SLM practices in the Sebapala Watershed Budget ? no change	The Outcome has been re-worded to reflect the adoption of integrated watershed management as the appropriate framework for addressing land degradation (See Box 1, pg 20 in the Prodoc), which is consistent with the national ICM guidelines. The planning domain for the IWM Plan has been specified as the Sebapala Watershed. The target of 34,000ha has been removed from the Outcome as the Sebapala IWM Plan will have effect over 121,996 ha (though direct, on-the-ground interventions will be implemented over 34,500 ha)

Outcome 1: Outputs *Output 1.1: Land and water resource degradation levels in the Sebapala watershed assessed to determine the extent and types of land and ecosystem degradation* *Output 1.2 Integrated Watershed Management Plan which mainstreams SLWM practices developed and operationalisation of the plan supported* *Output 1.3: Community Action Plans for watershed management developed to facilitate community participation in implementation of integrated watershed management*	***Outcome 1: Outputs*** *Output 1.1: Institutional arrangements for coordination, planning, implementation and monitoring of the Sebapala IWM master Plan and community action plans.* *Output 1.2 Integrated Watershed Master Plan , complemented by sub-catchment-level community action plans, to facilitate implementation of land restoration, soil and water conservation, and SLM practices in productive landscapes in the Sebapala Watershed (Tosing Community Council)*	Output 1.1 from the PIF was considered to be an activity that will be undertaken in delivery of the IWM plans, and has been removed A new Output 1.1 has been added to ensure effective coordination of the IWM planning process during this project, and to help foster collaboration and build the foundation for establishment of the new ICM governance structures when they come online Outputs 1.2 and 1.3 from the PIF have been merged into one Output
Outcome 3: Sustainable Land and Water Management (SLWM) technologies implemented in over 34,500 ha of the watershed	**Outcome 3:** Integrated Watershed Management practices (including SLM and SWM) effectively implemented over at least 34,500 ha in the Sebapala River Watershed, with ecosystem, climate resilience and livelihood benefits	A minor change to the wording has been made to emphasise Integrated Watershed Management, define the geographic domain and specify ecosystem, climate resilience and livelihood benefits.

Outcome 3, Output 3.4: *Integrated water resources management (e.g. water harvesting) promoted to augment water supply for community and household food production (e.g. fruit trees)*	***Outcome 3, Output 3.4****: Integrated water resources management promoted to augment water supply for community and household food production (measures including rainwater harvesting, in-field planting pits and keyhole gardens)*	The wording has been changed slightly although the overall output is the same. The project will focus on rainwater harvesting and the establishment of keyhole gardens - although the harvested rainwater may well be used to water fruit trees, and under Output 3.3 the project may introduce fruit trees in agroforestry systems, the emphasis in this Output has been shifted to establishing keyhole gardens. Fruit tree cultivation in these parts of Lesotho can be limited due to climate, topography and soils. Keyhole gardens (which may even include a fruit tree) are relatively simple to establish, and can diversify household food production, making use of ?grey water? from household use, and water stored in rainwater-tanks.
Outcome 4, Output 4.2 *Information for adaptive management and learning collated and lessons learned shared, in the wider catchment and nationally, with active participation of key stakeholders and project partners*	***Outcome 4, Output 4.2:*** *Knowledge management system to facilitate participatory M&E, ongoing learning and adaptive management in the watershed and nationally, with active participation of key project stakeholders and project partners*	A minor change in wording, to emphasize the delivery of a coordinated knowledge management system, and to link it to the M&E system. There has been no change to the GEF budget allocation, but $20,000 for the UNDP TRAC co-finance has been added to the budget for delivery under this Outcome.

The Indicators used in the project?s Strategic Results Framework are essentially the same as those in the PIF, with some minor re-wording. Two new indicators that were not in the PIF have been added, as described in the table.

Table 2 compares Indicators at PIF and CEO ER stage

Indictor(s) in PIF	Indicators at CEO ER stage	Brief explanation

Outcome 1: *Indicator: Integrated landscape restoration plan developed and officially approved*	**<u>Indicator 4:</u> Integrated Watershed Management Plan for Sebapala Watershed (including community action plans for land restoration, soil and water conservation, and SLM in production landscapes) developed and adopted** *Sebapala IWM Master Plan covering 121,699 ha (Tosing Community Council)* *Community Action Plans covering at least 49,425 ha* *(Sebapala Sub-catchment SC54)*	The indicator is essentially the same as in the PIF, with slight re-wording to reflect the production of an Integrated Watershed Management Plan, (as opposed to a landscape restoration plan) supported by community action plans, The extent of the planning domain for the Master Plan and Community Action Plans is also indicated

Outcome 2: *Indicator: Increase in capacity of key resource management institutions for watershed management (as measured by the UNDP Capacity Scorecard*	**<u>Indicator *6:*</u> Number of effective bylaws providing legal basis for local-level implementation of IWM Master Plan and Community Action Plans** **<u>Indicator 7:</u> Improved capacity scores of key resource management institutions responsible for implementation of IWM Master Plan and community action Plans at Quthing District, TCC and local levels**: *Systemic, institutional and individual capacities will be assessed using:* *The **UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard** for District-level institutions (Quthing District Officials, extension staff, and all other relevant entities under the approved National Governance Framework for ICM ? such as the Catchment Management Joint Committee), and the* ***modified Capacity Development Scorecard[3]**[3] for Tosing Community Council (Standing Committees on Finance, Planning and Environment; officials; extension staff), and local-level institutions (water supply groups, Grazing Associations, wool and mohair groups, vegetable growers, beekeepers ? full list to be confirmed at project inception)*	One new indicator (6) has been added, to measure improvement in the regulatory framework - to enable to track changes more easily. Indicator 7 is essentially the same as the indicator in the PIF, but has been elaborated to reflect that capacity at local levels will be measured using an adapted version of the UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard - during the PPG, and based on consultation with stakeholders, a simplified version of the Scorecard was developed that targets key capacities required at local level, and that will be practicable for local-level stakeholders to update.

Outcome 3: *Indicator: Area under rehabilitation and improved land use practices by end of project, as indicated by increased grass and tree cover, increased soil water retention capacity, increased soil nutrient content/fertility* - *10,00ha of degraded land under soil and water conservation measures* - *15,000ha of degraded rangelands under rehabilitation* - *8,000ha of farm/agricultural land under SLWM practices* - *1,500ha of riverine land under IWRM and productive water use*	**Indicator 8: Area of land under restoration and improved land use practices, measured in total, and separately for:** Sub-indicator 8.1: Agricultural lands Sub-indicator 8.2: Grasslands and shrublands (incorporating rangelands) Sub-indicator 8.3: Wetlands and riparian habitats Targets to be disaggregated for the whole Sebapala River Watershed (=Tosing Community Council - TCC) and the Sebapala Sub-catchment (No. 54 in catchment	The indicator is essentially the same, with slight re-wording. Sub-indicators that correlate with equivalents in the GEF Mandatory Indicator scorecard have been introduced, to streamline data collection. Increased basal cover, improved soil nutrient status and water-holding capacity will be assessed, but at targeted sites as it is impracticable to measure these indicators across all 34,500 ha the project will target. No baseline data was available, but this will be gathered when the rapid assessments of veld condition are made at project start. ?Rehabilitation?has been replaced with ?restoration
Outcome 4: *Indicator: Ratio of women/ men benefitting from project interventions* *Indicator: Number of lessons on SLWM collated and shared with wider audience at catchment level and nationally*	**Indicator 9: Ratio of women/ men benefitting from project interventions, in accordance with Gender Action Plan** **Indicator 10: Number of manuals, policy briefs, reports and lessons on SLWM in Sebapala Watershed collated and shared, and learning exchanges convened**	These indicators are essentially the same as in the PIF, with minor re-wording.

A.1: 4 and 5: Cofinance, Incremental reasoning, and Global Environmental Benefits

Cofinance

The unfortunate reduction in the level of cofinance (from the anticipated $4,65 million at PIF to $3,4 million committed at CEO ER) and the shift from grants to mainly in-kind support can be explained as follows:

At PIF, all cofinancing was indicated as grant, apparently based on a broad interpretation of ?grant? which incorporated both recurrent expenditures (from MFRSC, MTEC, and MLGCA) and investment mobilized (from UNDP, and the bulk of the anticipated cofinance from the Ministry of Water). Had the commitment letter been obtained from the Ministry of Water as was anticipated, 25% of the cofinance would have represented investment mobilized, instead of the current 6%, which is low, even for a Least Developed Country like Lesotho.

At first submission of the CEO ER, it was not possible to secure the letter of cofinance from the MoW (in the amount of $1,000,000, much of this derived from parallel investments under the EU/GIZ National Integrated Catchment Management Programme) for a number of unanticipated and unavoidable reasons related to changes in government, including appointment of new incumbents to senior decision-making positions. The decision was taken to submit the CEO ER without the MoW cofinance commitment letter in order to meet the submission deadline, whilst engagements with the MoW continued with a view to securing the cofinance commitment letter before project start.

However, in January 2020, the UNDP CO was informed that before the MoW could issue the letter, the project had to first be approved by the Public Sector Investment Committee (PSIC) under the newly-formed Ministry of Development Planning - which did not exist before, and which now has to approve all donor-funded projects to be implemented in the Kingdom of Lesotho. UNDP Lesotho, working in support of the MFRSC (the IP), made multiple presentations in the intervening months in order to secure this approval, which was finally granted by the Principal Secretary for Development Planning on 13 August (Record of Decision available) - the deliberations of the Committee took a long time, given the newness of the institution and operational delays caused by COVID19-related disruptions. Efforts to secure the signed MoW cofinance commitment letter will resume once the newly-appointed Principal Secretary and Minister of Water return to office following field assessments they are currently making of the impacts of COVID-19.

The difference between cofinance anticipated at PIF and committed at CEO ER is as follows:

Source	**Name of co-financier**	**Type**	**Amount committed**	**Difference from PIF**
Cofinance commitment letters secured				
Govt IP	Ministry of Forestry, Rangelands and Soil Conservation (MFRSC) - Implementing Partner	In-kind (Recurrent expenditures)	$2,500,000	Amount unchanged, but contribution will be in-kind, not grant
Govt	Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Conservation (MTEC) - Dept. of Environment	In-kind	$500,000	Amount unchanged, but contribution will be in-kind, not grant

Govt	Ministry of Local Government and Chieftainship Affairs, though the Quthing district Council	In-kind	$200,000	Contribution less than was anticipated at PIF, and contribution will be in-kind, not grant
GEF IA	UNDP	Cash grant	$200,000	Unchanged from PIF
Cofinance commitment letter pending				
Govt	Ministry of Water	Parallel investment (grant) and Recurrent Expenditures (in-kind)	Signature pending	$1,000,000, as anticipated at PIF, grant (parallel investment) and in-kind

Despite this, we believe that the ambition and impact of the Sebapala Subcatchment project remains assured as:

(i) A cofinance commitment letter will still be secured from the MoW. This cofinance accrues from parallel investments in the National Integrated Catchment Management Programme, which is led by the Ministry of Water, financed by the EU (with government cofinance), and with implementation support from GIZ. This programme, which was officially launched at the close of 2019, will invest some $7 million over the next three years in creating the enabling environment for adoption of ICM, on which successful implementation of the Sebapala project depends. Although the start of activities under the national programme has been slowed due to COVID-19, the investment is secure and the Cabinet has recently approved the new ICM governance structure that the Sebapala project will seek to operationalize at sub-catchment/catchment level. This strengthens the rationale for the Sebapala project.

(ii) The in-kind commitments from the IP (MFRSC), the MTEC and Quthing District Council (under the Ministry of Local Government and Chieftainship Affairs) will contribute significantly to successful delivery of the Sebapala project - much of this in-kind support will derive from the commitment of time and technical inputs by technical specialists and extension staff from the relevant government departments, and use of existing facilities and equipment. Technical specialists will serve on the Technical Secretariat that will guide production of the Sebapala ICM Master Plan, and extension staff (especially at District Level) will be directly involved in training community members and overseeing on-the-ground restoration and SLM activities. Whilst the cofinance commitments are in-kind, they represent a substantive investment by government in the implementation of the project and this will be essential for it to yield the anticipated impacts.

The decision has been taken to re-submit the Prodoc package and CEO-ER for approval, even with the MoW cofinance letter still pending, to avoid any further implementation delays. The project needs to stay well-synchronized with the national ICM programme which is now gathering momentum, much of the initial survey work for the Sebapala project will need to take place in the next few months, and the need to address the issue of livelihoods and food security is now extremely urgent, to address severe hardships induced by the impacts of the COVID19 pandemic.

Incremental cost reasoning and GEBs

The incremental cost reasoning remains the same as outlined in the PIF, but a summary of the baseline scenario, GEF alternative and Global Environmental Benefits is provided in Table 3 below.

The project will also contribute to improved local, regional and international water security in the critically important Orange-Senqu Catchment and a designated regional Strategic Water Source Area; (ii) Contribute to achievement of national land degradation neutrality targets through interventions that halt, restore and avoid land degradation, (adding to the contribution made to these targets by other GEF-financed interventions in the Lower Senqu Catchment and elsewhere); (iii) Avoid habitat loss and ecosystem degradation in a globally-recognized biodiversity hotspot, the Drakensberg Alpine Centre of Endemism, which is home to numerous endemic and threatened species, and includes a unique system of bogs and wetlands (Alpine Heathlands), thus contributing to achievement of Targets under SDG 15 (Life on land).

Beyond the contribution made to delivery of global environmental benefits, and SDG 15, the project will also contribute to achieving Lesotho?s commitments under the following Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs): 1 ? No Poverty; 2 ? No Hunger; 3 ? Good Health and Well-being; 5 ? Gender Equality; 6 ? Clean Water and Sanitation; 13 ? Climate Action; and 17 ? Partnerships for the Goals.

Table 3: The incremental cost reasoning, GEF alternative and GEBs

Summary of baseline/Business as Usual Scenario	Summary of the GEF alternative	The GEF increment ? link to global environment benefit
Summary of Baseline/Business as Usual Scenario	Summary of the GEF Alternative	The GEF Increment ? Link to Global Environmental Benefits

The concept of ICM has been fully embraced by government, but **approaches are still strongly sectoral, with little collaboration** between the land and water sectors The National ICM project is in its early stages, and its implementation is viewed as **responsibility of the water sector** only Under this scenario, **responses to land degradation will remain fragmented, cost ineffective and inefficient**, with little impact at the land-use level and in production landscapes where degradation occurs.	The project will **remove barriers to collaboration** between the land and water management sectors, different land users and other relevant stakeholders. Under Outcome 1, the project **will provide IWM plans and institutional mechanisms t**hat will : (i) enable stakeholders to agree on IWM objectives for the Sebapala Sub-catchment and develop an *IWM Master Plan* that integrates land and water resource management; (ii) develop and implement *community action plans,* that enable *ongoing learning*, and catalyze the process for halting, restoring and avoiding land degradation; (iii) contribute to establishment of a *stable, long-term system of integrated landscape governanc*e to ensure sustained implementation and monitoring of sustainable land and water management by land users	The GEF increment will provide the enabling framework for bringing 121,966 ha of land in the Tosing Community Council under improved management, through development and uptake of the Integrated Watershed Management Plan for the Sebapala Watershed, and its associated Community Action Plans. It will bring at least 34,500 ha directly under improved landscape management practices through: introduction of SLM over at least 8,000 ha of cultivated lands; rehabilitation of at least 15,000 of degraded rangelands; restoration and protection of 1,500 ha of wetlands and riparian habitats; and introduction of soil and water

There is a limited **skills base** for IWM, an under-developed **regulatory framework**, and low e**nforcement capacity.** There is a well-established system of **community institutions** that have responsibility for regulating and managing land use, but **little catchment-wide coordination**, or mechanisms for **knowledge-transfer and lesson sharing**, and many of the institutions have **high organizational development needs.** Under this scenario, **there is ineffective implementation of integrated watershed management**, and on-the-ground implementation of improved land-use practices. The **capacity of ecosystems to deliver critical goods and services will continue to decline**, reducing the productivity of land with **negative impacts** on the sustainability and profitability of agro-pastoral livelihoods. **Water and food security** will continue to decline ? especially in the face of climate change ? and poverty will worsen	The project will (i) **capacitat**e district-level technical officers, local authorities and resource management institutions to plan for and implement IWM and enforce relevant regulations; (ii) **strengthen** existing community-level resource?user groups, and establish new ones; (iii) **provide practical skills-training** to all land users and managers, and allow facilitate **ongoing learning** to enable uptake of SLM/IWM technologies in order to: ? rehabilitate degraded rangelands, cultivated lands and other degraded areas; ? bring grasslands, shrublands, wetlands and riparian habitats under proactive soil and water conservation measures to prevent future degradation; ? place productive land under improved practices; and, implement integrated water resource management to increase water supply in support of improved food production and human well-being.	conservation measures over 10,000 ha. It will deliver **direct benefits** to about 15,000 people (half of which will be female) through pilot projects in which on-the-ground measures will be implemented; and indirect benefits to the majority of residents of the Tosing Community Council, through the participatory development of the Sebapala IWM Master Plan.

A.1. 6 Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up

This is detailed in the Prodoc section on innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up (See page 50 of the Project document).

The concept of integrated watershed management is not new in Lesotho, and nor is SLM as an approach for addressing land degradation. However, the Sebapala Integrated Watershed Master Plan, and its associated Community Action Plans, will be among the first to be developed in the country, applying the new nationally adopted principles and guidelines in a fully participatory, gender-responsive process. The project will also pilot some novel approaches, including an incubation pilot for reseeding using indigenous grass seeds, and innovative technologies and applications for making the IWMP plan and its underlying data accessible to users (such as a mobile phone application). If the indigenous grass re-seeding pilot is

successful, it will be a trailblazer for Lesotho, providing a new, locally-adapted method for rehabilitating rangelands, and opportunities for small enterprise development, particularly for women and youth.

Implementing SLM in the context of carefully-crafted Integrated Watershed Management Plans will mean that the environmental gains at particular sites contribute to maintaining ecological functionality at a landscape scale and over time. It will also help ensure that environmental gains achieved at one site are not compromised later by inappropriate location of other land uses or developments. Sustainability plans that pinpoint prioritized sites for intervention, costed-out measures, other resource requirements, roles, responsibilities, monitoring frameworks and timeframes, will be developed under each outcome of the project.

Under Outcome 2, investments will be made in developing the knowledge, understanding and practical skills of a wide cross-section of stakeholders, and strengthening local organizations. The project will support the strengthening and establishment of forums and associations that promote integration, co-ordination and complementarity, and that identify opportunities for participation, co-operation and collective action.

The project has been designed with scalability in mind. The IWM plans will provide the overarching framework under which replicable pilots will be implemented and selected sites. Stakeholders will develop the knowledge, skills, understanding and practical tools to identify signs of degradation, select and implement appropriate remediation or preventive measures, monitor their impacts and adapt their responses accordingly. Lessons learnt and gains made through this project will be sustained and scaled up under the National ICM programme, with long-term capacity for planning, coordination and implementation provided by the new ICM governance institutions.

---

[1] Ministry of Energy, Meteorology and Water Affairs, 2015. VULNERABILITY MAPPING: Tosing Community Council: For the Improvement of early warning system to reduce impacts of climate change and capacity building to integrate climate change into development plans

[2] FAO, 2015: Integrated Landscape Management: http://www.fao.org/land-water/overview/integrated-landscape-management/en/ and the FAO-led GEF-financed review of TerrAfrica?s Sustainable Land Management Portfolio of 36 projects conducted under the TerrAfrica Strategic Investment Programme for sub-Saharan Africa (SIP).

[3] See Annex 16 for details..

A.2. Child Project?

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

N/A

A.3. Stakeholders

Please provide the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent assessment.

Stakeholder Engagement Plan is annexed to the Prodoc (Annex 4). This describes the key stakeholder groupings in government, research institutions and civil society. A thorough stakeholder engagement process was undertaken during the project formulation stage, with community-level consultations targeted in the Sebapala Sub-catchment - the results are reported in the Baseline Assessment Reports.

The key national and sub-national stakeholders include MFRSC, MoW, MAFS, MTEC, MLGCA, and community groups and associations. The successful implementation of the project will depend heavily on effective communication and coordination among the multiple project stakeholders, and the implementation of mechanisms to ensure their participation - towards this end the project will establish a team of Stakeholder Coordinators to ensure socially-inclusive and meaningful participation by community members from across the watershed in the IWM Planning processes; and a Technical Planning Secretariat, which will be a specialist working group under the project?s technical Advisory committee.

A gender-responsive, culturally sensitive and inclusive stakeholder consultation process underpinned the formulation of this project (see Stakeholder Engagement Plan ? Annex 4). At the local level, the most relevant stakeholders are community leaders (Chiefs and headmen) and community groups (e.g. grazing associations, herders association, traditional healers, custodians, harvesters and users of natural resources), including women?s groups, and their members. These stakeholders are the primary beneficiaries of the project. They will work as key agents of change in the landscape through active involvement in the key project activities such as IWM action-planning, rangeland rehabilitation, adoption of climate smart agriculture practices, bringing cultivated lands under sustainable land management and conserving soil and water to improve land productivity.

Private sector agencies and financial institutions will play an active role in the project as users of resources, and, potentially partnering with communities if the indigenous seed re-seeding pilot works out well. Research institutions such as the University of Lesotho will play an important role in training programmes and providing expertise to assist with determinations of rangeland condition. It is expected that researchers will be represented on the project?s Technical Planning Secretariat.

Documents

Title	Submitted
Annex 4: Stakeholder Engagement Plan	

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; Yes

Co-financier;

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

Executor or co-executor;

Other (Please explain) Yes

Civil society organizations (including grass-roots resource-user groups, chiefs and other local structures) will drive on-the-ground rehabilitation and restoration, and will be principal beneficiaries of the project. Communities will be engaged fully in the IWM planning processes, and, working with appropriate technical support, will lead implementation of SLM measures to bring land under improved management practices.

A.4. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis).

See Prodoc Annex 8.

Documents

Title	Submitted
Annex 8: Gender Action Plan	

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

Yes

If yes, please upload document or equivalent here

If possible, 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; Yes

Improving women's participation and decision making Yes

Generating socio-economic benefits or services or women Yes

Will the project?s results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators?

Yes

Gender equality and Women?s Empowerment: The project is classified as UNDP GEN2 (gender equality is a significant objective).The project has developed an over-arching Gender Action Plan (Annex 8) which identifies key actions that must be incorporated into the plan for delivery of each project output. This will be used annually to track performance on gender empowerment in the annual Project Implementation Report (PIR), and to identify adaptive measures if performance is weak. A Gender Expert will provide support to the PMU on a consultancy basis. Soon after project inception, the Gender Expert will ensure that the project?s Gender Action Plan is used to inform gender-related target-setting for all key steps of the IWM planning process and activities specified in the Master Plan and supporting Action Plans for site-level implementation. These gender targets must be incorporated into the IWM Master Plan?s monitoring and evaluation framework.

The gender data collected by the project will provide useful information at sub-catchment level that can be fed into the gender analysis that will be undertaken in 2020 under the National Integrated Catchment Management Programme. This national-level analysis will identify national gender-mainstreaming priorities for ICM, which will be agreed and incorporated into ICM policy, in line with the country?s 2018 National Gender Policy. Once the National ICM Gender Strategy is finalized, the project should review its Gender Action Plan, to ensure that all priorities identified at national level have been adequately captured.

The Gender Expert will also provide training on gender mainstreaming to the Project Board, the PMU, and all key stakeholders, and assist with collecting and collating gender data as part of the project?s M&E plan. The project will compile a lessons-learnt report/communications piece on women as agents of change in addressing land degradation in the Sebapala Watershed.

A.5. Risks

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 proposedmeasures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.

Description	Type	*Impact, Probability and Significance*	Mitigation Measures	Owner	Status

Description	Type	*Impact, Probability and Significance*	Mitigation Measures	Owner	Status
Insufficient capacities of duty bearers to meet obligations for integrated landscape planning. The NIM implementation modality uses government structures and existing staff (good for sustainability). But Capacity assessment indic	**Strategic**	**I = 3** **P = 2** **Moderate**	? The project has a strong focus on increasing skills and providing up to date information to all stakeholder groups, to enable them to actively engage in project initiatives (outcomes 1 and 2 strongly focus on increasing capacity and information for planning, and training as well as other organizational development needs). Outcome 3 will provide hands-on facilitation of stakeholders to implement the priority actions to rehabilitate and /or restore degraded rangelands, watershed services and agricultural lands. ? The coordination platform to be established by the project (Output 1.1) will incentivise government partners through joint accountability mechanisms. Furthermore, the project will work closely with FAO, the EU, GiZ and other partners who are supporting the Government in implementation of the National Integrated Catchment Management Programme and the National Land Rehabilitation Programme (including a parallel UNDP-supported, GEF-financed project which is working to mainstream climate resilience into the LRP). ? The project makes practical provisions (providing a Technical Advisor, Financial/Administration Officer, Project Field Facilitator and a Project Manager) to support the Government systems and accelerate project implementation. Collectively, these measures will address capacity gaps.	Project Board via the PMU	Current capacities are low as demonstrated by the capacity assessment scores (using UNDP capacity Scoring Systems Baseline for District officials under national Ministries (and other relevant entiti

Description	Type	*Impact, Probability and Significance*	Mitigation Measures		Owner	Status
Political support for IWM planning at the national, district and community level may not be enough to overcome difficulties of securing cross sector coordination and cooperation required for effective IWM planning and	*Operational*	P = 3 I = 3 Moderate		Output 1.1 and Outcome 2 is set up to reduce this risk. The project will build on existing coordination mechanisms to identify coordination challenges and resolve them (output 1.1 and Output 2.2). It will build operational and technical capacities of the coordination mechanism to lead the IWM planning process. Community participation will be secured through the community governance structures, led by the Chiefs. This will lay the foundation and prepare stakeholders for introduction of the new ICM governance structures that will be rolled out under the National ICM Programme,	Project Board, *PMU*	Currently, there are no specific mechanisms for IWM coordination in place and the strongly sectoral approach to natural resource management and low skills-base for IWM hampers effective coor

Description	Type	*Impact, Probability and Significance*	Mitigation Measures	Owner	Status
There is a risk that inability to mobilise sufficient finance for implementation of the IWM Master Plan and action plans (post project) due to limited resources (by government and residents of the Sebapala) could	*Strategic*	P=3 I=3 Moderate	Outcome 2 and 3 will provide funding for implementation of the priorities identified through the IWM planning. A sustainability plan will be designed under Outcome 1. In addition, the project will be implemented in close collaboration with the National ICM Programme, which has significant funding from the EU/Government of Germany and GiZ ? to increase opportunities for mobilizing additional funds for sustaining the implementation of the IWM Master Plan and action plans.	Project Board	Political support (by politicians and development partners) for ICM in Lesotho is high. The country has mobilized over US$ 78 million from development partners to support the national ICM programme, and this shou

Description	Type	*Impact, Probability and Significance*	Mitigation Measures		Owner	Status
Delays in critical legislation reforms for enabling effective IWM of the landscape due to slow bureaucratic processes or insufficient political will to enable change. Even bylaws have to be approved in Maseru befor	*Strategic*	P=3 I=3 Moderate		The Project Board will engage senior leadership of relevant ministries, advocating for and facilitating for ownership and support. Further support will be garnered through the coordination mechanism that will be established by the project. The technical cooperation project implemented by GIZ between 2020 and 2023 will be addressing legislative and policy reform at national level. This should help create the enabling framework for promoting regulatory reform at local levels - it is at the watershed/sub-catchment level that the Sebapala project will direct its attention.	Project Board via the PM	Several by-laws exist at the local level to regulate access to and use of natural resources (rotational grazing plans, protection of water resources) but enforcement is weak? hence they are ineffectiv

Description	Type	*Impact, Probability and Significance*	Mitigation Measures		Owner	Status
The project will support revegetation of denuded areas in rangelands, planting of abandoned lands with alternative fodder crops, and implementation of SLM measures such as agroforestry and deep fallows. Potentiall	Strategic	I=3 P=2 Moderate		To avoid these risks, the project will follow the IUCN guidelines on Preventing Biodiversity Loss from Invasive Alien Species[1], ensuring that there will be no introduction of known invasive species; no introduction of any alien species without risk assessment; and that possibility of accidental introduction of unwanted species will be duly considered and managed. Furthermore, all re-vegetation plans will be developed with full participation of and subject to approval by technical officers from the MFRSC (and other relevant agencies)	PM, Technical Advisor, MFRSC	There are alien tree species including poplars in the watershed, and infestation of degraded rangelands by karroid bushes and species such as Chrysocoma affects land productivity. Shrubs such as Leucoside a

Description	Type	*Impact, Probability and Significance*	Mitigation Measures	Owner	Status
There is a risk that the project will potentially reproduce discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits	**Strategic**	**I = 3** **P = 2** **Moderate**	? Societal roles in Lesotho are strongly influenced by entrenched perception on gender, and many stakeholders are unfamiliar with the concept of gender equity and do not perceive any problems with prevailing norms and engendered roles. ? Project implementation will be guided by the Gender Action Plan (Annex XX of the Prodoc); the project provides a budget for gender mainstreaming under output 4.1. This includes training of all stakeholder groups on the importance of gender considerations in the project and in advancing livelihood development objectives for women. Therefore, women, men and the youth will be actively targeted when and where relevant. ? In addition, the PMU will establish a grievance mechanism to provide systems and resources for the project to receive and address concerns about its impact on the relevant stakeholders. This will be done in line with UNDP guidelines on Grievances Response Mechanisms (https://info.undp.org/sites/bpps/SES_Toolkit/SES%20Document%20Library/Uploaded%20October%202016/Supplemental%20Guidance_Grievance%20Redress%20Mechanisms.pdf	PMU	? Currently gender imbalances are prevalent as outlined in the gender action. Societal roles in Lesotho are strongly influenced by entrenched perceptions on gender, and many stakeholders are unfamiliar

Description	Type	*Impact, Probability and Significance*	Mitigation Measures	Owner	Status
There is a risk that the project outcomes will be negatively impacted on by climate change impacts before the mitigation measures being introduced by the project become effective (frequent droughts and unreliable rainfall	**Environmental**	**I = 3** **P = 3** **Moderate**	? The project has built on the findings and recommendations of the 2015 vulnerability mapping of Tosing Community Council undertaken by the Ministry of Energy[2]. ? Linkages will be established with on-going and future efforts to improve climate information and resilience, including three GEF-funded projects: i) UNDP supported, MFRSC-implemented GEF-LDCF project on Reducing Vulnerability from Climate Change in the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin; ii) FAO-GEF/LDCF project on Strengthening Capacity for Climate Change Adaptation through Support to Integrated Watershed Management Programme in Lesotho; iii) UNDP-GEF Sustainable Energy for All (SE4ALL). ? As stated in the partnerships section, the PMU will formulate an action plan for collaborating with these and other relevant projects, clearly identifying actions to be monitored to demonstrate collaboration, learning and sharing lessons.	PMU and the Technical advisor	? High levels of poverty are interacting with climate driven risks to increase vulnerability of both livelihoods and watershed services ? this is well described in the Tosing Vulnerability Assessment Report[3]

Description	Type	*Impact, Probability and Significance*	Mitigation Measures	Owner	Status
COVID-19 restrictions and lockdown may have negative impacts on the trainings and capacity building interventions planned. This is because public gatherings and meetings are restricted to virtual meetings and/or	**Operational**	**I = 3** **P = 2** **Moderate**	Once COVID-19 lockdown is lifted, the project will engage with communities while implementing COVID-19 protocols including proper use of PPE to engage with communities. ? ?	Project Board via the PMU	? COVID-19 lockdown has been lifted but restrictions are still in place. Communities have resumed their developmental interventions. However, public gatherings including community mobilization activities have to be auth

Description	Type	*Impact, Probability and Significance*	Mitigation Measures	Owner	Status
COVID 19-related restrictions may hinder, or delay communities? work related to restoration and other site-based activities.	**Operational**	**I = 3** **P = 2** **Moderate**	? However, once the lockdown gets lifted, communities will continue with their restoration works following already established COVID-19 protocols including proper use of PPE and adherence to social distancing.	PMU	? COVID-19 lockdown has been lifted but restrictions are still in place. Communities have resumed their developmental interventions. However, public gatherings including community mobilization activities have to be auth

Description	Type	*Impact, Probability and Significance*	Mitigation Measures	Owner	Status
Lesotho relies heavily on South Africa for supplies. The restrictions on cross-border movement may affect a number of supply-chains hence goods and services obtain from local suppliers that rely on imports from	**Operational**	**I = 2** **P = 1** **Low**	? During the lockdowns, the project will continue to liaise with local authorities to facilitate exemptions for any critical supplies and services that may be needed from South Africa.	Project Board via the PMU	? Lockdowns including cross-border movements had significant impact on supply chains. However, local suppliers ensure that they stock adequate supplies when lockdowns are lifted and Government through

Description	Type	*Impact, Probability and Significance*	Mitigation Measures	Owner	Status
COVID 19 restrictions including travel ban will impact on stakeholder engagements including consultations at community level.	**Operational**	**I = 3** **P= 1** **Significant**	? Once COVID-19 lockdown is lifted, the project will engage with communities while implementing COVID-19 protocols including proper use of PPE to engage with communities	PMU	? During COVID-19 restrictions (including travel bans) technical inputs and services are affected during the COVID-19 lockdowns. However, when hard lockdowns are lifted travel, including cross-bord

Description	Type	*Impact, Probability and Significance*	Mitigation Measures	Owner	Status
A prolonged or recurrent COVID-19 pandemic will create ongoing challenges for the implementation of the project.	**Strategic**	**= 3** **P = 2** **Moderate**	? The project will adopt adaptive management as needed. This includes using virtual platforms for meetings and engaging with local authorities and community representatives where possible while implementing COVID-19 protocols.	Project Board via the PMU	? Authorities anticipate that there will be another COVID-19 3rd wave. However, with the on-going COVID-19 vaccination progress and lessons learnt from ongoing community programmes, both Government

Description	Type	*Impact, Probability and Significance*	Mitigation Measures	Owner	Status
Government counterparts not able to focus on the project as they will be also supporting national COVID-19 response efforts/plan.	**Operational**	**I = 2** **P = 1** **Low**	? The project will prioritize its activities aligned and complementing the national response particularly at aimed as building resilience of communities such as land restoration and food production.	Project Board via the PMU	? Assessment of the socio-economic impact of COVID-19 identified agriculture as one of the vulnerable sectors and hence one of the priority areas for COVID recovery. The Government of Lesotho also mad

[1] http://www.fao.org/docrep/008/y5968e/y5968e07.htm

[2] Ministry of Energy, Meteorology and Water Affairs, 2015. VULNERABILITY MAPPING: Tosing Community Council: For the Improvement of early warning system to reduce impacts of climate change and capacity building to integrate climate change into development plans

[3] Ministry of Energy, Meteorology and Water Affairs, 2015. VULNERABILITY MAPPING: Tosing Community Council: For the Improvement of early warning system to reduce impacts of climate change and capacity building to integrate climate change into development plans

A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination

Describe the Institutional arrangementfor project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

Implementing Partner: This project is implemented under the National Implementation Modality (NIM). The Implementing Partner is the Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC), as envisaged in the PIF. A detailed organogram and description of roles and responsibilities for each partner involved in project governance and coordination is provided in Prodoc Section 7 - Governance and Management Arrangements. UNDP is responsible for delivering GEF project cycle management services comprising project approval and start-up, project supervision and oversight, and project completion and evaluation. UNDP is also responsible for the Project Assurance role of the Project Board/Steering Committee. UNDP has not been requested to perform any direct execution duties.

A Project Board will be constituted, comprising of Project Executive (the Permanent Secretary of MFRSC), representatives of the beneficiaries (Chiefs of the Tosing and Tsatsane communities), Government Partners s (MoW, MAFS, MTEC, MLGCA, representatives of the ICM Programme from the EU and GiZ). The Project Board will provide policy guidance and will be responsible for taking corrective action as needed to ensure the project achieves the desired results. A Project Manager, who will have the responsibility of day-to-day management of the project, will be the Secretary to the Project Board. The terms of reference for the project manager, the technical advisor, project field facilitator and other project support staff are provided in Prodoc Section 7 and Prodoc Annex 7. Refer Section 8 of UNDP Project Document for detailed discussion of Governance and Management Arrangements

Coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives: The project will build on and be coordinated closely with the projects described in both the Baseline and Partnerships Sections of the Prodoc. It will in particular build on the achievements, lessons and best practices of the project on ?Integrated Catchment Management? funded by the EU/GIZ partnership and implemented by the Department of Water Affairs. A close working collaboration with this project will be set up by inviting representation on the Sebapala project?s Technical Secretariat and by participating in joint knowledge sharing events.

Other projects it will coordinate closely with include the following (see Partnerships Section of the Prodoc, page 46 for the list and description of relevant projects and a description of the expected collaboration).

Additional Information not well elaborated at PIF Stage:

A.7. Benefits

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

The socio-economic benefits delivered via the project will be felt at the individual household and the collective levels: this means households and resource user groups and traditional institutions (such as herders association, mohair wool producers, etc.) in the following manner:

- At least 445 households in the Sebapala Sub-catchment, with a total population of 2,397 (1,125 males and 1,272 females) will directly benefit through improved livelihoods and incomes. The whole population will be reached because they live in small scattered villages, in a small part of the landscape, largely along river channels). A total of at least 14,597 people (7,298M, 7,299F) living in the broader Sebapala watershed will also benefit directly as beneficiaries under Outcome 3.
- The total population of Tosing Community Council per 2016 National Census (23,839 people (11,786M, 12,053F) will be beneficiaries of the Sebapala Integrated Watershed Management Master Plan. Even those who are not direct beneficiaries under Outcome 3 will derive benefit from the interventions, as all people in the Tosing Community Council will benefit from restoration of rangelands and farmlands in the watershed
- Implementation of the action plans associated with the IWM Master Plan (Outcome 3) will result in soil conservation measures, range rehabilitation, improved grazing management, reseeding, wetlands conservation, which will improve rangeland productivity, with benefits to livestock - a corner stone of livelihoods in the Tosing Community Council. Unless desperately poor, all households keep livestock, hence this benefit will accrue to everyone.
- Improved water harvesting and climate smart agriculture will improve crops yields due to adoption of water conservation and mini irrigation during agricultural droughts, adoption of drought tolerant varieties, growing pastures in rotation with crops, etc. This will result in crop diversification (currently dominated by maize and sorghum) and improved food security.
- Mainstreaming gender in the project initiatives will improve project targeting, and therefore effectiveness and efficiency. In addition, it will remove barriers to women?s active participation in decision-making and participation in all project activities. This will have positive outcomes for the whole society.

A.8. Knowledge Management

Elaborate on the knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives (e.g. participate in trainings. conferences, stakeholder exchanges, virtual networks, project twinning) and plans for the project to assess and document ina user- friendly form (e.g. lessons learned briefs, engaging websites, guidebooks based on experience) and share these experiences and expertise (e.g. participate in community of practices, organize seminars, trainings and conferences) with relevant stakeholders.

The project has a dedicated knowledge management component to ensure that adequate attention is paid to delivering effective outreach and communications campaigns and training and education programmes, to enable a process of iterative learning and adaptive management. This will strengthen awareness and support for landscape rehabilitation, reducing unsustainable livestock grazing and overharvesting of resources, improving awareness and engagement of learning and self-critique as part of regular natural resources management practices. Information and knowledge accumulated and produced within the project will be documented and made available for wider communication as project lessons and experiences. This will support replication and scaling-up of project results. KM materials will be disseminated through many channels: sharing forums on IWM, nationally and internationally, PIR, technical publications in refereed journals and attendance (and presentation of papers) at relevant regional and international fora. The information will also be shared on project-related websites and on social media. The project will facilitate staff exchanges to build on lessons and knowledge accumulated under the partnership projects described in the Prodoc , page 46 (Partnerships), and other similar ones to be identified in the course of implementation. It will also identify synergies with all existing GEF-financed projects in Lesotho, and other projects to start during its lifetime, including most notably the EU/GIZ-supported National Integrated Catchment Management Programme which is led by the Ministry of Water. The project will contract the part-time services of a Communications and Knowledge Management Consultant to assist with delivery of outputs under Outcome 4 of the UNDP Project Document, including the development and implementation of a Communications and Knowledge Management Framework, which will be used to plan, direct and track the project?s knowledge management functions and performance. It will also detail specifics of the knowledge products to be delivered, following the minimum-set guidance as outlined in the Prodoc and SRF.

B. Description of the consistency of the project with:

B.1. Consistency with National Priorities

Describe the consistency of the project with nation strategies and plans or reports and assessements under relevant conventions such as NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc.

This project responds directly to national priorities articulated in numerous strategies, policies and pieces of legislation.

The Government of Lesotho has identified land degradation and watershed management as strategic priorities, as reflected in documents that guide Lesotho?s national development agenda, and contribute to meeting the country?s commitments under the CBD, UNCCD and UNFCCC. Key amongst these are: (i) the *National Strategic Development Plan* (NSDP II - 2018/19-2022/23); (ii) the *Long Term Water and Sanitation Strategy, Volume II,* Water Sector Programme (2014); and, (iii) the *National Action Programme in Natural Resource Management: Combating Desertification and Mitigating the Effects of Drought*, as outlined in the UNCCD *National Action Plan* (2015). The country is in the process of developing a *Climate Change Strategy* and a *Resilience Framework*, both of which recognize the need for integrated approaches for building resilience to climate-induced shocks and disturbances. It also has a *National Gender Policy* that was published in 2018. Integrated Catchment Management has been embraced by the government as its model for addressing the interlinked issues of land degradation, poverty alleviation and

climate resilience, as reflected in the enormous investment the country is making in the *National ICM Programme*, supported by development partners,

This project is consistent with priorities articulated under the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP), the Environment Act 2008, the Biodiversity Resources Management Draft Bill of 2016, the National Range Resources Management Policy of 2014, and the Long Term Water and Sanitation Strategy, Volume II, Water Sector Programme (2014), which also reflects the regional transboundary river basin management priorities set at the level of the Orange-Senqu River Basin Commission (ORASECOM).

The UNCCD NAP (2015) sets strategic objectives and accompanying operational areas, which are to: 1) To improve the living conditions of affected populations (People living in areas affected by DLDD to have an improved and more diversified livelihood base and to benefit from income generated from SLM; Affected populations? socio-economic and environmental vulnerability to climate change, climate variability and drought is reduced); 2) To improve the condition of affected ecosystems (Land productivity and other ecosystem goods and services in affected areas are enhanced in a sustainable manner contributing to improved livelihoods; The vulnerability of affected ecosystems to climate change, climate variability and drought is reduced); 3) To generate global benefits through effective implementation of the UNCCD (SLM and combating desertification/land degradation contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and the mitigation of climate change); and 5) To mobilize resources to support implementation of the Convention through building effective partnerships between national and international actors (Increased financial, technical and technological resources are made available to affected developing country Parties; Enabling policy environments are improved for UNCCD implementation at all levels).

Under its commitments to the UNCCD, Lesotho has embarked on a process of setting its voluntary land degradation neutrality targets. The project will contribute directly to achievement of these targets, as follows:

- *LDN Target*: Rehabilitate 600,000 hectares of degraded land to functionality by 2030 (**Project contribution: 15,000 ha of degraded rangelands, and 8,000 ha of cultivated lands under SLM, representing a 4% contribution**). As part of achieving this target, the project will contribute to another of the LDN targets which is to convert 135,600 ha of brush land back to rangeland by 2030 as compared to 2015. One of the key threats to rangelands in Lesotho is invasion by karroid and other weedy shrubs. This happens as a result of over-grazing and too-frequent use of fire to bring on a ?green flush?. Under Outcome 3, one of the key interventions will be removal of invasive species and revegetation with desirable grasses (including indigenous reseeding), implementation of improved grazing plans (including revitalization of traditional rotational systems) and improved fire management.
- *LDN target*: Halt the conversion of forests and wetlands to other land cover classes by 2022 (**Project contribution: 1,500 ha of wetlands and riparian systems restored or protected;** the project will target restoration of degraded headwater wetlands, and degraded stream and river banks).
- *LDN target*: Reduce the rate of soil erosion and sealing (conversion to artificial land cover) by 20% by 2030 as compared to 2015. (**Project contribution: 10,000 ha under soil and water conservation measures).**

Furthermore, through implementation of climate-smart SLM technologies to improve soil fertility and water-holding capacity, the project will contribute to the LDN target for improved soil organic matter (Lesotho has set an LDN target to improve productivity and Soil Organic Carbon stocks to 2% in all land classes by 2030 as compared to 2015).
The project aligns directly with four key objectives laid out in the 2014 Range Resources Management Policy, supported by several strategies. The objectives are: to develop strategies for proper management of rangeland resources; to promote an integrated approach to planning and management of rangeland resources; to develop appropriate policy and strategies for rehabilitation and possible restoration of lost rangeland resources; and to promote effective stakeholder participation in the planning and implementation of rangeland management programmes.

Lesotho is a signatory to the UNCCCF and has completed the First National Report on Climate in 2000 and the National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA) in 2007. The NAPA process identified eleven adaptation options, most of which emphasize the need for integrating SLM into ecosystem management and agriculture, in order to increase productivity without further damage to the natural resources base. The project contributes to NAPA Priority 2?Promoting Sustainable Crop Based Livelihood Systems in Foothills, Lowlands and SRV.

C. Describe The Budgeted M & E Plan:

Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Budget			
GEF M&E requirements	**Responsible Parties**	**Indicative costs (US$)**	**Time frame**
Inception Workshop	Implementing Partner Project Manager	Total: $5,000	Within 60 days of CEO endorsement of this project.
Inception Report	Project Manager	None	Within 90 days of CEO endorsement of this project.
Monitoring of indicators in project results framework	Project Manager will oversee national institutions/agencies charged with collecting results data.	Per year: $1,000 ($4,000)	Annually prior to GEF PIR. This will include GEF core indicators.
GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR)	Regional Technical Advisor; UNDP Country Office; Project Manager	None	Annually typically between June-August
Monitoring all risks (Atlas risk log)	Project Manager	None	On-going.
Monitoring of stakeholder engagement plan	Project Stakeholder Engagement Officer	None	On-going.
Monitoring of gender action plan	Project Gender Officer	Per year: $1,000 ($4,000)	On-going.
Project Board Meetings	Implementing Partner Project Manager	*Total: 10,000*	Annually.

Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Budget			
GEF M&E requirements	**Responsible Parties**	**Indicative costs (US$)**	**Time frame**
Reports of Project Board Meetings	Implementing Partner Project Manager	None	Annually.
Lessons learned/KM	Project Manager	*Total $8,000*	Annually.
Supervision missions	UNDP Country Office, Project Steering Committee	None[1]	Annually
Oversight missions	UNDP-GEF RTA and UNDP-GEF Directorate	None61	Troubleshooting as needed
Mid-term GEF Core indicators	PMU	*$1,000*	*Before mid-term review mission takes place.*
Independent Mid-term Review (MTR) and management response	UNDP Evaluation Specialists and independent evaluation consultants.	*$15,000[2]*	*2022.* Only oversight can be charged to the GEF Fee.
Terminal GEF Core indicators	PMU	*$1,000*	Before terminal evaluation mission takes place
Independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) and management response	UNDP Evaluation Specialists and independent evaluation consultants.	$20,000[3]	*2024.* Only oversight can be charged to the GEF Fee.
TOTAL indicative COST Excluding oversight/project assurance costs. Project implementation costs to be included in Component 4 KM and M&E outcome in TBWP.		*$68,000 (3% of UNDP and GEF grants)*	

[1] The costs of UNDP CO and UNDP-GEF Unit?s participation and time are charged to the GEF Agency Fee

[2] This is a small project with a total budget of US$ 2.1 million; $15,000 for IC

[3] This is a small project with a total budget of US$ 2.1 million; $20,000 for IC

PART III: Certification by GEF partner agency(ies)

A. GEF Agency(ies) certification

GEF Agency Coordinator	Date	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email
Pradeep Kurukulasuriya, UNDP	12/23/2019	Mandy Cadman	+27844642559	mandy.cadman@undp.org
Pradeep Kurukulasuriya, UNDP	7/1/2021	Sakhile Koketso	15145026501	sakhile.koketso@undp.org

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).

This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s): 15 (Life on land); 1 (No poverty); 2 (Zero hunger); 3 (Health and Well-Being); 5 (Gender Equality); 6 (Clean Water and Sanitation); 13 (Climate Action); 17 (Partnerships for the Goals)				
This project will contribute to the following country outcome (UNDAF/CPD, RPD, GPD): 3.2: By 2023, the people of Lesotho use natural resources in a more sustainable manner and the marginalized and most vulnerable are increasingly resilient				
	Objective and Outcome Indicators	**Baseline**	**Mid-term Target**	**End of Project Target**
Project Objective: To mainstream sustainable rangeland management and land restoration into the use of watersheds, enhance the flow of agro-ecosystem goods and services and improve livelihoods of agro-pastoral communities in the Sebapala Watershed (Tosing Community Council) in the Lower Senqu Basin	**Indicator 1: (Mandatory GEF 7 Core Indicator 3)** **Area of land restored (in ha), including:** Sub-indicator 1.1: natural grasslands and shrublands (incorporating rangelands) (Core Indicator 3.3) Sub-indicator 1.2: Areas of wetlands restored (Core Indicator 3.4)	*In Tosing Community Council:* *106, 282 ha of shrublands and grasslands in TCC (of which 47,091 are in SC 54), with 90,339 ha used for rangelands in TCC (40,027 of these in SC54188,696 ha rangelands (incorporating grasslands and shrublands)* *(extent degraded to be determined at inception)*	*At least 3,800 ha restored through implementation of mechanical restoration measures (terraces, stone-bunds, water furrows, cross-slope barriers, gabions etc), other soil and water conservation measures, and improved rangeland management (40% of EOP target)* *At least 200 ha of wetlands restored and under IWRM* *(Total area restored is 4,000ha)*	*At least 10,000 ha of land restored through implementation of mechanical restoration measures (terraces, stone-bunds, water furrows, cross-slope barriers, gabions etc), other soil and water conservation measures and improved rangeland management* *At least 1,500 ha of wetland and riparian habitat restored and under IWRM and productive water use* *(Total area restored is 11,500 ha)*

	Indicator 2 : (Mandatory GEF 7 Core Indicator 4) **Area of landscape under improved practices, outside of protected areas** Sub-indicator 2.1: Area of landscape (ha) under SLM in production systems (Core Indicator 4.3), including: Cultivated lands; rangelands	*In Tosing Community Council:* *8,000 ha cultivated lands* *106,282 ha rangelands*	*At least 8,000 ha under improved practices, as follows* *Cultivated lands: at least 2,000 ha (farmlands in SC54 to be targeted first) under improved practices, with agreed plan in place for roll-out in remaining 6,000 ha across TCC* *Rangelands: at least 6,000 ha under improved practices (targeting SC54)*	*At least 23,000 ha under improved practices* *8,000 ha of agricultural lands under SLM/IWM practices and productive water use, across Sebapala River Watershed* *At least 15,000ha of rangelands /grasslands under improved practices*
	Indicator 3: (Mandatory GEF Core Indicator 11) **No. of direct and indirect beneficiaries, disaggregated by gender, as co-benefit of the GEF investment**	*Total population of potential beneficiaries in Tosing Community Council 23,839 (11,786 M, 12,053F)* *Of which:* *2,397 People in SC54 (1,125M, 1,272F)*	At least 50% of population of TCC participating directly in consultations for development of the IWM Master Plan (with 50M:50F split) At least 3,649 people (25% of target) in SC 54 and neighbouring villages benefitting directly as a result of the project (1,824M, 1,925F)	At least 80% of Tosing Community Council population (19,071 total, 9,428M, 9,642F) people in TCC benefit indirectly through delivery of the ICM Master Plan for Sebapala Watershed At least 14,597 people (7,298M, 7,299F) benefit directly through involvement in pilot projects to implement SLM/IWRM interventions, (including all 2,397 people in SC54)

Project component	Institutional capacity at national and local levels for integrated watershed management
Project Outcome 1: Integrated Watershed Management Plan, with community action plans, facilitates implementation of landscape restoration, soil and water conservation,	*Output 1.1: Institutional arrangements for coordination, planning, implementation and monitoring f the Sebapala IWM master Plan and community action plans.* *Output 1.2 Integrated Watershed Master Plan , complemented by sub-catchment-level community action plans, to facilitate implementation of land rehabilitation, soil and water conservation, and SLM practices in productive landscapes in the Sebapala Watershed (Tosing Community Council)*

and Sustainable Land Management practices in the Sebapala Watershed	**<u>Indicator 4:</u> Integrated Watershed Management Plan for Sebapala Watershed (including community action plans for land restoration, soil and water conservation, and SLM in production landscapes) developed and adopted** *Sebapala IWM Master Plan covering 121,699 ha (Tosing Community Council)* *Community Action Plans covering at least 49,425 ha* *(Sebapala Sub-catchment SC54)*	*No IWMP plan or community action plans in place in Tosing CC or its sub-catchments*	*IW Master Plan developed and endorsed by National ICM Technical Secretariat and at least two community action plans for drainage basins in SC54 drafted and approved by District and local authorities*	*IWM Plan and at least 5 community action plans at sub-catchment level completed, endorsed by the National ICM Steering Committee and local governance structures and guiding management, with at least one Monitoring Report completed and informing adaptive management*
	<u>Indicator 5:</u> Institutional arrangements for co-ordnation of IWM planning, implementation and monitoring	*No institutional arrangements for IWM planning in place in Sebapala Watershed*	*IWM Plan Technical Secretariat and Stakeholder Coordination team in place and meeting regularly, according to agreed TORs, with minutes of all meetings kept*	*IWM Plan Technical Secretariat and Stakeholder Coordination Team capacitated to interface with Sebapala CPU and transfer skills, knowledge and capacity to implement the IWM Plan M&E system*

Outcome 2: District level technical officers, local authorities, and resource management institutions capacitated to implement IWM plans and enforce rules to prevent land and ecosystem degradation	*Output 2.1: Community Council by-laws developed to enforce implementation of Community Action Plans for integrated watershed management* *Output 2.2: Establishment and strengthening of community-level resource user groups (WUAs, Farmers? Associations, Farmer field Schools, Grazing Associations etc.) supported* *Output 2.3: District technical officers, village-level institutions, farmers? associations, and members of the community trained on SLWM practices for application at landscape and farm levels*			
	<u>Indicator *6:*</u> Number of ffective bylaws providing legal basis for local-level implementation of IWM Master Plan and Community Action Plans	*Tosing Community Council and local-level structures currently have no bylaws for enforcing IWM*	*Full scoping assessment (review of legal instruments and identification of gaps in local-level regulatory framework) completed and consultative processes concluded for identification of new bylaws for ICM (number of bylaws to be determined during scoping)*	*At least three* by-laws developed by CC, adopted and in force as the legal basis for local-scale implementation of IWM plans (*number and type to be refined based on scoping study to be carried out in second year of implementation)*

	<u>Indicator 7:</u> Improved capacity scores of key resource management institutions responsible for implementation of IWM Master Plan and community action Plans at Quthing District, TCC and local levels: *Systemic, institutional and individual capacities will be assessed using:* *The **UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard** for District-level institutions (Quthing District Officials, extension staff, and all other relevant entities under the approved National Governance Framework for ICM ? such as the Catchment Management Joint Committee), and the* ***modified Capacity Development Scorecard[1]**for Tosing Community Council (Standing Committees on Finance, Planning and Environment; officials; extension staff), and local-level*	*Baseline for District officials under national Ministries (and other relevant entities)* *55%* *Baseline for local-level institutions* *70%*	*Midterm score for district officials under national Ministries (and other relevant entities)* *60%* *Midterm score for local-level institutions:* *75%*	*End-of-project score for district officials under national Ministries (and other relevant entities)* *65%* *End-of-project score for local-level institutions:* *80%*

Project component 2:	**Integrated Watershed Management practices in the Sebapala Watershed**
Outcome 3: Integrated Watershed Management practices (including SLM and SWM) effectively implemented over at least 34,500 ha in the Sebapala River Watershed, with ecosystem, climate resilience and livelihood	*Output 3.1: Soil and water conservation measures implemented to combat soil erosion and promote water infiltration (including hillside terracing, stone-bunding, gully rehabilitation, re-seeding, tree-planting and soil improvement)* *Output 3.2: Rangeland rehabilitation measures implemented to promote improved productivity and vegetative cover (measures including enforcement of rotational grazing plans, selective reseeding, resting and natural regeneration, removal of invasive species, pasture resting).* *Output 3.3: SLWM practices piloted by land users at selected sites to improve agricultural productivity (and strengthen resilience) measures including climate-smart agriculture, crop diversification, mixed crop-livestock systems, agroforestry)* *Output 3.4: Integrated water resources management promoted to augment water supply for community and household food production (measures including rainwater harvesting, in-field planting pits and keyhole gardens)*

benefits	**Indicator 8: Area of land restored or under improved land use practices, measured in total, and separately for:** Sub-indicator 8.1: Agricultural lands Sub-indicator 8.2: Grasslands and shrublands (incorporating rangelands) Sub-indicator 8.3: Wetlands and riparian habitats Targets to be disaggregated for the whole Sebapala River Watershed (=Tosing Community Council - TCC) and the Sebapala Sub-catchment (No. 54 in catchment map ? SC54)	*Total area under different kinds of landcover:* *(Extent degraded to be determined at inception)* *Agricultural lands 8,181 ha in TCC, of which 612 ha are in SC 54* *106, 282 ha of shrublands and grasslands in TCC (of which 47,091 are in SC 54), with 90,339 ha used for rangelands in TCC (40,027 of these in SC54)* *847 ha of wetlands in TCC (of which 496 ha are in SC54), and 953 ha of other riparian/aquatic habitats in TCC (of which 202 ha are in SC54)*	*Total area under restoration or under improved practices by midterm: 12,000ha* *Agricultural lands: 2, 000 ha under improved practices - 400 ha in SC54, with agreed plans in place for roll out more broadly over a further 1,600 ha in TCC* *At least 6,000 ha of rangelands under improved practices* *At least 3,800 ha of rangelands under fast tracked??restoration , targeting hotpots in SC54 first, with plans in place for roll-out of soil and water conservation measures in remainder of SC54 and TCC, as appropriate* *At least 200 ha of headwater wetlands under emergency restoration (targeting wetlands in Upper Sebapala and Tsatsane minor drainage basins in SC54 first), with sites for further roll-out identified*	*At least **34,500 ha** restored or under improved practices:* *At least 8,000 ha of agricultural lands under improved SLM practices* *15,000 ha of degraded rangelands under improved practices* *10,000ha degraded rangelands restored through improved soil and water conservation and grazing management measures* *At least 1,500 ha of wetlands and riparian habitats under IWRM (including 496 ha of restored wetlands)*
Project component 3	**Gender mainstreaming, Knowledge Management, and M&E**			

Outcome 4: Lessons learnt by the project through gender mainstreaming, knowledge management and participatory M&E are used to promote SLWM in the wider Sebapala Watershed and nationally	*Output 4.1: Project gender strategy and action plan implemented, monitored and reported on* *Output 4.2: Knowledge management system to facilitate participatory M&E, ongoing learning and adaptive management in the watershed and nationally, with active participation of key project stakeholders and project partners*			
	<u>Indicator 9:</u> Ratio of women/ men benefitting from project interventions, in accordance with Gender Action Plan	*Total population of potential beneficiaries in Tosing Community Council 23,839 (11,786 M, 12,053F)* *Of which:* *2,397 People in SC54 (1,125M, 1,272F)*	At least 50% of population of TCC participating directly in consultations for development of the IWM Master Plan (with 50M:50F split) At least 3,649 people (25% of target) in SC 54 and neighbouring villages benefitting directly as a result of the project (1,824M, 1,925F)	At least 80% of Tosing Community Council population (19,071 total, 9,428M, 9,642F) people in TCC benefit indirectly through delivery of the ICM Master Plan for Sebapala Watershed (11,786M, 12,053F) At least 14,597 people (7,298M, 7,299F) benefit directly through involvement in pilot projects to implement SLM/IWRM interventions, (including all 2,397 people in SC54)

	<u>Indicator 10:</u> Number of manuals, policy briefs, reports and lessons on SLWM in Sebapala Watershed collated and shared, and learning exchanges convened	*Currently there are no policy-briefs or SLM knowledge products specific to the Sebapala Watershed, and no comprehensive knowledge management or M&E syste for IWM/SLM.* *An SLM Toolkit for Lesotho (based on work in the Maseru District) available, and A booklet capturing lessons on Rangeland Rehabilitation in the Mount Moorosi area* *Stakeholders in the Sebapala have not yet benefitted from SLWM learning exchanges*	*Sebapala Catchment Communications and Knowledge Management Framework in place and guiding development and distribution of policy briefs and lessons learnt, and participation in learning exchanges:* *At least:* *1 Technical Report/Policy Brief* *4 Best-practice/lessons learnt communications pieces (at least one of which should have a specific gender focus)* *At least five local-level learning exchanges facilitated* *Participation by Sebapala stakeholders in at least one national or regional knowledge-exchange event, with a report prepared on lessons learnt*	*Sebapala Catchment Communications and Knowledge management Framework fully implemented, Web-based knowledge management system in place and serving information and knowledge products on ICM in Sebapala Catchment, including at least:* *4 Technical Reports**[2]**/Policy Briefs* *8 best-practice/lessons learnt**[3]** communications pieces* *At least one national knowledge-sharing workshop convened, ahead of TE, with proceedings collated as a technical lessons-learnt report* *Participation in at least 2 regional or national knowledge-exchange events, with reports prepared on lessons learnt* *Community-led advocacy programme operational*

[1] See Annex 14 for details. During the PPG, and based on consultation with stakeholders, a simplified version of the Scorecard was developed that targets key capacities required at local level, and that will be practicable for local-level stakeholders to update.

[2] To include at least: (i) one Report on implementation of the indigenous grass-reseeding pilot in Sebapala Subcatchment; (ii) Lessons Learnt from implementation of Lesotho?s new governance model for ICM at sub-catchment level (with policy recommendations)

[3] To include at least one case study each on: (i) The Role of Women in adoption of ICM in Sebapala Sub-catchment; (ii) Lessons Learnt reports form at least 2 local-level knowledge-sharing events and 1 national event (iii) At least one Photo Essay published through the UNDP Ecosystems & Biodiversity Exposure platform to capture human-interest stories from the project; (iv) Once case study on the Sebapala Catchment Community Advocacy Programme (to be published through a platform such as IUCN Panorama Solutions)

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).

Responses to STAP Comments and comments from Germany are provided in the Table below.

STAP Comment	How it is Addressed	Where to Find the Information

Comment 1a: STAP recommends detailing the climate data for Lesotho, such as the average monthly temperature and rainfall, information on weather variability, and anticipated climate change trends, which are important for planning, and managing the project. This information can be obtained from various sources. Comment 1b: The project developers may also consider collecting climate data for the project site. The following documents can be helpful for collecting climate data and information, and for describing the climate projections for southern Africa: 1) Morueta-Holme, N. et al. (2018). "Best practices for reporting climate data in Ecology". Nature Climate Change.; 2) Conway, D. et al. (2015). "Climate and southern Africa's water?energy?food nexus". Nature Climate Change.	This has been accommodated as follows: During the baseline assessments, up-to-date data on temperature, rainfall and weather variability was collated for the Sebapala sub-catchment and is incorporated into the baseline assessment reports (Annex 16 to the Prodoc). Climate data for the broader Sebapala Watershed (Tosing Community Council) was obtained from the Report emanating from the Vulnerability Mapping conducted in 2015 by the Ministry of Energy Meteorology and Water Affairs in 2015[1]. This includes rich climate data and trends, scenarios for future change, and vulnerability mapped against four criteria including erosion, drought, floods, and crop vulnerability. These data showed that the project domain is highly vulnerable to drought, erosion and floods (with the greatest hazard being drought), and faces shifts in rainfall that include less rain overall, drier summers, wetter winters (with more snowfall and colder temperatures) and increased incidence of long dry-spells which will occur unpredictably and be of longer duration. This increases the vulnerability of communities who rely on agro-pastoral livelihoods, and ecosystems that are inherently fragile and erosion-prone due to topographic, edaphic and physio-graphic features in these high-altitude landscapes. Using the information on climate change, and taking	Section A1.1 **CEO ER**; Threat analysis in **Prodoc, page 12;** **Prodoc Annex 1, Map 3** - Vulnerability Map for Tosing Community Council **Prodoc Annex 17**: Summary of climate change projections for Tosing Community Council **Prodoc, Outcome 3**, pages 37 to 43) **Prodoc Annex 16:** Baseline Reports: Biophysical Description

Comment 2: STAP suggests that the project developers provide detail on the current land tenure system, and the objectives of the current land management legislation and its weaknesses. The proposal lists a broad range of governance concerns, that will be challenging to overcome. STAP suggests that the project developers provide detail on the practical approach that will be taken to devising effective policy solutions. Consider the linkages between national and local level.	This has been done. The land tenure system that operates in the watershed is the same as that operating elsewhere in Lesotho. It has been described under the description of drivers of degradation in the Prodoc (pages 9 to 12). In the Sebapala Sub-catchment and watershed, land use is dominated by livestock-keeping, through which land is accessed communally. Historically, a transhumance system of rotational grazing was followed, providing time for pastures to rest and recover. In this system, Principal Chiefs had control over land access rights. Government policy, however, has removed the authority of Chiefs to control access to land and the traditional transhumance system is actively discouraged. Compounded with many other societal and environmental changes, loss of authority by chiefs has led to breakdown of the traditional rotational system, leading to extensive overstocking and overgrazing. (This is described in detail in the Prodoc, System Description, pages 9 - 12). At local scale Grazing Associations play an important role in decisions around land use, but their capacity to enforce land-use rules is weak. Cultivation takes place on small plots of semi-private land, access to which is passed down through patrilineal inheritance. Men own the land and take most key decisions on land use, though women commonly work the fields. Farmer?s Associations and many other natural	**Prodoc, System Description** for the project site, pages 9 - 12. **Prodoc, System Description** under Outcome 2, Page 34

STAP suggests that the project developers include a description of the catchment management approach, and detail the methods that will be used to identify suitable SLM interventions for each part of the catchment. With respect to the latter, STAP suggests that the project developers consider the guidance provided in the Scientific Conceptual Framework for Land Degradation Neutrality (see below).	Box 1, page 20 in the Prodoc, includes the definition and set of principles for the ICM approach that has been adopted in this project. The planning process will follow the national guidelines and protocols for Integrated Catchment Management planning in Lesotho, and use nationally-adopted data-capture templates for ICM planning,[3] customizing them for use in the Sebapala Watershed where appropriate ? this will be done in the interests of methodological consistency and to facilitate direct data-sharing between ICM planning processes taking place in different watersheds and sub-catchments in Lesotho. The mains steps in the planning process - which will be highly - participatory and gender-sensitive- are described in detail the Prodoc under Outcome 1, Output 1.2, page 30. These steps are fully consistent with the guidance provided in the UNCCD Scientific Conceptual Framework for LDN (see response to STAP comment 4, and response to comments from Germany, below). They include, at a minimum: (i) **delineation and characterization of the watershed** (biophysical features; land condition; land degradation assessment; socio-economic and institutional assessment; watershed mapping and zonation to visualize current land uses, future land capability, etc; mapping of future scenarios with cost-benefit analysis); (ii) **Stakeholder consultation and action research** (visioning and objective setting;	**Prodoc Box 1,** Strategy Section, page 20; **Prodoc, Outcome 1, Output 1.2,** page 30

Comment 4: STAP is pleased that Lesotho committed to setting LDN targets. To embrace this opportunity STAP suggests for UNDP and Lesotho to consider how this project can contribute to LDN. The Science-Policy Interface of the UNCCD developed the "Scientific Conceptual Framework for Land Degradation Neutrality", which can assist in planning sustainable land management interventions. The framework can be accessed at: https://www.unccd.int/sites/default/files/documents/2017-08/LDN_CF_report_web-english.pdf	The *UNCCD Scientific Conceptual Framework for Land Degradation Neutrality*[4][4] outlines five key criteria that must be considered in an LDN assessment: land condition; land potential; resilience; and socio-economic and socio-cultural criteria (including gender). These are fully consistent with the criteria that will be assessed as part of the IWM planning process to be followed in the Sebapala Project (see explanation under Comment 3, above). The Framework also advocates for leveraging existing planning processes, which the Sebapala project will do by adopting the national ICM planning protocols Further, the Framework identifies three ecosystem condition indicators for monitoring LDN - carbon stocks (soil condition and stability), land productivity an land cover. The Sebapala project will make a rapid vegetation assessment at each site before restoration starts , focusing on basal cover and soil condition. This means that monitoring data gathered in the lifespan of this project can feed directly into national data systems for tracking achievement of LDN targets. The project contribute directly to achievement of Lesotho?s voluntary LDN targets which include: Specific Targets to Avoid, Minimize and Reverse Land Degradation ? Improve productivity and Soil Organic Carbon stocks to 2% in all land classes by 2030 as compared to 2015. ? Rehabilitate 600 000 hectares	**Output 1.1 of the Prodoc**

Comment 5: STAP recommends applying the Resilience, Adaptation Pathways, and Transformation Assessment (RAPTA) Framework to assist Lesotho plan for changes, including climate risks. RAPTA is based on the principles of resilience thinking. It assists in analyzing the interactions across sectors, for example, between social, biophysical and economic variables, and how risks and shocks (e.g. drought) may influence the project's ability to meet its objective. RAPTA could assist in devising mitigation strategies for the risks identified in section 4. RAPTA also encourages consideration of the linkages between scales ? for example, how national policies on agricultural prices influences household decisions in the project area. Based on a resilience assessment, the project developers can identify the need for adaptation or transformation, and develop alternative options to steer away from unsustainable paths. More detailed guidance on applying RAPTA can be found at: http://www.stapgef.org/rapta-guidelines	The PPG budget and timeframe did not allow for full adoption of the RAPTA methodology, although the Guidelines were consulted and principles were applied in designing the project - where possible. Fortunately, the project could draw on the Vulnerability Assessment that was carried out for the Tosing Community Council in 2015 to build resilience thinking into the design of the project. This is discussed in more detail on page one, Section A1:1 at the start of this CEO ER. Key factors to address in building resilience in the Tosing Community Council were identified as: ? Reducing vulnerability to drought and soil erosion ? Maximising impact in cultivated lands ? Strengthening local livelihoods In response, and as explained elsewhere, under Outcome 3, the project will: ? selectively target implementation of measures that have the best combined capacity for improving soil stability and condition, and improving water-use efficiency, with best returns for land productivity. This will include revitalization of traditional practices (such as Machobane Farming Systems and keyhole gardens, and traditional rotational grazing systems), in combination with new SLM technologies that are	**Prodoc,** Threats and Impact Pathway 3 (Theory of Change), and description of Outcome 3 (in the Results Section)

6. STAP welcomes the map of Lesotho's sub-catchments as an initial step to identifying the location of sub-catchment #54, which the project will target. As the project is designed, STAP encourages the project developers to consider applying Trends.Earth (or a similar geographic information system) that uses district level data (e.g. for land cover) to estimate the baseline, and monitor changes that are potentially resulting from the project activities. Trends Earth's calculations also can be used to report to UNCCD's impact indicators on land cover, land productivity and soil organic carbon. Further information about Trends.Earth can be found at: http://trends.earth/docs/en/	Up-to-date maps and landcover data were sourced from the LandCover Atlas of Lesotho, and staff at the FAO office in Maseru, who had undertaken the research and mapping to produce the Atlas. It was reference to these maps and statistics that enabled clarification of the project domain, as described under Section A.1:2 at the start of this CEO ER. The landcover statistics for Tosing Community Council and Sebapala sub-catchment are presented in Annex 1 to the Prodoc. The data accessed through the Land Cover Atlas datasets can be used to monitor changes in above-ground biomass, changes in landcover in the main landcover classes and for monitoring degradation in rangelands (extent of bare areas) and for preparing risk maps. Currently, there is no baseline data available for soils, but the National ICM Programme will be conducting a national-scale soil survey during 2020 to establish current baselines At site level, the project will conduct vegetation surveys and ecosystem condition assessments using metric belt quadrat methods and a visual assessment tool that uses a scorecard system for parameters such as basal cover, presence absence of indicator species, soil exposure and condition - this has been piloted in a neighbouring district through a community-led rangeland rehabilitation programme run under the auspices of the GEF-financed support to the Orange-Senqu SAP, under ORASECOM.	Chapter 3 of the Baseline Assessment Reports ? **Annex 1 and 16 of the Prodoc**.

Comment 7: STAP welcomes a component on gender mainstreaming and knowledge management. As the project is designed, STAP recommends considering the following issues: On gender: 1) consider the differentiated risks and opportunities for men and women, and define the preliminary response measures to address these differences; and, 2) consider whether the interventions hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed by the project. On knowledge management: 1) detail how the project will use the theory of change to adjust the project so it deals with expected and possible change. (The project description summary begins to describe adaptive management as an outcome. Therefore, it would be valuable to describe how the project will gather information, iteratively monitor change, and how the information and knowledge will be used to improve the project's management.); and, 2) identify indicators to measure knowledge sharing, learning, and other related outcomes described in the project description summary.	A **gender assessment** was undertaken during project preparation and a gender action plan is appended to the Prodoc, as Annex 8. The differentiated risks of men and women were considered. The findings of the gender assessment informed the project design, including identification of gender disaggregated indicators. A Gender Action Plan was formulated to guide project implementation in ensuring equal opportunities for men, women and youth to project benefits (Prodoc Annex 8). The project is classified as UNDP GEN2 (gender equality is a significant objective). The PMU will have the support of a Gender Expert (hired on a consultancy basis). The Gender Expert will ensure that the project?s Gender Action Plan is used to inform gender-related target-setting for all key steps of the IWM planning process and activities specified in the Master Plan and supporting Action Plans for site-level implementation. These gender targets will be incorporated into the IWM Master Plan?s monitoring and evaluation framework. The gender data collected by the project will provide useful information at sub-catchment level that can be fed into the gender analysis that will be undertaken in 2020 under the National Integrated Catchment Management Programme. This national-level analysis will identify national gender-mainstreaming priorities for ICM, which will be agreed and incorporated into ICM policy, in line with the country?s 2018 National Gender Policy.	Description of Barrier 3; **Output 4.1 of the Project Results;** Also, **Gender Action plan, Annex 8 to Prodoc** **Output 4.2, Prodoc**

8. STAP encourages the project developers to detail the integrated catchment approach that will be applied, and to identify indicators at this scale. This will allow the project to detail how the approach has been applied, how progress has been measured, and provide data to support the outcomes resulting from integrated catchment planning. A combination of environmental management, governance, and production variables can be used to monitored and assess progress. The following paper can help the project developers identify indicators at the catchment level, and strengthen the rationale for selecting catchment indicators: Reed, J., Van Vianen, J., Deakin, E. L., Barlow, J., & Sunderland, T. (2016). Integrated landscape approaches to managing social and environmental issues in the tropics: learning from the past to guide the future. Global change biology, 22(7), 2540-2554.	Project design took note of this as advised by STAP and has provided a definition of IWM (Box 1, Prodoc), has provided detailed objectives of the system and guidelines on how the system will be developed. This is detailed under the Strategy and Outcome 1 of the Results and Partnerships Sections of the Prodoc. The IWM Master Plan will have its own M&E Framework and set of indicators, which will be developed in a participatory way. It will combine environmental management, governance and production variables, as well as process indicators and targets. The recommended reference will be used to shape the formulation of these indicators, as ill the national guidelines which are being developed for this.	Strategy and Outcome 1 of the Results; and, Partnerships Sections of the Prodoc.

9. For developing component 2, it would be valuable to utilize UNDP's "Sustainable Land Management Toolkit" developed in partnership with the Government of Lesotho: http://www.undp.org/content/dam/lesotho/docs/Other/SLM-Toolkit.pdf The toolkit offers guidance on applying integrated watershed management, including through the application of soil and conservation technologies, rangeland management, and agro-forestry.	Recommendation adopted. Under Output 2.3 (skills development), the project will use three key training resources (among others that may be developed to fill any gaps): The SLM Toolkit for Lesotho, the online Compendium of Soil and Water Conservation Measures for ICM that has been developed under the National ICM Programme (and will be finalized in 2020), and the TerrAfrica/FAO/WOCAT Best Practice Guideline on SLM for Sub-Saharan-Africa (Liniger, et al. 2011). Under Outcome 2.3, the project will equip district?level technical officers, village-level institutions, farmers and other members of the community in the Sebapala Watershed with the knowledge, understanding, tools and practical skills they need for effective on-the-ground implementation of sustainable land and water management measures. The training should enable beneficiaries to: understand the principles of integrated catchment management; assess ecosystem health and identify signs of degradation in the landscape (including rangelands, farmlands, wetlands, riverine and riparian habitats); interpret how these impacts should be managed; select appropriate SLWM technologies to apply to both rehabilitate degraded areas and prevent future degradation; implement the measures effectively, monitor their impact, and adapt responses accordingly. training delivered under	Prodoc, Description of Output 2.3

10. Additionally, there a few details that are unclear in the PIF and require clarification as the project is developed: a. The stocking rates are described as ranging from 40-80%. If this is 40-80% of carrying capacity, it is not clear how this amounts to overstocking and results in overgrazing. Extensive grazing is discussed under the heading of "Overcultivation". Are the extensively grazed pastures cultivated? b. In the description of forests, which are stated to cover 1% of the land area, there is also reference to "total crown cover of 34.14% of the country". Please reword to explain this point. c. Scarcity of monitoring equipment is stated as a limitation: explain what monitoring equipment is required for rangelands management.	This project is sharply focused on piloting the implementation of IWM on the ground to provide practical guidelines and generate lessons for the larger National Integrated Catchment Management Programme, the analysis of threats, root causes and barriers has also been sharply focused on the Sebapala sub-catchment. This is explained in Section A1.1 of the CEOR. As a result, some statistics in the PIF that referred to national -level processes (which are going to be dealt with under the National ICM Programme) have been replaced with those specific to the watershed . a) Stocking rates: Baseline assessments showed that the optimal stocking rate in Sebapala sub-catchment are lower than the national average (at 8-10 ha per animal unit against a national average of 8 ha per animal unit). However, overgrazing has occurred especially in grazing categories B and C due to the partial breakdown of traditional seasonal grazing patterns, driven by changes in society, which interact and compound effects of each other in a cascading manner. b) It is unclear where the figure of 34.14% canopy cover was obtained. The latest landcover statistics for Tosing Community Council show very sparse tree cover of less than 1 % - which is t be expected in this high-altitude, escarpment landscape, where woody vegetation is strictly limited to drainage lines and some southern slopes, and where trees hardly form a closed canopy. The Lesotho Land	Development challenge section of the Prodoc (threats and barriers analysis);

Response to comments from Germany
Comments: The project explicitly relates to the objectives of UNCCD and will be a significant contribution to their implementation at country level. Therefore, the full proposal should describe how the proposed activities link to the land degradation neutrality (LDN) process in Lesotho and ensure synergies with the LDN conceptual framework as well as the national LDN target setting and monitoring process: 1) Under the Baseline Scenario, consider existing LDN commitments in the context of the UNCCD Target Setting Programme 2) Under Output 1.1 - Degradation Assessment, consider the LDN indicators and monitoring tools offered by UNCCD; 3) Under Output 1.2 - Integrated Watershed Management Plan und 1.3 -Community Action Plans, consider integration of LDN principles and relevant actors.

Response:
Consolidated responses to this set of comments is provided below. It should be noted, that Output 1.1 as described in the PIF has been removed (as it is considered to be an activity required to deliver the IWM (plans), and Outcome 1.2. and 1.3 of the PIF have been combined under one Output, 1.2. in the Prodoc.

1) The baseline commitments under Lesotho?s LVN voluntary commitments have been described in the Prodoc.

The Sebapala IWM project will make ad direct contribution under these targets as follows:

- ? Rehabilitate 600,000 hectares of degraded land to functionality by 2030 (**Project target: 15,000 ha of degraded rangelands, and 8,000 ha of cultivated lands under SLM, representing a 4% contribution**). As part of achieving this target, the project will contribute to another of the LDN targets which is to convert 135,600 ha of brush land back to rangeland by 2030 as compared to 2015. One of the key threats to rangelands in Lesotho is invasion by karroid and other weedy shrubs. This happens as a result of over-grazing and too-frequent use of fire to bring on a ?green flush?. Under Outcome 3, one of the key interventions will be removal of invasive species and revegetation with desirable grasses (including indigenous reseeding), implementation of improved grazing plans (including revitalization of traditional rotational systems) and improved fire management.
- ? Halt the conversion of forests and wetlands to other land cover classes by 2022 (**Project target: 1,500 ha of wetlands and riparian systems restored or protected);** the project will target restoration of degraded headwater wetlands, and degraded stream and river banks.
- ? Reduce the rate of soil erosion and sealing (conversion to artificial land cover) by 20% by 2030 as compared to 2015. (**Project target: 10,000 ha under soil and water conservation measures).**
- ? Furthermore, through implementation of climate-smart SLM technologies to improve soil fertility and water-holding capacity, the project will contribute to the LDN target for improved soil organic matter.

2 & 3) The UNCCD outlines five key objectives of LDN, each of which is described below with a brief explanation of how the project will deliver on these:

(i) ***Maintain or improve the sustainable delivery of ecosystem services***: under the Community Action Plans, the project will implement practical measures to rehabilitate degraded rangelands, place cultivated lands under SLM and restore degraded wetlands and riparian belts. The net effect of this will be to restore soil fertility; halt, reduce and avid soil erosion; reduce water runoff, improve water infiltration, and restore functionality of wetland ecosystems to secure water supplies. The Sebapala IWM Master Plan will develop an M&E system to track improvements in key ecosystem services including water flows/regulation, food supply and nutrient cycling land cover, linked to LDN indicators of land cover, land productivity and soil carbon stocks.

(ii) ***Maintain or improve productivity to enhance food security***: measures introduced under (i) above, will restore land productivity (in croplands and rangelands); the project will also introduce measures to diversify food production (keyhole gardens); the IWM plans will include indicators for tracking changes in food security (e.g. number of food insecure days experienced by households).

(iii) ***Increase the resilience of the land and populations dependent on the land***: in addition to measures described under (i) and (ii) above, the project will contribute to social resilience through skills development and capacity-building (Output 2.3), knowledge exchange and ongoing learning (Output 4.2) and gender empowerment (Output 4.1)to facilitate adaptive management. Ecological resilience will flow from returning restoring ecosystem functionality, and ensuring that thresholds for irreversible change are not crossed.

(iv) ***Seek synergies with other social, economic and environmental objectives***: Under Outcome 3, the project will implement land restoration technologies that also hold potential for the development of small businesses (e.g. indigenous re-seeding and compost-making), though these may not be set up during the lifespan of the project. Under Output 2.2, the project will provide training to community land -user groups in skills such as financial planning and management and business planning.

(v) Reinforce responsible and inclusive governance of the land: Under Output 2.1, the project will contribute to strengthening the regulatory framework for IWM in the Sepabala Watershed, and will strengthen capacity for enforcement. Under Output 1.1 and 2.2 the project will enable participatory planning processes, and will contribute to establishing inclusive coordination and governance arrangements for IWM.

Further, during the project development process, a comprehensive social and environmental safeguards screening was carried out (See Annex 9 to Prodoc) to ensure that all stakeholders can exercise their rights to participate fully in and reap equitable benefits from the land restoration activities put in place under this

Comment The full proposal should further detail how activities will be coordinated with the upcoming EU/GIZ support for a national framework for Integrated Catchment Management in Lesotho. Germany also supports the recommendations provided by STAP.
Response: As should be evident under the description of project activities in the Prodoc, every facet of this project has been designed to interface smoothly with and contribute to the National ICM Programme, technical support for which will be provided through the collaboration with EU/GIZ. The project will invite a representative from GIZ in Lesotho to serve on the Technical Planning Secretariat for the Sebapala IWM Plan to ensure alignment at a practical level. The PMU of the Sebapala Project will serve as the focal point for connecting stakeholders in the Sebapala Watershed with the national programme, and opportunities will be identified for these stakeholders to participate in assessments and knowledge sharing platforms convened under the GIZ-led programme of work. At a strategic level, coordination will be facilitated through the Donor Coordination Forum that is being initiated in Lesotho under UN facilitation.

[1] Ministry of Energy, Meteorology and Water Affairs, 2015. VULNERABILITY MAPPING: Tosing Community Council: For the Improvement of early warning system to reduce impacts of climate change and capacity building to integrate climate change into development plans.

[2] ?O Donnell, D; Abel,N; Grigg, N; Maru, Y; Butler, J; Cowie, A; Stone-Jovcich, S; Walker, B; Wise, R; Ruhezwa, A; Pearson, L; Ryan, P; Stafford-Smith, M. 2016. Designing projects in a Rapidly Changing World - Guidelines for embedding RAPTA into sustainable development projects. A STAP Advisory Document. GEF, Washington D.C.

[3] Although currently in draft form, these will be finalized and endorsed during 2020, under the EU-funded, GIZ-implemented ?Support to Integrated Catchment Management in Lesotho Project.? The draft guidelines are available in: Puri, S. (2016). Development of Catchment Management Plans: Summary Guidelines, Design of Plans, Roadmap for Implementation of Plans, and ICM technologies for classified catchments. Technical Report prepared under the EU-supported Integrated Catchment Management project.

[4] Orr, B.J., A.L. Cowie, V.M. Castillo Sanchez, P. Chasek, N.D. Crossman, A. Erlewein, G. Louwagie, M. Maron,G.I. Metternicht, S. Minelli, A.E. Tengberg, S. Walter, and S. Welton. 2017. Scientific Conceptual Framework for Land Degradation Neutrality. A Report of the Science-Policy Interface. United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), Bonn, Germany

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS.

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

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: **100,000**			
Project Preparation Activities Implemented	***GEF/LDCF/SCCF Amount ($)***		
	Budgeted Amount	***Amount Spent Todate***	***Amount Committed***
Component A: Preparatory Technical Studies & Reviews Component B: Formulation of the UNDP-GEF Project Document, CEO Endorsement Request, and Mandatory and Project Specific Annexes Component C: Validation Workshop and Report Delivery of final outputs Component D: Preparatory Technical Studies & Reviews	100,000.00	59,553.49	40,446.51
Total	100,000.00	59,553.49	40,446.51

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: GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet

Use this Worksheet to compute those indicator values as required in Part I, Table G to the extent applicable to your proposed project. Progress in programming against these targets for the program will be aggregated and reported at any time during the replenishment period. There is no need to complete this table for climate adaptation projects financed solely through LDCF and SCCF.

GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet

Core Indicator 1	**Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use**					***(Hectares)***
			Hectares (1.1+1.2)			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 1.1	Terrestrial protected areas newly created					
Name of Protected	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	

Area				PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			Sum				
Indicator 1.2	Terrestrial protected areas under improved management effectiveness						
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares	METT Score			
				Baseline		Achieved	
					Endorsement	MTR	TE
		Sum					
Core Indicator 2	**Marine protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use**						***(Hectares)***
				Hectares (2.1+2.2)			
				Expected		Achieved	
				PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	*TE*
Indicator 2.1	Marine protected areas newly created						
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category		Hectares			
				Expected		Achieved	
				PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			Sum				
Indicator 2.2	Marine protected areas under improved management effectiveness						
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares	METT Score			
				Baseline		Achieved	
				PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
		Sum					
Core Indicator 3	**Area of land restored**						***(Hectares)***
				Hectares (3.1+3.2+3.3+3.4)			
				Expected		Achieved	
				PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
				10,000	*11,500*		
Indicator 3.1	Area of degraded agricultural land restored						
				Hectares			
				Expected		Achieved	

			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 3.2	Area of forest and forest land restored					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 3.3	Area of natural grass and shrublands restored					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			10,000	*10,000*		
Indicator 3.4	Area of wetlands (including estuaries, mangroves) restored					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
				1,500		
Core Indicator 4	**Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)**					***(Hectares)***
			Hectares (4.1+4.2+4.3+4.4)			
			Expected		Expected	
			PIF stage	*Endorsement*	MTR	TE
			24,500	*23,000*		
Indicator 4.1	Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 4.2	Area of landscapes that meet national or international third-party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations					
Third party certification(s):			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE

Indicator 4.3	Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			24,500	*23,000*		
Indicator 4.4	Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided					
Include documentation that justifies HCVF			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Core Indicator 5	**Area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity**					***(Hectares)***
Indicator 5.1	Number of fisheries that meet national or international third-party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations					
Third party certification(s):			Number			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 5.2	Number of large marine ecosystems (LMEs) with reduced pollution and hypoxial					
			Number			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 5.3	Amount of Marine Litter Avoided					
			Metric Tons			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Core Indicator 6	**Greenhouse gas emission mitigated**					***(Metric tons of CO?e)***
			Expected metric tons of CO?e (6.1+6.2)			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
	Expected CO2e (direct)					

	Expected CO2e (indirect)					
Indicator 6.1	Carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in the AFOLU sector					
			Expected metric tons of CO?e			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
	Expected CO2e (direct)					
	Expected CO2e (indirect)					
	Anticipated start year of accounting					
	Duration of accounting					
Indicator 6.2	Emissions avoided Outside AFOLU					
			Expected metric tons of CO?e			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
	Expected CO2e (direct)					
	Expected CO2e (indirect)					
	Anticipated start year of accounting					
	Duration of accounting					
Indicator 6.3	Energy saved					
			MJ			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 6.4	Increase in installed renewable energy capacity per technology					
		Technology	Capacity (MW)			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Core Indicator 7	**Number of shared water ecosystems (fresh or marine) under new or improved cooperative management**					***(Number)***
Indicator 7.1	Level of Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Program (TDA/SAP) formulation and implementation					
		Shared water ecosystem	Rating (scale 1-4)			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 7.2	Level of Regional Legal Agreements and Regional Management Institutions to support its implementation					
		Shared water	Rating (scale 1-4)			

		ecosystem	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 7.3	Level of National/Local reforms and active participation of Inter-Ministerial Committees					
		Shared water ecosystem	Rating (scale 1-4)			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 7.4	Level of engagement in IWLEARN through participation and delivery of key products					
		Shared water ecosystem	Rating (scale 1-4)			
			Rating		Rating	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Core Indicator 8	**Globally over-exploited fisheries Moved to more sustainable levels**					***(Metric Tons)***
Fishery Details			Metric Tons			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Core Indicator 9	**Reduction, disposal/destruction, phase out, elimination and avoidance of chemicals of global concern and their waste in the environment and in processes, materials and products**					***(Metric Tons)***
			Metric Tons (9.1+9.2+9.3)			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	PIF stage	MTR	TE
Indicator 9.1	Solid and liquid Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) removed or disposed (POPs type)					
POPs type			Metric Tons			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 9.2	Quantity of mercury reduced					
			Metric Tons			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE

Indicator 9.3	Hydrochloroflurocarbons (HCFC) Reduced/Phased out					
		Metric Tons				
		Expected		Achieved		
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Indicator 9.4	Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control chemicals and waste					
		Number of Countries				
		Expected		Achieved		
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Indicator 9.5	Number of low-chemical/non-chemical systems implemented particularly in food production, manufacturing and cities					
	Technology	Number				
		Expected		Achieved		
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Indicator 9.6	Quantity of POPs/Mercury containing materials and products directly avoided					
		Metric Tons				
		Expected		Achieved		
		PIF stage	Endorsement	PIF stage	Endorsement	
Core Indicator 10	**Reduction, avoidance of emissions of POPs to air from point and non-point sources**				***(grams of toxic equivalent gTEQ)***	
Indicator 10.1	Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control emissions of POPs to air					
		Number of Countries				
		Expected		Achieved		
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Indicator 10.2	Number of emission control technologies/practices implemented					
		Number				
		Expected		Achieved		
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Core Indicator 11	**Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment**				***(Number)***	

			Number			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
		Female		*7,298*		
		Male		*7,299*		
		Total	*14,597*	*14,597*		

ANNEX F: Project Taxonomy Worksheet

Use this Worksheet to list down the taxonomic information required under Part1 by ticking the most relevant keywords/topics//themes that best describes the project

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
☐ Influencing models			
	☒ Transform policy and regulatory environments		
	☒ Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making		
	☒ Convene multi-stakeholder alliances		
	☒ Demonstrate innovative approaches		
	☐ Deploy innovative financial instruments		
☐ Stakeholders			
	☐ Indigenous Peoples		
	☐ Private Sector		
		☐ Capital providers	
		☐ Financial intermediaries and market facilitators	
		☐ Large corporations	
		☐ SMEs	
		☐ Individuals/Entrepreneurs	
		☐ Non-Grant Pilot	
		☐ Project Reflow	
	☒ Beneficiaries		
	☒ Local Communities		
	☒ Civil Society		
		☒ Community Based Organization	
		☒ Non-Governmental Organization	
		☐ Academia	
		☐ Trade Unions and Workers Unions	
	☒ Type of Engagement		
		☒ Information Dissemination	
		☒ Partnership	
		☒ Consultation	
		☒ Participation	
	☒ Communications		
		☒ Awareness Raising	
		☒ Education	
		☒ Public Campaigns	
		☒ Behavior Change	

☒ **Capacity, Knowledge and Research**			
	☒ **Enabling Activities**		
	☒ **Capacity Development**		
	☒ **Knowledge Generation and Exchange**		
	☐ **Targeted Research**		
	☒ **Learning**		
		☒ Theory of Change	
		☒ Adaptive Management	
		☒ Indicators to Measure Change	
	☒ **Innovation**		
	☒ **Knowledge and Learning**		
		☒ Knowledge Management	
		☒ Innovation	
		☒ Capacity Development	
		☒ Learning	
	☒ **Stakeholder Engagement Plan**		
☒ **Gender Equality**			
	☒ **Gender Mainstreaming**		

		☒ Beneficiaries	
		☒ Women groups	
		☒ Sex-disaggregated indicators	
		☒ Gender-sensitive indicators	
	☒ **Gender results areas**		
		☒ Access and control over natural resources	
		☒ Participation and leadership	
		☐ Access to benefits and services	
		☒ Capacity development	
		☐ Awareness raising	
		☒ Knowledge generation	

☐ **Focal Areas/Theme**			
			☐ Drylands
	☒ **Land Degradation**		
		☒ Sustainable Land Management	
			☒ Restoration and Rehabilitation of Degraded Lands
			☐ Ecosystem Approach
			☒ Integrated and Cross-sectoral approach
			☒ Community-Based NRM
			☒ Sustainable Livelihoods
			☐ Income Generating Activities
			☐ Sustainable Agriculture
			☒ Sustainable Pasture Management
			☐ Sustainable Forest/Woodland Management
			☒ Improved Soil and Water Management Techniques
			☐ Sustainable Fire Management
			☐ Drought Mitigation/Early Warning
		☒ Land Degradation Neutrality	
			☒ Land Productivity
			☒ Land Cover and Land cover change
			☒ Carbon stocks above or below ground

ANNEX G: Project Budget Table

Please attach a project budget table.

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)						Total (USD eq.)	(Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency) [1]
		Component 1	*Component 2*	*Component 3*	*Sub-Total*	*Component 4 (M&E + KM)*	*PMC*		
Equipment	Procurement of electronic/digital equipment and IT hardware and software required for data collection, analysis and interpretation under Output 2 (and to enable District technical officers to participate fully in development of the IWP plan, and its use. Including: Hand-held GPS devices; Digital camera (with geo-referencing capability); 2 laptop computers, with appropriate GIS and map-production software; survey and drawing equipment; map printer. (Note: this equipment will be located in the Quthing District Offices of the MFRSC) Total $15,000: $10,000 in year 1 and $5,000 in year 2	15,000			15,000			15,000	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC)

Equipment	This budget is reserved for purchase of hand-held GPS devices for recording site coordinates during rapid vegetation assessments, and other data recording equipment and 1 Laptop for the Field Officer. $6,904 in year 1			6,904	6,904			6,904	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC)
Equipment	This amount is reserved for meeting the operating costs of the project vehicle, which will be used mainly to facilitate delivery of the Outputs under Outcome 3. Total cost: $19,200, over four years			19,200	19,200			19,200	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC)
Equipment	This budget is reserved for Office furniture for PMU staff. Total estimated cost is $3,000, in Yr 1				-		3,000	3,000	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC)

Equipment	This budget is reserved for IT equipment of PMU staff a) Computer for the PM - Total cost: $1,500. b) Computer for the Financial/Administrative Officer: Total cost: $1,500 c) Printer (1). Total cost: $250. d) Digital camera (1). Total cost: $250. e) Projector (1). Total cost: $500. Total estimated cost is $4,000, in Yr 1				-		4,000	4,000	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC)

Contractual services-Individual	This budget will contribute to the salary of the Project Manager (20% of gross salary @ $3,333/m), for the delivery of technical outputs (Output 1.2), as follows: 1. (a)Conduct consultations to agree on the Terms of Reference and composition of both the Sebapala IWM Technical Planning Secretariat and Stakeholder Coordination Forum/Team, secure the participation of nominated/designated persons and constitute the two entities; (b) Convene an inception meeting of the Technical Secretariat and Stakeholder Coordination Forum, followed by regular meetings, assist with logistical arrangements, and keep records of all meetings; (c) Equip the members of the Stakeholder Coordination Forum to raise awareness among their constituencies about the IWM Master Plan, its purpose, intended outputs and benefits for communities, and promote their participation in the planning process; (d) Conduct consultations and workshops with key decision-makers across all sectors at National, District and	32,000			32,000			32,000	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC)

Contractual services-Individual	This is reserved for contracting the services of: a) a Field Officer who will provide services to the Project Management Unit to support delivery of all field-related Outputs, and will contribute to project M&E, awareness raising and gender mainstreaming; see TOR in Annex 7 ($25,000 per year for four years; total: $100,000) b) Part-payment of the salary of the Project Manager (30% of gross salary @3,333/m), as follows: Technical leadership of the rapid assessments of vegetation condition to be undertaken to fast-track restoration at selected sites (Outputs 3.1 and 3.2 and 3.3); providing training to communities in the use of visual condition assessment scorecards and methods, plant identification and veld condition monitoring; preparation of an action plan at each fast-track site - including measures to be implemented, roles and responsibilities, required resources, timeframes; Support to implementation of the indigenous re-seeding pilot and documenting the process (Output 3.2) Total allocation			148,000	148,000			148,000	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC)

Contractual services-Individual	These funds are reserved to pay the salaries of PMU staff as follows: a) Project Manager (50% of gross salary @$3,333/m), for delivery of all duties related to overall project management and coordination (the remaining 50%, is related to delivery of technical outputs and is covered under Outcome 1 (20%), and Outcome 3 (30%), see Budget Notes 3 & 15 Total: $80,000, distributed evenly over 4 years				-		80,000	80,000	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC)

Contractual services-Company	These funds are reserved to procure the services of a suitable company, consortium of consultants, or NGO or other suitable entity, to facilitate development of the Sebapala IWM Master Plan, and its associated Community Action Plans . The scope of services will be to: lead the technical planning (working in close collaboration with technical staff in relevant government departments and the Technical Planning Secretariat); undertake baseline assessments and analyses and gather necessary data, engage stakeholders and partners actively at all stages of the planning process, conduct a robust review process, deliver the plans and any associated materials in accessible formats targeted to different user groups, and train user groups in interpretation and adaptive application of the plans. The spread of expertise required will include: land degradation or rangeland management specialist/ grassland ecologist/SLM or IWM expert; land-use planner (with GIS expertise); stakeholder facilitation expert/social	195,000			195,000			195,000	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC)

Contractual services-Company	This budget will pay for the services of an NGO, company or consortium with experience in facilitating capacity enhancement of local institutions and training on IWM (or other aspects of natural resource management), developing training materials, and co-ordinating delivery of the skills-development and training plan. They will be responsible for delivery of Outputs 2.2 and 2.3 The entity should have expertise in: i) Conducting capacity assessments and identifying organizational and skills-development needs; ii) Formulating skills-development and training plans and programmes in the natural resources sector; iii) experience working with stakeholders across multiple sectors and in government, civil society and grass-roots communities; iv) coordinating delivery of training through multiple partner institutions; developing educational and awareness-raising materials Responsibilities will include: a) Conduct a rapid SWOT assessment of existing organizations and groups (building on the capacity assessment undertaken during		95,000		95,000			95,000	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC)

Contractual services-Company	This budget is reserved for equipment, materials, goods and labour required to bring at least 10,000 ha under soil and water conservation measures (Output 3.1), 15,000 rangeland and 1,500 ha of degraded wetlands rangeland under rehabilitation (Output 3.2), 8,000 ha of farmland under improved SLM practices (Output 3.3), and to improve water supply for household food production (Output 3.4): Outputs 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3: grass seed (Eragrostis curvula - to be purchased from South Africa to revegetate denuded areas and stabilise eroded river-banks; costs estimated at $130/ha); latex gloves, secateurs, seed-collection bags and storage boxes, drying racks (for the indigenous re-seeding pilot); fodder plant seedlings (to re-plant abandoned lands); stone, galvanized wire, other materials and tools for building stone-packs and gabions; brushcutters (petrol motors) and fuel, protective eye and foot-wear, gloves, clippers, spades, axes, wheelbarrows, and other tools for clearing invasive shrubs (costs estimated at			927,800	927,800			927,800	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC)

International Consultants	This budget is reserved to hire a consultant to develop a Grievance Mechanism, following standard UNDP protocols; (Provide training to the PMU and other key stakeholders (including the consultancy team leading the IWM planning) in application of the GM across all project activities; Monitor the outcome in Year 2 (Note: if the Gender Expert (see Budget Note 24) also has experience in social safeguards, this consultancy can be merged with the contract of the gender Expert) Total: $26,000 spread over four years	26,000			26,000			26,000	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC)

International Consultants	This budget is reserved for procuring the services a Technical Advisor (International/Regional expert) to provide technical quality control for the whole project (all Outputs). S/he will be a range scientist/grassland ecologist (or related) with experience in IWM planning, SLM and exposure to policy reform; or an IWM expert with experiences in range management/grassland ecology, SLM and policy reform. Full TOR are included in Annex 7. Total - $96,000: 40 days per year @ $600 per day , for four years			96,000	96,000			96,000	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC)
International Consultants	This budget is reserved for hiring an IC contractor to undertake: a) the Mid-Term Review at the end of Yr 2 ($15,000) b) the TE in Yr 4 ($20,000) Total: $35,000				-	35,000		35,000	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC)

Local Consultants	This budget is reserved to procure the services of a local consultant with expertise on legislative reform and institutional capacity development to implement the following activities of output 2.1 and 2.2: ? Facilitate a participatory review of legal instruments (policies, legislation, by laws, rules and regulations) governing the natural resources management sector, with a view to identifying strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, gaps and recommendations to improve their support to the implementation of the Sebapala sub-catchment IWM Master Plan and the associated community action plans; ? Facilitate a participatory review of the mandates of the relevant institutions (Ministries and Traditional Institutions) to identify overlaps and contradictions that weaken the overall effectiveness of the institutional set up in facilitating natural resources management in general, and specifically the implementation of the IWM Master Plan and action plans;		20,000		20,000			20,000	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC)

Local Consultants	This budget is reserved to hire the services of a national consultant (botanist/agronomist/pasture scientist), to assist with the design, implementation and monitoring of the indigenous grass re-seeding pilots (and contribute to preparation of a technical report documenting the experience), and providing assistance with plant identifications during the rapid rangeland assessments and monitoring, and as required at other times Total: $19,250 - 40 days over years 2,3&4: Year 2 (15 days), 3 (15 days), 4 (10 days) , @ $350 per day			19,250	19,250			19,250	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC)

Local Consultants	This budget is reserved for hiring National Consultants (NC) to support the following activities: a) A Communications/Knowledge Management Expert: who will deliver services under Output 4.2; Calculated at 10 days per year @ $2,000 per year, total: $8,000 b) A Gender/Stakeholder Engagement Expert: To deliver services under Output 4.1 related to gender mainstreaming and monitoring of social risks. Calculated at 24 days per year @$7,200 per year, total: 28,800 c) A webpage designer (design and maintenance): 10 days @200 per day; total $8,000 Total cost: $44,800				-	44,800		44,800	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC)

Training, Workshops, Meetings	This budget is reserved for workshops (participatory planning and training), meetings (IWM Technical Planning Secretariat, Community Coordinators), and community consultations required for delivery of the IWM Master Plan and Community Action Plans, including inception and validation workshops. Meetings/workshops will be convened in Maseru, Quthing and in local villages in Tosing Community Council. Total - $60,000: $15,000 in yr 1; $ 20,000 in yr 2; $15,000 for yr 3 and $10, 000 for yr 4.	60,000			60,000			60,000	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC)

Training, Workshops, Meetings	Reserved for meeting and workshop costs - meetings with community resource-user groups to discuss, plan and activate Community Action Plans; on-site training in practical implementation of measures; FFS exchanges; meetings with local chiefs and Community Councillors; planning and project design meetings for the indigenous grass seed incubation pilot, and monitoring sessions Total: $60,000			60,000	60,000			60,000	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC)

Training, Workshops, Meetings	This budget is reserved to cover the costs of meetings/ workshops/ trainings: a) $5,000 is for Project Inception Workshop., Yr 1 b) $15,000 is for inception and validation of MTR and TE; to convene knowledge exchange workshops; and to cover the cost of convening the closing project lessons-learnt workshop etc c) $10,000 is for Quarterly Project Board meetings over 4 years d) $15,000 is reserved for PMU and TAC-related trainings, workshops and meetings etc Total: $45,000 over four years				-	45,000		45,000	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC)
Training, Workshops, Meetings	This budget is reserved to meet the costs of meetings and training events linked to the PMU, to ensure good governance as follows: a) Project Inception Workshop. $5,000, Yr 1 b) Quarterly Project Board meetings. $5,000, over four years Total: $10,000				-		10,000	10,000	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC)

Travel	This budget is reserved to meet the costs of travel that will be required to conduct consultations and field work for development of the Sebapala Master Plan and associated Community Action Plans. This will include: car rental and rental of horses (and a trained guide) to access remote areas in the Upper Sebapala Sub-catchment. Total over four three years: $25,000	25,000			25,000			25,000	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC)
Travel	This budget is reserved to meet the costs of travel required to carry out the reviews under Outputs 2.1 and 2.2 and delivery of training under Outputs 2,2 and 2.3; learning exchanges to capacitate communities to participate in Farmer Field Schools (including travel costs for the Master Trainer who will come from Quthing District to train district extension officers and community members). Total: 31,585, distributed over four years.		31,585		31,585			31,585	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC)

Travel	Travel This budget is reserved for meeting the costs of field site visits by the PMU, Technical Advisor, Grasslands Expert (contracted under item 14 above), field staff, communities; farmer learning exchanges (FFS), farmer ?show days?, meetings of land-user groups (FFS, grazing associations etc), transporting equipment and materials to intervention sites; this will be required for delivery of Outputs 3.1 through 3.4 Total cost: $30,000 over four years			30,000	30,000			30,000	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC)
Travel	This budget is reserved for travel expenses to attend knowledge exchange events (e.g. convened by the National ICM Programme or related), local knowledge exchange forums, monitoring during MTR and TE, and for stakeholders to attend the final lessons learnt workshop in Year 4. Total estimated cost: $15,200				-	15,200		15,200	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC)

Office Supplies	This budget is reserved for Office supplies Total: $8,000, evenly distributed over four years			8,000	8,000			8,000	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC)
Office Supplies	This budget is reserved for Office supplies. Total estimated cost is $3,087 distributed evenly over four years during the 4 years				-		3,087	3,087	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC)
Other Operating Costs	This budget is reserved for meeting the costs of printing associated with the IWMP plan and Community Action Plans, under Output 1.2: (a) Satellite maps, wallmaps, the IWMP handbook (Quick Guide) and other interpretive materials and land-use guidelines; awareness-raising materials; (b) other miscellaneous printing costs linked to meetings of the IWMP Technical Planning Secretariat and/or planning team; (c) Production of knowledge-management materials, etc Total allocation: $22,000	22,000			22,000			22,000	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC)

Other Operating Costs	This multi-year budget is reserved for audio visual and print production for materials (flyers, posters, manuals, flashcards etc) to support training under Outcome 2, particularly Output 2.1 Total - $ 10,000 over four years.		10,000		10,000			10,000	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC)
Other Operating Costs	This multi-year budget is reserved for audio visual and print production for awareness-raising materials under outcome 3, printing of maps, production of technical drawings Total cost estimate: $ 15,000 over four years			15,000	15,000			15,000	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC)
Grand Total		**375,000**	**156,585**	**1,330,154**	**1,861,739**	**140,000**	**100,087**	**2,101,826**	