

Conservation Areas for Biodiversity Conservation and Development II-Additional Financing

| Part I: Project Information |
|---|
| Name of Parent Program Sustainable Forest Management Impact Program on Dryland Sustainable Landscapes |
| GEF ID 10583 |
| Project Type FSP |
| Type of Trust Fund GET |
| CBIT/NGI CBIT NGI |
| Project Title Conservation Areas for Biodiversity Conservation and Development II-Additional Financing |
| Countries Mozambique |

Agency(ies)

World Bank

Other Executing Partner(s):

Mozambique National Sustainable Development Fund (FNDS)

Executing Partner Type

Government

GEF Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Taxonomy

Focal Areas, Tourism, Grasslands, Biomes, Biodiversity, Land Degradation, Land Degradation Neutrality, Sustainable Land Management, Improved Soil and Water Management Techniques, Restoration and Rehabilitation of Degraded Lands, Forest, Forest and Landscape Restoration, Climate Change, Climate Change Mitigation, Agriculture, Forestry, and Other Land Use, Financial and Accounting, Conservation Trust Funds, Mainstreaming, Agriculture and agrobiodiversity, Protected Areas and Landscapes, Terrestrial Protected Areas, Productive Landscapes, Tropical Dry Forests, Integrated Programs, Capacity, Knowledge and Research, Enabling Activities, Knowledge Exchange, Field Visit, North-South, Conference, Capacity Development, Innovation, Knowledge Generation, Workshop, Training, Learning, Sustainable Forest, Income Generating Activities, Carbon stocks above or below ground, Drylands, United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, Nationally Determined Contribution, Influencing models, Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making, Transform policy and regulatory environments, Convene multi-stakeholder alliances, Deploy innovative financial instruments, Stakeholders, Communications, Strategic Communications, Education, Awareness Raising, Type of Engagement, Information Dissemination, Participation, Consultation, Civil Society, Non-Governmental Organization, Academia, Community Based Organization, Private Sector, Individuals/Entrepreneurs, Financial intermediaries and market facilitators, SMEs, Beneficiaries, Local Communities, Gender Equality, Gender Mainstreaming, Sex-disaggregated indicators, Gender results areas, Participation and leadership, Knowledge Generation and Exchange, Theory of change

Rio Markers
Climate Change Mitigation
Climate Change Mitigation 1

Climate Change Adaptation

Climate Change Adaptation 0

Submission Date

6/12/2020

Expected Implementation Start

11/2/2020

Expected Completion Date

11/30/2024

Duration

48In Months

Agency Fee(\$)

2,080,420

A. FOCAL/NON-FOCAL AREA ELEMENTS

| Objectives/Programs | Focal Area Outcomes | Trust Fund | GEF Amount(\$) | Co-Fin Amount(\$) |
|---------------------|--|------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| IP SFM Drylands | Dryland Landscapes sustainably managed | GET | 23,115,776 | 113,000,000 |
| | | Total | Project Cost(\$) 23,115,776 | 113,000,000 |

B. Project description summary

Project Objective

To improve management of target conservation area landscapes and enhance the living conditions of communities in and around these conservation areas.

| Project Component | Component | Expected Outcomes | Expected Outputs | Trust | GEF Project Financing(\$) | Confirmed Co-Financing(\$) |
|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| | Туре | | | Fund | | |

| Project Component | Component Type | Expected Outcomes | Expected Outputs | Trust Fund | GEF Project Financing(\$) | Confirmed Co-Financing(\$) |
|--|-------------------|---|--|---------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Component 1: Strengthening Capacity and Financial Sustainability of National Conservation Institutions (Project and Knowledge | Investment | 1.2 Strenghthened financial sustainability for dryland degradation and deforestation | 1.2 BIOFUND has specific windows under its Endowment fund that support dryland management interventions, druing and beyond the | GET | 12,743,297 | 40,000,000 |
| Mgt is embedded within this component but reflected in PMC row) | | 1.1 Improved coordination and capacity of | lifetime of the project | | | |
| | | conservation institutions to ensure | 1.2 The BIOFUND Endowment fund has | | | |
| | | integrated and | generated revenue streams | | | |
| | | harmonized dryland | of up to \$900,000 for | | | |
| | | management interventions; | direct investments in dryland rehabilitation and | | | |
| | | mer ventions, | restoration, hence | | | |
| | | | contributing to achieving | | | |
| | | 1.1 Improved regional | national LDN and SFM | | | |
| | | collaboration on the joint management and connectivity of | targets | | | |
| | | transboundary dryland | 1.1.2.3Key biodiversity | | | |
| | | ecosystems | and dryland institutions | | | |
| | | | (Biofund, ANAC, FNDS) | | | |
| | | 1.2 Einanging gygtom | have functioning coordination mechanisms | | | |
| | | 1.2 Financing system for dryland | at local, national and | | | |
| | | management, LDN and SFM in CAs diversified | regional levels in place; | | | |
| | | | 1.1 and 1.3 Research on | | | |
| | | 1.1 and 1.3 Knowledge on dryland management | specific challenges related to dryland management in | | | |
| | | experiences is | Mozambique and | | | |

| Project Component | Component Type | Expected Outcomes | Expected Outputs | Trust Fund | GEF Project Financing(\$) | Confirmed Co-Financing(\$) |
|--|-------------------|--|--|---------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Component 2: Improving Conservation Areas Management in Target Landscapes | Investment | 2.2 Increased community participation in sustainable dryland management, in particular of womenheaded households | 2.2 Up to six community governance plans elaborated in a participatory and gender-responsive manner and under implementation | GET | 2,575,000 | 33,000,000 |
| | | 2.1 and 2.2 Improved awareness and engagement on biodiversity and dryland, at the level of all stakeholders, including youth | 2.1 Multi-stakeholder platforms in the three targeted landscapes functional and meeting on regular basis, with specific sessions dedicated to dryland management | | | |
| | | 2.2 Improved coordination among CAs that are part of TFCAs regarding dryland and wildlife monitoring and research | 2.2 Environmental education is adopted into the curriculum in up to 25 local schools in the three landscapes and youth environmental clubs are functional, including girls clubs that aim to keep girls in schools | | | |
| | | 2.1 Improved capacity of CAs to actively track threats to wildlife and fauna and act upon it | 2.1 Three Conservation Areas have achieved an average increase of 20% in the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool score; | | | |

| Project Component | Component Type | Expected Outcomes | Expected Outputs | Trust Fund | GEF Project Financing(\$) | Confirmed Co-Financing(\$) |
|---|-------------------|---|--|---------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Component 3: Promoting Conservation-compatible Rural Development and Integrated Landscape Management in Target Landscapes | Investment | Strengthened sustainable dryland value-chains and financing mechanisms to support sustainable production, management and restoration of drylands, with the inclusion of women led businesses. | Up to 3,000 rural households, local entrepreneurs, SMEs, entrepreneurs, SMEs, communities in the three target Landscapes engaged in conservation-compatible and dryland value chains; | GET | 6,719,266 | 37,000,000 |
| | | Financial institutions and other investors (public and private) offer finance to support sustainable production, | Restoration of 6,700 hectares of degraded lands, including forest, pasture and rangelands | | | |
| | | management and restoration of drylands, tailored to the needs and conditions of resource managers and users | Three district level land- use planning tools revised and under implementation, considering both degradation and climate risks, and at least 6 community level plans | | | |
| | | Reduced loss of habitat and a reduction in GHG emissions | under implementation. All plans contribute to achieve LDN and SFM targets. | | | |
| | | Increased area under improved protection or management to benefit biodiversity and avoid | Up to 520,000 hectares of land in the CA landscapes (excl. protected areas) under improved management from land-use | | | |

| Project Component | Component Type | Expected Outcomes | Expected Outputs | Trust Fund | GEF Project Financing(\$) | Confirmed Co-Financing(\$) |
|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|---------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| | | | Sub | Total (\$) | 22,037,563 | 110,000,000 |
| Project Management C | Cost (PMC) | | | | | |
| | | | | GET | 1,078,213 | 3,000,000 |
| | | | Su | b Total(\$) | 1,078,213 | 3,000,000 |
| | | | Total Projec | ct Cost(\$) | 23,115,776 | 113,000,000 |

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 | Investment Mobilized | Amount(\$) |
|-----------------------------|--|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------|
| GEF Agency | World Bank (Mozbio II) | Grant | Investment mobilized | 45,000,000 |
| GEF Agency | World Bank (MozFIP, Susenta, MozLand) | Grant | Investment mobilized | 44,000,000 |
| Private Sector | Peace Parks Foundation and other CA co-managers | Unknown at this stage | Investment mobilized | 16,000,000 |
| Beneficiaries | Local entrepreneurs, households and SMEs that are beneficiaries of the Matching Grant Scheme | In-kind | Recurrent expenditures | 5,000,000 |
| Government | FNDS and ANAC | In-kind | Recurrent expenditures | 3,000,000 |
| | | | Total Co-Financing(\$) | 113,000,00 |

Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified

Baseline investments leveraged are from the ongoing World Bank IDA Mozbio 2 project (US\$45 million) as well as an estimated US\$44 million from the WB financed Integrated Landscape Management (ILM) Program (which consists of a combination of larger investments including MozLand project; Sustenta; and MozFIP), implemented by GoM. US\$3 million in in-kind contribution will come from the GoM, including office space, equipment and the salaries of staff relevant to the project. Investments of US\$5 million will be leveraged under implementation of the Project, from the matching finance that beneficiaries of the Matching Grant Scheme will provide. The Project will also mobilize technical and financial resources to a minimum of US\$16 million from co-managers of Protected Areas, including Peace Parks Foundation (confirmed) for Maputo Special Reserve/Ponta do Ouro Marine Partial Reserve. Other potential sources including Carr Foundation (for Marromeu) and Flora and Fauna International (for Chimanimani) and WB PROGREEN funding are under discussion and expected to be leveraged during the project duration. Cofinancing letters attached.

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 | Amount(\$) | Fee(\$) |
|------------|------------|------------|------------------|---------------------------|------------|-----------|
| World Bank | GET | Mozambique | Biodiversity | BD STAR Allocation | 9,941,464 | 894,732 |
| World Bank | GET | Mozambique | Climate Change | CC STAR Allocation | 1,908,257 | 171,743 |
| World Bank | GET | Mozambique | Land Degradation | LD STAR Allocation | 4,100,917 | 369,083 |
| World Bank | GET | Mozambique | Multi Focal Area | IP SFM Drylands Set-Aside | 7,165,138 | 644,862 |
| | | | | Total Grant Resources(\$) | 23,115,776 | 2,080,420 |

E. Non Grant Instrument

NON-GRANT INSTRUMENT at CEO Endorsement

Includes Non grant instruments? **No**Includes reflow to GEF? **No**

| | | | | Total Project Costs(\$) | 0 | 0 | |
|--------------|-------------------------|---------|------------|-------------------------|------------|---------|--|
| Agency | Trust Fund | Country | Focal Area | Programming of Funds | Amount(\$) | Fee(\$) | |
| PPG Agen | cy Fee (\$) | | | | | | |
| PPG Amou | unt (\$) | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| PPG Req | uired | | | | | | |
| F. Project P | Preparation Grant (PPG) |) | | | | | |

Core Indicators

Indicator 1 Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use

| Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| 0.00 | 387,300.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Indicator 1.1 Terrestrial Pro | tected Areas Newly created | | |
| Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Total Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Total Ha (Achieved at TE) |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

Total Ha (Expected

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

Indicator 1.2 Terrestrial Protected Areas Under improved Management effectiveness

| Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Total Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Total Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| 0.00 | 387,300.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

| | | | | | | | METT score | | |
|-------------|---------|----------|--------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Name of the | | | На | Ha (Expected | Total Ha | Total Ha | (Baseline at | METT score | METT score |
| Protected | | IUCN | (Expected at | at CEO | (Achieved at | (Achieved at | CEO | (Achieved at | (Achieved at |
| Area | WDPA ID | Category | PIF) | Endorsement) | MTR) | TE) | Endorsement) | MTR) | TE) |

| Protected Area | WDPA ID | IUCN Category | (Expected at PIF) | at CEO Endorsement) | (Achieved at MTR) | (Achieved at TE) | CEO Endorsement) | (Achieved at MTR) | (Achieved at TE) | |
|--|------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------|-------------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------------|------------------|--|
| Akula National Park Chimanimani National Reserve | 125689 55592250 | Select National Park | | 65,500.00 | | | 47.00 | | | |
| Akula National Park Maputo Special Reserve/ Ponta de Ouro Marine Reserve | 125689 4256 | Select National Park | | 171,800.00 | | | 59.00 | | | |
| Akula National Park National Reserve | 125689 4649 | Select National Park | | 150,000.00 | | | 37.00 | | | |
| Indicate | or 3 Area of land re | estored | | | | | | | | |
| Ha (Expected a | at PIF) | Ha (E | Expected at CEC | Endorsement) | Ha (Achieve | ed at MTR) | На | (Achieved at TE | ≣) | |
| 0.00 | | 6700 | .00 | | 0.00 | | 0.0 | 0 | | |
| Indicato | or 3.1 Area of degra | aded agricultural lan | d restored | | | | | | | |
| Ha (Expected | at PIF) | Ha (E | Expected at CEC | Endorsement) | Ha (Achieve | ed at MTR) | На | (Achieved at TE | ≣) | |
| | | 3,000 | 0.00 | | | | | | | |
| Indicato | or 3.2 Area of Fores | st and Forest Land r | estored | | | | | | | |

Total Ha

Total Ha

Ha (Expected

На

Name of the

METT score

(Baseline at

METT score

METT score

| Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|-------------------------------|--|---|----------------------|
| Tia (Expected at 1 ii) | , . | The (Achieved at WTK) | Tia (Admidved at TE) |
| | 3,700.00 | | |
| Indicator 3.3 Area of natural | grass and shrublands restored | | |
| Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
| Indicator 3.4 Area of wetland | ls (incl. estuaries, mangroves) restored | | |
| Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
| The (Exposition at Fin) | 114 (25pooted at 020 2114010011011) | | (, 10 |
| Indicator 4 Area of landscape | es 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 | 520000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Indicator 4.1 Area of landsca | pes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (he | ectares, qualitative assessment, non-certif | fied) |
| Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
| | 507,000.00 | | |
| Indicator 4.2 Area of landsca | pes that meets national or international third party certifica | ation that incorporates biodiversity consi | derations (hectares) |
| Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
| | 3,000.00 | | |
| Type/Name of Third Party C | ertification | | |
| Indicator 4.3 Area of landsca | pes under sustainable land management in production syste | ems | |
| Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
| | 10,000.00 | | |
| Indicator 4.4 Area of High Co | onservation 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)

Capacity (MW) (Expected at

Technology PIF)

Title

| Indicator 6 Greenhouse C | Gas Emissions Mitigated | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Total Target Benefit | | (At PIF) | (At CEO Endorsemen | nt) (Achieved at MTR) | (Achieved at TE) |
| Expected metric tons of CO ₂ | e (direct) | 0 | 10845249 | 0 | 0 |
| Expected metric tons of CO ₂ | e (indirect) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Indicator 6.1 Carbon Seq | uestered or Emissions Avoide | d in the AFOLU (Agr | riculture, Forestry and Other | Land Use) sector | |
| Total Target Benefit | | (At PIF) | (At CEO Endorsemen | nt) (Achieved at MTR) | (Achieved at TE) |
| Expected metric tons of CO ₂ | e (direct) | | | | |
| Expected metric tons of CO ₂ | e (indirect) | | | | |
| Anticipated start year of acc | ounting | | | | |
| Duration of accounting | | | | | |
| Indicator 6.2 Emissions A | Avoided Outside AFOLU (Agr | iculture, Forestry and | d Other Land Use) Sector | | |
| Total Target Benefit | | (At PIF) | (At CEO Endorsemen | nt) (Achieved at MTR) | (Achieved at TE) |
| Expected metric tons of CO ₂ | e (direct) | | 10,845,249 | | |
| Expected metric tons of CO ₂ | e (indirect) | | | | |
| Anticipated start year of acc | ounting | | 2021 | | |
| Duration of accounting | | | 20 | | |
| Indicator 6.3 Energy Sav | ed (Use this sub-indicator in a | ddition to the sub-inc | licator 6.2 if applicable) | | |
| Total Target Benefit | Energy (MJ) (At PIF) | Energy (MJ) (A | t CEO Endorsement) | Energy (MJ) (Achieved at MTR) | Energy (MJ) (Achieved at TE) |
| Target Energy Saved (MJ) | | | | | |
| ranger Energy Garca (Into) | | | | | |

Capacity (MW) (Expected at CEO

Endorsement)

Submitted

Capacity (MW) (Achieved at

MTR)

Capacity (MW) (Achieved at

TE)

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

| | Number (Expected at PIF) | Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Number (Achieved at MTR) | Number (Achieved at TE) |
|--------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| Female | | 17,500 | | |
| Male | | 17,500 | | |
| Total | 0 | 35000 | 0 | 0 |

Part II. Project Justification

1b. Project Map and Coordinates

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

Please see Annex E for maps.

2. Stakeholders

Please provide the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent assessment.

The process of preparation of the Project included extensive consultation with key stakeholders, to explore issues around the activities to be supported by this additional financing from GEF and the safeguards instruments (ESMF, RPF, PF and PMP). The consultations also discussed other instruments developed by FNDS, namely the protocol of land conflicts, protocol to prevent the conversion of critical habitats and the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM). The consultations were done at national level, involving institutions based in Maputo, provincial and at the district levels at the landscapes. The stakeholders included representatives of the district government and the local government, members of the district consultative councils, civil society and the private sector (see matrix below). Overall participants appreciated to be consulted and expressed interest in having the financing prioritize the needs of the poorest, while also conserving dryland forests.

Summary of the key Stakeholders and their roles

| Institution | Responsibilities |
|---|--|
| C | ENTRAL GOVERNMENT |
| Council of Ministers | This body has responsibility of creating, modify or extinguish reserves, parks, controlled hunting areas and establish buffer zones. It also authorizes certain activities in CAs in accordance to the management plans, set fees for wildlife use and CA's access while ensures compliance with the forest wildlife environment and land policies. |
| Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MADER) | FNDS is under the MADER and engaged with various Directorates of MADER collaborating with the Rural Extension Directorate in promoting sustainable development, through administration, management, protection, conservation and rational use of resources essential to agriculture and food security. In addition, FNDS promotes the sustainable development of agroforestry resources. It also plays the broad role of coordinating and monitoring rural development programs/projects |

| Ministry of Land and Environment (MTA) | Will collaborate with the FNDS in the environmental licensing of subprojects financed by the MozBio 2 and additional financing from GEF 7. The MTA is responsible to establish and implementing the standards and procedures for the administration, supervision and monitoring of the rules of land use. The Project will also work closley with MTA to review guidelines for benefit sharing from genetic and biological resources. |
|--|---|
| National Administration for Conservation Areas (ANAC) | ANAC is responsible to conduct the development process of guidelines and standards of procedures on key issues of CA management and operations, including community governance, benefit sharing, biodiversity monitoring and human resource management. Preparation of legal agreements, concerning the co-management of CAs, should be based on business management plans that ensure the support of communities within CAs, with sharing of benefits, based on their performance, support for projects for the development of livelihoods, based on agreements with commitments for conservation; |
| National Directorates of Land (DNAT), National Directorate of Forest (DINAF) | The National Directorates will design and implement land, forest, and other sector policies and strategies ensure the equitable and fair award of the titles of Right to Use and Use of the Land (DUAT), allocation of forest concessions for both private sector and local communities. The Directorate of forest provides guidance on the management of forest Reserves and promotes best practices in forest management |
| Project Steering Committee | The PSC will provide strategic guidance and oversight for the project and will support the coordination among the stakeholders and participatory management of the project, engaging them in planning monitoring and problem solving. The PSC is chaired by the FNDS the project executing unit and comprises high level management representation from Ministries, private Sector operating in the project target areas NGO's and local community representatives. |
| PR | OVINCIAL GOVERNMENT |
| Provincial Government | The Mozambique legislation has categorized the licensing, monitoring and supervising responsibilities for different government levels, being central provincial and local. The provincial directorates will play essential roles, and will be further determined during the Project. |
| Landscape Management Unit (LMU) | The LMUs are responsible for implementing and monitoring activities of the Project, at the level of landscapes (FNDS branch at local level). The LMU will work under the direct guidance of FNDS and in coordination with the District authorities to promote value chains. The LMU will work primarily outside CAs. |

| Administration of Conservation Areas (CAs) | CAs each has an administration that is responsible for management and development of the area. It also uses Management Councils (MC), a consultative body composed by the stakeholders of the area in which the CA is located. The MC provides policy guidance contributes in management planning and on the day to day management of the CA. The CA's are the core of the target landscape and promotes regional cooperation in form of TFCAs for the sustainable management of natural resources in areas of high ecological value. |
|--|--|
| | LOCAL GOVERNMENT |
| District Services of Economic Activities (SDAE) District Planning and Infrastructure Services (SDPI), Women's District Services, Social Action (SDMAS); District Education, Youth and Technology Services (SDEJT) | The district government authorities have responsibility of developing a district level spatial planning and execute the approved national and provincial plans for its district. The district is responsible to deliver extension services for agriculture, forest management, bee keeping, conservation building infrastructures and other rural development benefits. The district ensures compliance with the legislation promote education and awareness in environmental and civic matters and disseminate appropriate production technologies within producers |
| | PRIVATE SECTOR |
| Conservation Trust Fund (BIOFUND) | The Project will strengthen BIOFUND's ability to become an international benchmark in sustainable ac financing. BIOFUND's scope is dedicated to finance the conservation of biodiversity in Mozambique with a special focus on the national system of conservation areas of Mozambique. The project will strengthen the BioFund trust fund and ensure that part of the resources that the Biofund generates are directed to support dryland forest management |
| PPF, FFI | Partners for co-management and community based natural resources management. They operate in protected areas or in their buffer zone under specific agreements with the Government to implement activities. They support biodiversity conservation, nature based tourism development, law enforcement, and wildlife reintroduction and management infrastructures. The partners are instrumental in mobilizing additional technical and financial resources and capacity. |
| Coutadas (10,11, 14), Eco-MICAIA, Forest Concessionaries | The commercial private sector is licenced by the Government to explore hunting and forest concessions. Twenty percent (20%) of the revenues generated should be shared with local communities. In addition, the private sector promotes jobs and constitute partners in business with the communities. They can be an important partner to use the matching grants to develop value chains in the landscape they are involved |

| | Communities |
|--|--|
| Community Organizations including the Natural Resources Management Communities CGRN) | The community leaders will be instrumental as entry points to ensure the strong community institutions are created and good governance established, as they are key in mobilizing communities to solve problems within their areas, monitor, and mediate the resolution of problems between communities and the public authorities. The CGRN plays the role of promoting the awareness among the community and constitutes the participatory platform to discuss the use of the 20% of the revenues from forest and wildlife and to engage in other income generating activities that involves the sustainable use of natural resources. |
| | COMMUNICATION ORGANS |
| Community Radio | Play a crucial role in informing local communities about different matters of interest. The Project will use channels such as community radio to convey messages and information. |
| | COOPERATION PARTNERS |
| World Bank | Administers the IDA and GEF financing as well as the Agency for implementing the DSL Program. Will support project implementation, through procurement, fiduciary, M&E and providing technical supervision support and assistance |
| French Development Agency (AFD) | AFD is supporting similar initiatives in the country, and will be a strategic partner for strategic direction of the project and sharing of lessons learned between initiatives. |
| FAO | FAO is supporting the broader ILM Portfolio, in issues such as improving selected value chains for food and food safety; ensure transparent and sustainable management of natural resources and the environment and increasing livelihood resilience to climate change threats and crises. |
| NGO'S - JOCUM-Jovens com missão, VIDA-ONE, CESAL, FUNDACAO MINHEMBETE, ECO-MICAIA | NGOs play a crucial role for the design, discussion and implementation of the Project. Key NGOs that will be relevant for the project include for example Eco-Micaia, an NGO working with communities, supporting the livelihoods development, community level planning; Fundação Minhembeti who is supporting livelihoods of local communities through the expansion of sustainable agricultural activity, provision of clean water supply and creation of job opportunities. The CESAL are working in promoting social integration and promoting human development of the most disadvantaged people. |
| | ACADEMIA |

Eduardo Mondlane University (EMU), UNI-ZAMBEZI, Manica Polytechnic Higher Institute (ISPM)

University and learning institutions will support production and dissemination of scientific knowledge, culture and promote innovations and technology, through research, as the foundation of teaching-learning and extension processes, educating generations with humanistic values in order to face contemporary challenges in development of society.

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.

The project has developed a Stakeholders Engagement Plan (SEP) to ensure the stakeholder engagement through the project lifecycle, considering the Government of Mozambique policies and GEF guidelines. Thus, it will be ensured that the project meets best international practice and specifically the requirements for stakeholder engagement and public consultations. The specific elements of the SEP include (a) identification of the stakeholders for engagement and methods of communication to ensure inclusive participation and consultation; (b) stakeholders expectations and concerns analysis to ensure there is enough support for the Project to address them; (c) making information available to the public to allow stakeholders to get to know and understand both the environmental and social risks and impacts associated with the project, as well as opportunities provided by the Project; and (d) monitoring and reporting as a management tool which provides an opportunity to know whether results are being achieved as planned, what corrective action are needed to ensure delivery of the intended results and how they are making positive development contributions. Elements from the SEP which will be confirmed during appraisal include:

- (a) Identification of stakeholders for engagement and methods of communication to ensure inclusive participation: The project has identified several key stakeholders that are working on a national level and in targeted landscapes. A considerable number of public, private and community organizations also compose the Project Steering Committee of the project. At landscape level the project is continuously mapping the stakeholders, who are involved through various coordination structures the conservation areas management committees.
- (b) Stakeholders expectations and concerns analysis to ensure there is enough support for the Project to address them: The Stakeholder Engagement plan will ensure that there is a clear process of engaging the stakeholders mainly at landscape level, ensuring that the local communities are consulted end involved in the implementation of the project. The SEP will ensure that the Community governance plans elaborated in a participatory and gender-responsive manner and under implementation and that the creation of functional multi-stakeholder platforms in the landscapes with meetings on regular basis. The Park management with lead project awareness programs in the landscape to reach the local community and the civil society in general.

(c) Making information available to the public to allow stakeholders to get to know and understand both the environmental and social risks and impacts associated with the project, as well as opportunities provided by the Project. The environmental and social risks will be listed. Each risk will be characterized and deserve a specific strategy to address it. This will involve the public, private and community stakeholders with clears role and responsibilities. The project will make useful information available to the public using various means including the community radios, leaflets, workshops including schools to address the children.

(d) Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting as a tool for Adaptive Management: FNDS will verify the indicators of the project very closely and timely monitored reported to the multisectoral platforms at landscape and national levels which will appreciate the progress and when necessary agree on strategic changes and adaptations of the activities to ensure that that the PDO is pursued. This will, in particular, reflect in annual work plan changes, strategies of engaging stakeholders, communication, etc.

(e) Making information available to the public to allow stakeholders to get to know and understand both the environmental and social risks and impacts associated with the project, as well as opportunities provided by the Project. The project will continue working with the partners of co-management and other co-financing projects within the ILM portfolio, in the implementation of the activities. The CAs and the landscape management units will be supported at central level to ensure the implementation of the activities in their landscapes. The local communities will be engaged using their institutional and governance structures to support their engagement in conservation activities and accessing the matching grants funds in value chain activities. The community institutional structures will have their governance strengthened through various training, including GALS.

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; Yes

Other (Please explain)

3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Provide the gender analysis or equivalent socio-economic assesment.

Women bear the heavy burden of ensuring the livelihood sustainability of rural households. Moreover, restrictions on their participation in public consultations and decision-making spaces, customary laws, and low level of literacy all play against women empowerment within the community. As such, the Project, through the community governance and environmental education programs - envisages empowering women by (a) ensuring their active participation in project consultation and decision mechanisms at the community level; (b); increasing their access to employment in the CAs and in the value chains under the MGS (30 percent must be women and youth); (c) promoting greater participation of women in credit and savings schemes and literacy training and all forms of capacity building; (d) establishing girls clubs in the schools of the three CAs to decrease school dropout and reduce premature marriages; (e) providing access to training opportunities and benefits to increase their capacity on leadership conservation schemes; and (f) implementing the Gender Action Learning System (GALS) methodology. GALS is a household planning methodology that enables households to start delineating concrete realistic joint plans on the basis of resources available to the household. In the process, barriers limiting household progression – including common areas of gender inequality manifested at household level – and corresponding corrective measures are identified and integrated by the household in their daily lives. GALS allows for the integration of other social risks such as HIV prevention and treatment, GBV (including information of clinical and psychosocial services available) and nutrition. The methodology has been successfully used in Mozambique and in other countries in Africa. The project will also define measures to ensure that women are adequately represented and participate in both project activities and decision-making processes.

A detailed Gender Gap Analysis and Action Plan for the ILM Portfolio, of which the Project will be part, was conducted by FNDS and the World Bank in 2019 (see separate Annex H) and is laying the ground for the aforementioned and other activities that are specifically targeting women. This analysis also laid the basis for the Gender Strategy of FNDS, which will be completed in July 2020. As such, by piloting some of these activities under this Project, it will help inform the institutionalization process of this Gender Strategy, hence ensuring that these types of gender-responsive measures are not dependent on the project but are sustained in FNDS beyond the Project.

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

Yes

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

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

Yes

4. Private sector engagement

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

- Capitalization of an Endowment Fund managed by a private foundation: BIOFUND. The endowment contribution is to create a specific endowment window for a period of 10 years. This specific endowment will focus on financing the protection and restoration in forests that are either already degraded, or at risk of becoming so. This contribution will further help to strengthen BIOFUND's capacity to become an international reference on sustainable financing of CAs, and it will support the development of a policy framework and financial mechanisms for sustainable management and restoration of drylands, tailored to the needs and conditions of resource managers and users. Part of this window will also focus on collaboration with private sector actors in strengthening green value chains in support of sustainable and equitable dryland management through the promotion of innovative financing mechanisms with the private sector. The principle objective of these investments is to fundamentally alter current land use practices from low-value and ecologically unsustainable activities such as subsistence agriculture or charcoal production to higher-value ones that are based directly on sustainable use of natural resources, such as game farming, sustainable wildlife use, NTFP extraction, and possibly community forestry. The specific private sector entities will engage with the target landscapes for MozBio and would be selected for support based on their ability to i) generate concrete economic benefits, ii) demonstrate biodiversity benefits, iii) increase protection for large areas of dryland forest currently in a natural or mostly natural condition, and iv) generate co-benefits with local communities. The investments under this program will be structured either in the form of impact investments, providing blended finance contributions to attract additional private capital. BIOFUND will reinvest its share of returns on investment both into new similar initiatives but with at least 50% used to reinforce its grant making initiative
- Provision of matching grants to SMEs/smallholder entrepreneurs for sustainable dryland value chains. By linking communities to private sector entities, that have a somewhat bigger transformational effect on the landscape, through value chains, accompanying TA and market linkages, communities as well as private entities are envisioned more capable and motivated to sustain these efforts and govern the resources well over the long-term. This approach has been proven effective in Nampula and Zambezia provinces, where restoration activities linked to value chains have managed to be sustained. At the landscape level; private sectors engaged in matching grants for dryland value chains and restoration, with the criteria of involving small landowners as out growers and participants, will be enabled to create jobs and alternatives in which communities can engage, and as such reducing the risk for land tenure and other conflicts in the use of drylands.
- The promotion of public-private partnerships (PPPs) for the management of the three CAs targeted by the project. PPPs for conservation, also known as CA comanagement, is an emerging 'conservation model' in Mozambique and entail agreements between the state and third parties to delegate certain responsibilities in managing a CA over an agreed period and under conditions established and monitored by the state. These agreements have shown to increase conservation effectiveness

| by increasing funding and human resources availability, creating opportunities for knowledge exchange and skills transfer to CAs and also improving communities. | nity |
|--|------|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

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).

Please refer to Section VIII of the Project paper for full results framework. In addition Tables 1 and 2 below summarize the child project alignment with the DSLIP framework and the specific indicator that directly contribute to the overall goals.

Results Framework

COUNTRY: Mozambique Conservation Areas for Biodiversity Conservation and Development

Project Development Objective(s)

To improve management of target conservation area landscapes and enhance the living conditions of communities in and around these conservation areas.

Project Development Objective Indicators by Objectives/ Outcomes

RESULT FRAME TRL PDO

| Indicator Name | PBC | Baseline | End Target | | |
|--|-----|----------|------------|--|--|
| | | | | | |
| Management improvements of target conservation area landscapes | | | | | |
| CAs with improved management effectiveness (Number) | | 0.00 | 2.00 | | |
| CAs with improved management effectiveness (Number) | | 0.00 | 3.00 | | |
| CAs with improved management effectiveness: Elephant Coast CA (Number) | | 59.00 | 70.00 | | |
| CA (Ivaniooi) | | | | | |

RESULT FRAME TBL PDC

| Indicator Name | PBC | Baseline | End Target | | |
|---|-----|----------|------------|--|--|
| CAs with improved management effectiveness : Chimanimani CA (Number) | | 47.00 | 59.00 | | |
| CAs with improved management effectiveness: Marromeu Complex (Number) | | 37.00 | 47.00 | | |
| Species population maintenance, and/or increase (Yes/No) | | No | Yes | | |
| Key Species population maintenance, and/or increase: Elephant Coast CA (1.Elephant, 2.Reedbuck, 3.Serranidae family) (Yes/No) | | No | Yes | | |
| Key Species population maintenance, and/or increase. Chimanimani NR (1.Apalis chirindensis (Passerine Bird); 2.Olea Chimanimani (Olive shrub)) (Yes/No) | | No | Yes | | |
| Key Species population maintenance, and/or increase. Marromeu Complex (1. Buffalo, 2. Sable) (Yes/No) | | No | Yes | | |
| Living conditions of communities in and around target conservation area landscapes enhanced | | | | | |
| Target landscapes with positive variation in local communities' perception of CAs' impact in wellbeing (Number) | | 0.00 | 3.00 | | |

PDO Table SPACE

Intermediate Results Indicators by Components

RESULT_FRAME_TBL_IO

| Indicator Name | PBC | Baseline | End Target |
|--|-------|--------------------------------------|--------------|
| C1:Strengthen Capacity of National Conserv. Institutions & | Finan | cial Sustainability of the CA system | |
| People trained by the Conservation Leadership Initiative (of which % of women) (Number) | | 0.00 | 445.00 |
| % of women trained by the Conservation Leadership Program (Number) | | 0.00 | 26.00 |
| Electronic visa acquisition process piloted (Yes/No) | | No | Yes |
| Co-Management Agreements in target CAs signed by the relevant authority (Number) | | 1.00 | 3.00 |
| Amount of non-IDA funds disbursed by BIOFUND for operation costs in the CA Network (of which amount disbursed to the three target CAs) (Amount(USD)) | | 0.00 | 2,000,000.00 |
| Action: This indicator has been Revised | | | |
| Amount of non-IDA funds disbursed by BIOFUND to the three target CAs for operation costs, out of the total (Amount(USD)) | | 0.00 | 300,000.00 |
| Amount of non-IDA funds disbursed by BIOFUND for sustainable dryland management in CAs (Amount(USD) (Amount(USD)) | | 0.00 | 900,000.00 |

| Indicator Name | PBC | Baseline | End Target |
|---|-----------------|---|--|
| Action: This indicator is New | Ration Added | ale: to measure functionality of new financing mechanisms | for sustainable dryland management in CAs |
| Increase of Endowment Fund through non-GEF Funds (Amount(USD)) | | 0.00 | 5,000,000.00 |
| Action: This indicator is New | | ale: to measure activities related to BIOFUNDs capacity to a g a national reference for financing conservation | attract other sources beyond GEF and hence it's status |
| C2: Improving Conservation Areas Management in target l | andsca | pes | |
| CAs' Management Councils functional (Number) | | 0.00 | 3.00 |
| Target landscapes with basic infrastructure established under the project (Number) | | 0.00 | 3.00 |
| New private tourism concessions (Number) | | 0.00 | 4.00 |
| New private tourism concessions: Elephant Coast CA (Number) | | 0.00 | 3.00 |
| New private tourism concessions: Chimanimani NR (Number) | | 0.00 | 1.00 |

RESULT FRAME TBL IC

| Indicator Name | PBC | Baseline | End Target |
|---|----------|--|------------|
| Number of Environmental and/or girl clubs created in target landscapes (Number) | | 0.00 | 27.00 |
| Number of Environmental and/or girl clubs created in: Elephant Coast CA (Number) | | 0.00 | 9.00 |
| Number of Environmental and/or girl clubs created in: Chimanimani CA (Number) | | 0.00 | 9.00 |
| Number of Environmental and/or girl clubs created in: Marromeu Complex (Number) | | 0.00 | 9.00 |
| Number of community management plans implemented (Number) | | 0.00 | 6.00 |
| Rationale: Added to measure activities related to strengthening community governance in and around CAs, including supcommunities to design and implement local management plans. | | | |
| C3: Promoting conservation-compatible rural dev.&integr | ated lan | ndscape management in target landscape | |
| Grievances registered related to delivery of project benefits effectively addressed (Percentage) | | 0.00 | 90.00 |
| Grievances registered related to delivery of project benefits effectively addressed, disaggregated: Elephant Coast CA (Percentage) | | 0.00 | 90.00 |

RESULT FRAME TBL IO

| Indicator Name | PBC | Baseline | End Target |
|---|-----|----------|------------|
| Grievances registered related to delivery of project benefits effectively addressed, disaggregated: Chimanimani CA (Percentage) | | 0.00 | 90.00 |
| Grievances registered related to delivery of project benefits effectively addressed, disaggregated: Marromeu Complex (Percentage) | | 0.00 | 90.00 |
| Participants in Rotating Saving and Credit Scheme cycles (Number) | | 0.00 | 1,080.00 |
| Number of conservation-compatible businesses under implementation (Number) | | 0.00 | 36.00 |
| Rural households integrated into conservation-compatible value chains in targeted landscapes (Number) | | 0.00 | 3,000.00 |
| Rural households integrated into conservation-compatible value chains in Elephant Coast CA (Number) | | 0.00 | 1,000.00 |
| Rural households integrated into conservation-compatible value chains in Chimanimani CA (Number) | | 0.00 | 1,000.00 |
| Rural households integrated into conservation-compatible value chains in Marromeu Complex (Number) | | 0.00 | 1,000.00 |
| Share of women participants in Rotating Saving and Credit Scheme cycles (Percentage) | | 0.00 | 60.00 |
| Share of conservation-compatible businesses under implementation led by women (Percentage) | | 0.00 | 30.00 |

RESULT FRAME TBL IO

| Indicator Name | PBC | Baseline | End Target |
|--|-----------------|--|---|
| Share of rural households integrated into conservation-compatible value chains, headed by women (Percentage) | | 0.00 | 30.00 |
| Area restored (Hectare(Ha)) | | 0.00 | 6,700.00 |
| Action: This indicator is New | Ration Added | to measure activities related to forest and land restorati | on |
| Area of landscapes under improved practices (excluding protected areas) (Hectare(Ha)) | | 0.00 | 520,000.00 |
| Action: This indicator is New | | vale: to measure progress related to improving landscape ma funities | nagement and conservation compatible business |
| Emissions avoided from reduced deforestation (Metric tons/year) | | 0.00 | 542,262.00 |
| Action: This indicator is New | Ration Added | to measure activities related to reducing emissions from | deforestation and degradation in target landscapes. |
| Number of beneficiaries aggregated by gender (Number) | | 0.00 | 35,000.00 |

RESULT FRAME TBL IO

| Indicator Name | PBC | Baseline | End Target |
|-------------------------------|-----|---|---|
| Action: This indicator is New | | ale: to measure participation in activities such as MGS, PCI vomen) | R, ecological restoration, etc; disaggregated by gender |

IO Table SPACE

Table 1. Summary of the Linkages Between Relevant Original Project Indicators and Supporting GEF Activities

| Name of Indicator | Targets | Rationale |
|---|---------------|---|
| | For AF | |
| Component 1 | | |
| Increase of Endowment Fund through non-GEF Funds | US\$5,000,000 | Added to measure activities related to BIOFUNDs capacity to attract other sources beyond GEF and hence it's status of being a national reference for financing conservation Contributes to objectives 2.1, 2.3 and 2.4 of the Dryland Sustainable Landscape Program Framework Document (DSL Global Impact Program) |
| Amount of non-IDA funds disbursed by BIOFUND for sustainable dryland management in CAs | US\$900,000 | A sub-indicator added to the existing indicator on BIOFUND's disbursement to CA operations. Added to measure functionality of new financing mechanisms for sustainable dryland management in CAs Contributes to objectives 2.1, 2.3, 2.4 and 3.1 of the DSL Global Impact Program |

| Component 2 | | |
|---|--------------------------|---|
| Number of community plans implemented | 6 | Added to measure activities related to strengthening community governance in and around CAs, including support to communities to design and implement local management plans Contributes to objectives 2.1, 2.3, 2.4 and 3.1 of the DSL Global Impact Program |
| Component 3 | | |
| Area restored | 6,700 hectares | Added to measure activities related to forest and land restoration Contributes to objectives 2.4 of the DSL Global Impact Program |
| Area of landscapes under improved practices (excluding protected areas) | 520,000 hectares | Added to measure progress related to improving landscape management and conservation compatible business opportunities Contributes to objectives 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4, 2.1 and 3.1 of the DSL Global Impact Program |
| Emissions avoided from reduced deforestation | -542,262 tCO2eq per year | Added to measure activities related to reducing emissions from deforestation and degradation in target landscapes. The indicator measures progress per year, yet is also calculated to measure the net carbon sink over a period of 20 years: -10,845,249 tCO2-eq Contributes to objectives 2.4 of the DSL Global Impact Program |
| Number of beneficiaries aggregated by gender | 35,000 (50% women) | Added to measure participation in activities such as MGS, PCR, ecological restoration, etc; disaggregated by gender Contributes to objectives 2.1 and 2.2 of the DSL Global Impact Program |

Table 2: Alignment of indicators with DSIP

| T 1 | | T 1. | |
|-----|--------|--------|------|
| VΔ | levant | Indica | tore |
| | CVAIIL | HIUKA | |

| Relevant PDO indicators | |
|---|---|
| (i) Score of Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool for CAs (annual) | Since the METT evaluates a range of issues, including community and CA relationship as well as biological status, law enforcement ability, HR, and others most activities of the GEF have the potential to improve the METT score. Specific examples are as follows. GEF AF will help targeted CAs sustain area of land restored, and reduce GHG emissions. CAs will adopt a combination of approaches and incentives, most of which are associated with agricultural activities by local populations, helping to improve community/CA relationships. GEF AF will also help the three CAs to reduce barriers to natural forest regeneration, improving biological status. The Earth Ranger system will also help CAs take timely and effective action to respond to biodiversity threats. Awareness-raising on CA Management Plans, with the help of CA Management Councils will also contribute to improved METT scoring. *Contributes to objectives 1.1, 1.3 and 1.4 of the DSL Global Impact Program* |
| (ii) Species population maintenance, and/or increase | GEF AF will pilot the Earth Ranger system and accompanying management measures and therefore contribute to maintenance of key species population namely <i>Apalis chirindensis</i> (Passerine Bird); <i>Olea Chimanimani</i> (Olive shrub). Through restoration, value chain development, community management, improved law enforcement and programs for habitat management, GEF AF will also contribute to maintenance and/or increase of species populations in Marromeu (Buffalo and Sable) and Elephant Coast (Elephant and Reedbuck). **Contributes to objectives 2.1 of the DSL Global Impact Program** |
| (iii) Living conditions of communities in and around target conservation area landscapes enhanced (positive variations in local communities' perception of CAs' impact in wellbeing). | GEF AF will provide additional support to improve the coexistence between CAs and communities around the buffer zones, minimize casualties from HWC and promote alternative and sustainable livelihoods. These measures will redu ce human pressure on the natural resources base and strengthen the resilience of households to natural disasters and economic shocks. Contributes to objectives 1.2 and 1.3 of the DSL Global Impact Program |
| Relevant Component-Level Indicators | |
| 1.4. Improving CA Management in target landscapes (Number) | GEF AF will contribute to this indicator through its support to provisional CA Management Council's work on raising awareness of CA Management Plans. Contributes to objectives 1.1 and 1.4 of the DSL Global Impact Program |

| 2.2 Number of Environmental and/or girl clubs created in target landscapes (Number). | GEF AF will expand the environmental and/or girls clubs to encompass entire schools, rather than specific clubs for selected pupils, ensuring wider benefits from the activity. The GEF AF will support increased number of girls for the Girls Clubs and if needed, establish additional ones, contributing to addressing underlying gendered social factors in NRM and creating ownership regarding NRM in vulnerable groups such a women and youth. *Contributes to objectives 1.2 of the DSL Global Impact Program* |
|---|--|
| 2.3 Participants in Rotating Saving and Credit Scheme cycles | GEF AF will support for improved participation of participants, a sizeable portion of whom women, in rotative Credit and Savings Groups, as a way to improve social and economic conditions for women to engage and benefit from NRM. *Contributes to objectives 1.2 and 2.1 of the DSL Global Impact Program* |
| 2.4 Number of conservation- compatible businesses under implementation | GEF AF will ensure specific support to conservation-compatible businesses and value chains that are focused on reducing threats to dryland deforestation and degradation, ensuring that such businesses get the technical and financial support possible to become viable. *Contributes to objectives 2.2,2.3 and 2.4 of the DSL Global Impact Program* |
| 2.5 Rural households integrated into conservation-compatible value chains in targeted landscapes (Number) | GEF AF will support LMUs and FNDS to improve their gender-responsive measures, to have adequate capacity to identify and engage women-led businesses in conservation-compatible businesses and value chain development. Contributes to objectives 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 of the DSL Global Impact Program |

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).

No pending comments on the child project approved under the PFD.

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

Non applicable

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) | |

Non applicable

ANNEX E: Project Map(s) and Coordinates

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

Maps of the Target sites.

1. Elephant Coast Landscape: Land degradation (LAUREL)



2. Chimanimani Landscape: Land degradation (LAUREL)



3. Marromeu Landscape: Land degradation (LAUREL)





Submitted to GEF Secretariat Review

Go To Home