



GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

Naoko Ishii
CEO and Chairperson

March 25, 2015

Dear LDCF/SCCF Council Member:

UNDP as the Implementing Agency for the project entitled: ***Lesotho: Reducing Vulnerability from Climate Change in the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin***, has submitted the attached proposed project document for CEO endorsement prior to final approval of the project document in accordance with UNDP procedures.

The Secretariat has reviewed the project document. It is consistent with the proposal approved by LDCF/SCCF Council in May 2013 and the proposed project remains consistent with the Instrument and LDCF/SCCF policies and procedures. The attached explanation prepared by UNDP satisfactorily details how Council's comments have been addressed. I am, therefore, endorsing the project document.

We have today posted the proposed project document on the GEF website at www.TheGEF.org. If you do not have access to the Web, you may request the local field office of UNDP or the World Bank to download the document for you. Alternatively, you may request a copy of the document from the Secretariat. If you make such a request, please confirm for us your current mailing address.

Sincerely,

Naoko Ishii
Chief Executive Officer and Chairperson

Attachment: GEFSEC Project Review Document
Copy to: Country Operational Focal Point, GEF Agencies, STAP, Trustee



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: LDCF

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title:	Reducing vulnerability from climate change in the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin		
Country(ies):	Lesotho	GEF Project ID: ¹	5057
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4630
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation; Ministry of Gender, Youth, Sport and Recreation	Submission Date:	Nov 26, 2014
GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change	Project Duration(Months)	72
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):	N/A	Project Agency Fee (\$):	797,828
➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/>			

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
CCA-1	Outcome 1.1: Mainstreamed adaptation in broader development frameworks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas	Output 1.2.1: Vulnerable physical, natural and social assets strengthened in response to climate change impacts, including variability	LDCF	619,908	2,500,000
	Outcome 1.2: Reduced vulnerability in development sectors	Output 1.2.1: vulnerable physical, natural and social assets strengthened in response to climate change impacts, including variability	LDCF	5,296,452	15,000,000
CCA-2	Outcome 2.1: Increased knowledge and understanding of climate variability and change-induced risks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas	Output 2.1.1: Risk and vulnerability assessments conducted and updated	LDCF	1,419,906	4,000,000
	Outcome 2.3: Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes at local level	Output 2.3.1: Targeted population groups participating in adaptation and risk reduction awareness activities	LDCF	661,994	3,000,000
Project management costs				399,912	1,500,000
Total project costs				8,398,172	27,600,000

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the [Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework](#) when completing Table A.



United Nations Development Programme

Country: Lesotho PROJECT DOCUMENT¹

Project Title: *Reducing vulnerability from climate change in the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin.*

UNDAF Outcome(s):

Outcome 2: By 2017 Lesotho adopts environmental management practices that promote a low-carbon, climate-resilient economy and society, sustainably manages natural resources and reduces vulnerability to disasters.

UNDP Strategic Plan Primary Outcome:

Outcome 5: Countries are able to reduce the likelihood of conflict, and lower the risk of natural disasters, including from climate change

UNDP Strategic Plan Secondary Outcome:

Outcome 1: Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded.

Expected CP Outcome(s):

Outcome 2: By 2017, Lesotho adopts environmental management practices that promote a low-carbon, climate-resilient economy and society, sustainably manages natural resources and reduces vulnerability to disasters.

Expected CPAP Output (s)

Number of national/sectoral policies and strategies that promote low-carbon, climate-resilient economy and society.
Number of national/sectoral policies that promote conservation of natural resources.
Number of local communities that implement disaster risk reduction measures.

Implementing Agency : UNDP

Executing agency/Implementing entity:

Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation

Responsible Partners:

Department of Environment, Ministry of Gender and Youth, Sports and Recreation.

¹ For UNDP supported GEF funded projects as this includes GEF-specific requirements

Programme Period:	72 months
Atlas Award ID:	00084520
Project ID:	00092485
PIMS #	4630
Start date:	January 2015
End Date	December 2020
Management Arrangements	NIM
PAC Meeting Date	

Total resources required	35,998,172
Total allocated resources:	
• Regular (UNDP TRAC)	600,000
• GEF	8,398,172
○ Government	27,000,000
○ In-kind	_____
○ Other	_____
In-kind contributions	_____

Agreed by (Government): PS: Ministry of Finance and Development Planning

Date/Month/Year

Agreed by (Executing Entity/Implementing Partner): PS - Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation

Date/Month/Year

Agreed by (UNDP):

Date/Month/Year

Brief Description

Climate change – including rising temperatures, and a greater frequency of droughts and extreme rain events – is negatively affecting local communities living in rural parts of Lesotho. The fragile mountain ecosystems of Lesotho provide a range of benefits that increase the resilience of such communities to climate change. These include regulating services such as storing and retaining water as well as mitigating floods. However, these ecosystems are characterised by widespread degradation as a result of unsustainable land management and exploitation of natural resources. The effects of this ecosystem degradation in Lesotho include loss of vegetative cover and extreme soil erosion. Such effects reduce the capacity of these ecosystems to protect vulnerable communities from the increasingly negative impacts of climate change that are threatening their livelihoods.

The government of Lesotho does not presently have appropriate policies and sector-specific strategies in place to adapt to the anticipated impacts of climate change. For example, ongoing initiatives related to addressing ecosystem degradation currently do not take into account climate change-related risks and adaptation needs. Furthermore, the capacity of Lesotho's line ministries and various socio-economic sectors to plan and implement appropriate climate change adaptation interventions is hindered by the limited availability of technical skills, up-to-date climate information and best-practice examples to inform the design of locally appropriate adaptation measures.

The preferred solution to the climate change problem facing Lesotho is to strengthen the resilience of climate-vulnerable communities by: i) enhancing the capacity of government institutions and local communities to mainstream climate change risks into policies, plans and programmes; ii) implementing climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures using a community/household based approach; and iii) establishing a system for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of various approaches to climate change adaptation to inform a process of adaptive management.

However, there are multiple barriers to achieving this preferred solution, including *inter alia*: i) limited technical capacity and information base for the analysis of climate risks; ii) limited application of cutting-edge technology in the planning and implementation of climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures; iii) limited institutional and community awareness and knowledge regarding climate risks and adaptation measures; and iv) weak governance systems for the mainstreaming of climate risk into land use planning and decision-making.

The LDCF-financed project will contribute to overcoming these barriers through strengthening institutional and technical capacities of government institutions to plan for and implement adaptation using an ecosystem management approach. In particular, the project will: i) develop a geo-based climatic, agro-ecological and hydrological information system to inform the analysis of climate-driven vulnerabilities and the cost-effective planning of climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures; ii) strengthen institutional capacity for land use planning and decision-making by integrating climate risks into development plans and policies; iii) provide access to knowledge and training on adaptation using an ecosystem management approach; and iv) demonstrate climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures – through the LRP – in the Foothills, Southern Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin. Communities within the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils will be included in the selection and implementation of the activities, with a particular focus on ensuring that the issues of youth unemployment and interests of women are adequately represented.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents	4
List of Acronyms.....	5
List of Annexes.....	6
1.Situation analysis.....	7
1.1 Climate change-induced problem	8
1.2. Long-term solution and barriers to achieving the solution	10
2. Strategy.....	13
2.1. Country ownership: country eligibility and country drivenness	13
2.2. Project rationale and policy conformity	14
2.3. Design principles and strategic considerations.....	16
2.4 Project Objective, Outcomes and Outputs/activities.....	20
2.5. Key indicators, risks and assumptions.....	41
2.6. Cost-effectiveness.....	43
2.7. Sustainability	44
2.8. Replicability	45
2.9. Stakeholder involvement plan	46
2.10 Compliance with UNDP safeguards.....	52
3. Project Results Framework	54
4. Total budget and workplan.....	61
5. Management Arrangements	69
6. Monitoring Framework and Evaluation	72
7. Legal Context	75
8. Annexes	77

List of Acronyms

AAKN	African Adaptation Knowledge Network
AAP	Africa Adaptation Programme
AMAT	Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool
BOS	Bureau of Statistics
BSAP	Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CO	Country Office
DCOs	District Coordination Offices
DoF	Department of Forestry
DoLS	Department of Lands and Survey
DRM	Department of Rangeland Management
DoSWC	Department of Soil and Water Conservation
DWA	Department of Water Affairs
EESU	Environmental and Energy Statistics Unit
GAN	Global Adaptation Network
GCM	Global Circulation Models
GIS	Geographic Information System
GoL	Government of Lesotho
HFA	Hyogo Framework for Action
FNC	First National Communications
LDCF	Least Developed Country Fund
LMS	Lesotho Meteorological Services
LRP	Land Rehabilitation Programme
LUNDAP	Lesotho United Nations Development Assistance Plan
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MAFS	Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security
MoDP	Ministry of Development Planning
MoEMWA	Ministry of Energy, Meteorology and Water Affairs
MoET	Ministry of Education and Training
MoF	Ministry of Finance
MFLR	Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation
MoGYSR	Ministry of Gender and Youth, Sports and Recreation
MTEC	Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Culture
MoLGCA	Ministry of Local Government and of Chieftainship Affairs
MoPWT	Ministry of Public Works and Transport
MoSD	Ministry of Social Development
MTEC	Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Culture
MoTICM	Ministry of Trade and Industry, Cooperatives and Marketing
NAPA	National Adaptation Programme of Action
NSDP	National Strategic Development Plan
NTFP	Non-timber Forest Product
NUL	National University of Lesotho
PM	Project Manager
PSC	Project Steering Committee
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
SGP	Small Grants Programme
SLM	Sustainable Land Management
SNC	Second National Communications
PSC	Project Steering Committee
RSDA	Rural Self-Help Development Association
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
WAMPP	Wool and Mohair Production Project

List of Annexes

Annex 1: Risk analysis
Annex 2: Key assessment reports
Annex 3: Stakeholder involvement plan
Annex 4: Terms of reference for project personnel
Annex 5: Capacity assessment
Annex 6: Letters of co-financing
Annex 7: UNDP Strategic Plan
Annex 8: Detailed project activities
Annex 9: Site Selection
Annex 10: Maps
Annex 11: References

1. SITUATION ANALYSIS

1. The Kingdom of Lesotho (hereafter Lesotho) is a Least Developed Country (LDC) in southern Africa. It is a small, land-locked and mountainous country that occupies 30,588 km², with elevation varying from 1,388 m to 3,482 m above sea level. The population of Lesotho was estimated to be ~1.94 million people in 2014². Approximately 80% of the population lives in the lowland areas where there is a greater availability of arable land and better socio-economic opportunities compared with the highland areas. The vast majority of Lesotho's population (~86%) is dependent on agriculture related livelihoods, particularly in rural areas^{3,4}. However, agriculture only contributed ~7% of the GDP in 2011⁵. Progress has been made in the country's economic and financial performance over the past few years, but Lesotho still faces widespread poverty. Approximately 57% of the population live below the international poverty line of US\$1.25 per day⁶. Poverty is particularly prevalent among farmers, casual labourers and households with small land holdings.
2. Degradation of ecosystems has been identified as a major constraint to Lesotho's socio-economic development⁷. Current land management practices result in soil erosion, loss of plant cover, and reduced soil fertility. For example, many grasslands in Lesotho are negatively affected by excessive grazing by livestock, while forested areas are degraded as a result of increasing demands for biomass fuel to supply domestic energy. The widespread degradation of these ecosystems results in reduced agricultural productivity and further exacerbates the challenges of rural poverty and food insecurity.
3. The Government of Lesotho (GoL) has responded to the dual challenges of ecosystem degradation and rural poverty by implementing catchment-based rehabilitation programmes in participation with local communities. Poverty is recognised as one of the underlying causes of land degradation and as a result the design of the GoL's land restoration efforts include measures to create temporary employment opportunities for local communities. For example, the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation (MFLR) is responsible for the implementation of the Land Rehabilitation Programme (LRP) since 2007. The targeted outcomes of the LRP include: i) increase the total area of rehabilitated and protected watersheds; ii) increase the area of productive rangelands under appropriate management plans; iii) protect wetlands to enhance the availability and quality of water resources; iv) contribute to the reduction of employment and resultant poverty; v) increase honey production; and vi) increase fruit tree production. As of January 2012, the LRP has created temporary jobs for ~387,836 labourers, rehabilitated ~250,000 ha of land, planted ~11,000,000 trees and implemented numerous land reclamation works⁸.
4. Despite the positive gains achieved by programmes such as the LRP, the sustainability of GoL's investments in rehabilitation of ecosystems is threatened by the anticipated effects of climate change across Lesotho. At present, the effects of future climate change, including variability, across Lesotho are not well understood. Furthermore, these effects are not being considered in present land use planning and decision-making at national or local government levels. For example, there are currently no comprehensive climate change policies in place to ensure that climate risks are integrated into sector-specific planning and strategies. As a result, GoL's response to the challenges of ecosystem degradation and rural poverty will be undermined by the negative effects of climate change.

² Bureau of Statistics 2010. *Statistical Yearbook 2010*; CIA World Factbook estimates derived from 2006 population census.

³ African Development Bank. 2013. Kingdom of Lesotho: Country Strategy Paper 2013-2017. Available at <http://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Project-and-Operations/2013-2017%20-%20Lesotho%20-%20Country%20Strategy%20Paper.pdf>. Accessed on 11 June 2014.

⁴ Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). 2010. The World Factbook: Lesotho. Available at <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/lt.html>. Accessed on 11 June 2014.

⁵ African Development Bank. 2013. Kingdom of Lesotho: Country Strategy Paper 2013-2017. Available at <http://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Project-and-Operations/2013-2017%20-%20Lesotho%20-%20Country%20Strategy%20Paper.pdf>. Accessed on 11 June 2014.

⁶ As determined by the World Bank. Available at: <http://data.worldbank.org/country/lesotho>.

⁷ UNDP. Country Programme for Lesotho (2013-2017).

⁸ These include the construction of diversion furrows, stonelines, gully structures, dams and ponds.

1.1 Climate change-induced problem

1.1.1 Climate change scenarios and climate variability

5. Lesotho has a continental temperate climate with alpine characteristics. There are four distinct seasons, which are characterized by major seasonal fluctuations in temperature and precipitation. The summers are hot and wet, the winters are cold and dry. Furthermore, as a result of the country's high elevation and heterogeneous landscape, Lesotho's climate is influenced by several converging weather systems/events⁹. Under climate change conditions, these weather systems/events are becoming increasingly erratic, including the temporal and spatial variability of rainfall.
6. A comprehensive analysis of climate change scenarios in Lesotho has been undertaken using historical data. Projections from several global circulation models (GCM)¹⁰ predict: i) increased temperatures throughout the country; ii) decreased precipitation in the spring and summer seasons; and iii) increased precipitation in winter and autumn¹¹. Temperature across the country is predicted to increase by ~0.7°C by 2030 and ~2°C by 2075¹². Average annual rainfall is predicted to decrease 0.5–1.0 mm per day for spring and 0.5 mm per day for both the autumn and summer seasons by 2075. In contrast, winter is predicted to have an increase of 0.5 mm per day¹³. Consequently, it is predicted that precipitation patterns will shift from summer rainfall towards autumn rainfall. The climate models also predict that extreme events such as floods, droughts and snowfall will increase in severity and frequency. These extreme events are likely to result in increased loss of human lives as well as destruction of crops, livestock and infrastructure.

1.1.2 Climate variability impacts and vulnerabilities

7. Lesotho is already experiencing the negative effects of the above-described climate changes. These include the: i) increasing frequency of extreme events, *inter alia* droughts; ii) increased rates of soil erosion and desertification; and iii) reduced soil fertility¹⁴. Over the past ~20 years- in particular- Lesotho has experienced an unprecedented number and frequency of droughts. The Southern Lowlands have been affected particularly severely by droughts on an almost annual basis over the last decade. A national famine in 2002 was a direct result of such consecutive and severe droughts. In addition to the change in frequency of droughts, it has been observed that rainfall is increasingly variable within seasons (for example, extended dry spells have been noted to occur in the middle of the wet season). As a result of this recent unpredictability of rainfall, agricultural production has declined in the Foothills and Lowland areas of Lesotho. The reduced agricultural production has particularly negative consequences for poor households who are reliant on rainfed agriculture as the primary source of livelihood. Another observed impact of climate change is the increased frequency of rainstorms in the winter, which exacerbate the already severe soil erosion in the Foothills, the Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin areas. Lastly, sudden snowfalls, strong winds and floods have affected the country periodically. The resulting damage to property and crops, as well as loss of livestock and human life, negatively affect multiple sectors including, *inter alia*: transport, agriculture, health and small-scale industry.

⁹ These include pressure and wind systems governed by the movement of the Inter-Tropical Convergence Zone as well as El Niño and La Niña events which create drier and wetter conditions in Lesotho, respectively.

¹⁰ United Kingdom Meteorological Office High Resolution Model (UKHI), the Canadian Climate Centre Model (CCCM), the USA Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory model (GFDL), the USA Oregon State University model (OSU), the Goddard Institute for Space Studies model (GISS), and the United Kingdom Meteorological Office Hadley Centre Transient model (UKTR).

¹¹ These projections are derived from climate change scenarios for the years 2030, 2050 and 2075.

¹² The models report increases of 2°C for both summer and autumn, 1.5°C for winter and 2.75°C for spring.

¹³ First National Communication to the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. 2000. Ministry of Natural Resources.

¹⁴ National Adaptation Programme of Action on Climate Change. 2007. Ministry of Natural Resources.

8. The predicted biophysical and socio-economic effects of climate change in Lesotho are summarised below.

Climate change effects on ecosystems

9. Mountain ecosystems provide services such as freshwater, timber, medicinal plants, and protect the surrounding Lowlands from hazards such as landslides and flooding. Climate change in Lesotho is likely to result in a shift in ecosystem boundaries, including changes in species composition and biodiversity. Furthermore, degraded ecosystems are more sensitive to climate-related hazards such as flooding and landslides. Therefore, climate change will reduce the capacity of mountain ecosystems to generate ecosystem goods and services for the benefit of local communities, as well as increasing the exposure of local communities to hazards such as floods, landslides, drought and food insecurity.

Climate change effects on water resources

10. The projected changes in rainfall and temperature will result in: i) increased flooding; ii) reduced rainwater infiltration; and iii) increased erosion. Areas which are bare or degraded (e.g. as a result of deforestation or overgrazing) are particularly prone to soil erosion. In addition to the reduced stability of eroded slopes, one of the major negative effects of soil erosion is the reduced rate of infiltration of water into the soil profile. The result of reduced rainfall infiltration is a reduced rate of groundwater recharge as well as an increased rate of surface water runoff. During heavy rainfall periods, the reduced rate of infiltration can result in flooding in downstream and low lying areas. Therefore, the degradation of watershed areas and other sensitive ecosystems results in multiple negative impacts on water resources. The reduction in water infiltration and increased erosion will diminish groundwater recharge and result in increased flooding. A decline in groundwater levels will reduce the availability of safe drinking water for people and livestock. Therefore, rural communities who are dependent on groundwater for drinking and cooking will be particularly vulnerable to the predicted effects of climate change.

Climate change effects on agriculture

11. The majority of agriculture in Lesotho is practised using rainfed cultivation methods. It is anticipated that the predicted changes in rainfall and temperature will reduce the total area of arable land for rainfed cultivation as well as reduce the duration of the growing season. It is predicted that climate change will result in substantially decreased agricultural production in the Lowlands, Foothills and the Lower Senqu River Basin¹⁵. The aforementioned areas are the most densely populated and cultivated in the country. The predicted effects of climate change will therefore have severe impacts on local livelihoods and national food security.

Climate change effects on livestock

12. The livestock breeds kept by pastoralists in Lesotho are generally hardy and are adapted to the country's harsh climate. However, the effects of climate change are likely to result in negative impacts on the availability and productivity of palatable grass species in the rangeland areas. Therefore, the livestock sector is likely to be affected directly by the effect of climate change on the availability and quality of pastures for grazing. Consequently, supplementary feeding will be required throughout the year under predicted climate change scenarios¹⁶. Additionally, increased average temperature and frequency of extremely hot days may result in negative impacts on livestock production as a result of heat stress¹⁷.

Climate change effects on forestry

13. Predicted climate changes are likely to have a positive effect on afforestation programmes. The predicted warmer climate will improve the growth and yields of various forest species¹⁸. Consequently,

¹⁵ National Adaptation Programme of Action on Climate Change. 2007. Ministry of Natural Resources.

¹⁶ First National Communication to the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Conventions on Climate Change. 2000. Ministry of Natural Resources

¹⁷ St-Pierre N.R, Cobanov B, and Schnitkey G. 2003. Economic Losses from Heat Stress by US Livestock Industries. J. Dairy Sci. 86:(E. Suppl.):E52–E77

¹⁸ First National Communication to the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on

woody biomass production in Lesotho will increase. This will result in positive economic impacts if afforestation/reforestation programmes are implemented.

1.1.3 Root causes of Vulnerability to Climate Risks

14. Lesotho's vulnerability to climate change is the result of multiple environmental, institutional and socio-economic factors. These weaken communities' adaptive capacity and consequently increase their vulnerability to climate change. The underlying causes of Lesotho's vulnerability are described below:
- **Poverty levels.** Households in poor communities are the most vulnerable to climate change as they are the most dependent upon natural resources-based livelihoods and have the least capacity to adapt to climate change.
 - **Land degradation.** Decades of inappropriate environmental management and unsustainable resource use in Lesotho – particularly through overstocking, overgrazing, and harvesting of trees for fuel wood – have resulted in widespread ecosystem degradation. This degradation has been identified as a major barrier to effective climate change adaptation in Lesotho's NAPA.
 - **Dependence on rainfed agriculture.** The widespread dependence on rainfed agriculture and the lack of appropriate irrigation technologies limits agricultural productivity in Lesotho and increases the vulnerability of rural communities to reduced or erratic rainfall.
 - **Limited institutional and local capacity to adapt to climate change.** Lesotho has an inadequate capacity to plan and implement climate change adaptation interventions at the national and local level. This is as a result of limited technical knowledge on climate change.
 - **Limited financial resources.** The GoL is restricted in its capacity to finance climate change adaptation. This is a result of: i) limited national budget allocated to climate change adaptation; ii) limited capacity of technical government staff to identify and develop proposals to acquire funds for climate change adaptation; and iii) limited capacity of government staff to manage the distribution of funds for climate change adaptation.

1.2. Long-term solution and barriers to achieving the solution

1.2.1. Long-term preferred solution

15. The preferred solution is to reduce the climate change vulnerability of local communities in the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin by: i) enhancing the capacity of government institutions and local communities to mainstream climate change risks into policies, plans and programmes; ii) implementing climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures using a community-based approach; and iii) establishing a system for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of various approaches to climate change adaptation to inform a process of adaptive management. The preferred solution would be achieved by implementing multiple complementary interventions, as elaborated below.
16. *Increased institutional and local capacity to plan and implement climate change adaptation.* The preferred solution would include strengthening institutional capacity in Lesotho to adopt improved approaches for rehabilitation and management of the country's ecosystems under conditions of climate change. This strengthening would include undertaking extensive capacity building and awareness raising activities with national and sub-national stakeholders, including: MFLR, Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MAFS), Ministry of Gender and Youth, Sports, and Recreation (MoGYSR), Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Culture (MTEC), Lesotho Meteorological Services (LMS) and Bureau of Statistics (BOS), as well as district and Community Councils. It would also be necessary to improve national structures for coordination and information-sharing between local communities, policy-makers, and technical staff – of the MFLR, MAFS, LMS, BOS related to climate change adaptation and land use planning. Enhanced coordination and sharing of information between these stakeholders will support the integration of climate risk into cross sectoral planning pertaining to ecosystem management. In addition, capacity building at the national and sub national levels – including district

development teams and Community Councils – would improve understanding of climate risks and the associated negative effects and management options. The increased awareness of the negative impacts of climate change at the level of national decision-makers in the MFLR, MoGYSR, Ministry of Local Government of Chieftainship Affairs (MoLGCA), Ministry of Development Planning (MoDP) and Ministry of Finance (MoF) will support efforts to increase the allocation of funding for the implementation of climate change adaptation programmes across agricultural, grassland and forest landscapes in Lesotho.

17. At the local level, the preferred solution would raise awareness of the impacts of climate change and the importance of ecosystem management in Community Councils. The increased awareness of the impacts of climate change would be complemented by increasing the capacity of Community Councils and local community members to effectively respond to and manage the negative effects of climate change, particularly related to water resources, agricultural productivity and livelihoods. Additionally, local communities would be equipped with knowledge of – and appropriate technologies for – innovative climate change adaptation that is specific to local needs and contexts. Local participation in planning and implementing interventions would promote community “buy-in”, ensure that activities are appropriate for the local context and improve the sustainability of the project.
18. The preferred solution would entail the adoption of a flexible and adaptive management process whereby policies, plans and legislation are developed based on current knowledge of climate change risks. Climate change would also be integrated into the GoL’s long-term planning development programs and budget allocations. The integration of climate change into cross sectoral planning by the MFLR and MAFS would provide a sustainable long-term approach to assist climate vulnerable sectors – such as agriculture and forestry – to develop appropriate climate change adaptation strategies at local, district and national levels. In addition, the preferred solution would ensure that policies, plans and legislation are reviewed and updated regularly to respond to improved understanding of climate change risks.
19. *Ecosystem rehabilitation and management.*
The preferred solution would include the rehabilitation of rangelands and wetlands in Lesotho through the introduction of a climate-smart, ecosystem-based approach to adaptation. This solution would improve ecosystem functioning and increase the benefits derived from these ecosystems. These benefits include: i) improved water quality; ii) increased groundwater recharge; iii) reduced surface water runoff during intense rainfall events; and iv) mitigating the impact of extreme weather events and natural disasters. As a result, the resilience of Basotho communities to climate change would be increased and sustainable water management improved. In addition, rehabilitation of degraded rangeland and wetland ecosystems would increase the potential for local communities to increase or diversify household income by supporting alternative livelihoods generated by ecosystem goods and services. The development of sustainable alternative livelihoods would reduce the pressure placed on natural resources by traditional livelihood practices such as agriculture, thereby increasing the climate resilience of vulnerable communities in Lesotho.
20. *Improved M&E of climate change adaptation.*
The preferred solution would include the development of Lesotho’s institutional capacity – particularly the MFLR, MAFS, MTEC, LMS and BOS – to monitor and analyse the efficacy and cost-effectiveness of ongoing adaptation activities. This approach would require the establishment of a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation system (M&E) system. The information collected through this M&E would be collated within a centralised platform that is mandated to disseminate such information to all relevant institutions, including the National University of Lesotho (NUL) and other vocational training institutes, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and local communities. The collection and dissemination of this information would support ongoing and future adaptation interventions in ecosystems across Lesotho.

1.2.2 Barriers to achieving the long-term solution

21. There are multiple institutional, technical and financial barriers to the implementation of the preferred solution in Lesotho. The project will contribute to the long-term preferred solution by implementing a suite of complementary measures to address the barriers described below.
22. **Limited institutional and technical capacity to plan and implement climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management.** The technical capacity to plan, implement and upscale adaptation interventions is limited at national, sub-national and local levels. This technical limitation is a result of: i) insufficient training of staff employed in relevant departments within the MFLR and MAFS; and ii) understaffing of the MFLR and MAFS. As a result, mainstreaming of an ecosystem management approach to adaptation into sub-national development strategies is hampered. The institutional and technical capacity to implement the LRP is also limited. In 2012, a review of the programme reported that the Department of Forestry (DoF) and Department of Soil and Water Conservation (DoSWC) within the MFLR are in need of additional staff with updated skills¹⁹. The Geographical Information System (GIS) unit in MFLR and the unit within MAFS are both particularly understaffed. This is compounded by: i) the low level of GIS skills among the technicians working within the LRP; and ii) inadequate collaboration between the GIS units. Additionally, implementing units responsible for cooperation and coordination in the MFLR and MAFS are inadequately staffed and coordination between these offices is weak. As a result, there is limited capacity to analyse the outputs of the LRP programme to improve its effectiveness and climate-proof its activities.
23. Technical and institutional capacity is particularly limited at district and local levels of government²⁰. As an example, the District Offices for the various ministries are under-capacitated and have insufficient resources to carry out their existing workload. Extension officers working for these centres do not have an adequate understanding of emerging environmental issues – such as climate change impacts and vulnerability – to effectively implement climate change adaptation programmes over and above their existing tasks.
24. **Limited information to inform climate-smart decisions.** The information that is available to guide climate-smart land use planning and management is ineffectually packaged and disseminated. There is currently no information system that compiles land use, climate, agro-ecological and hydrological information for Lesotho. As a result, information available within different departments on the consequences of changes to land cover across multiple ecosystem services is underutilised. A lack of synthesis and aggregation is particularly evident. For example, the MAFS collates data on crop distribution, whilst the MFLR collates data on catchments. However, this information is not analysed in combination. One reason for this poor collaboration is that no GIS unit has been mandated to ensure efficient and integrated capturing, storage, sharing and management of data. This results in: i) weak application of science in the selection and development of rehabilitation techniques and measures; and ii) poor monitoring and evaluation of interventions.
25. **Weak resource governance systems.** In Lesotho, the number of proven and replicable governance models for the management of natural resources by contemporary community structures is limited. Community Councils have no institutional model for natural resource management and lack governance mechanisms – such as a planning documents and technical guidelines – that could organise and empower resource users at the local level. Additionally, it is not clear – between the local community councillors and Chiefs – who is mandated to determine practices for land management²¹.
26. Current resource governance systems to support a climate-smart approach are weak because climate change considerations have been poorly integrated into national policies and plans such as the Rangeland and Wetland Management Strategies. Although climate variability is recognised as a potential limiting factor for socio-economic development in the country²², progress on a national climate

¹⁹ Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation. March 2012. *Review and Assessment of Integrated Watershed Management Project*.

²⁰ Pers. comm. with national consultants.

²¹ Pers. comm. with national consultants.

²² Government of Lesotho, National Poverty Reduction Strategy 2004/2005 – 2006/2007, which was extended to

change policy has been limited. Additionally, no systematic effort has been made to integrate future climate change scenarios into sectoral policy- and decision-making processes. The policy framework for climate change adaptation is therefore fragmented and inadequate. Consequently, climate change interventions have predominantly been undertaken on an *ad hoc* basis as opposed to adopting nationwide strategies. Limited mainstreaming of environmental considerations into cross-sectoral policies – coupled with inadequate progress on a national climate-change policy – prevents socio-economic development in Lesotho that is environmentally sustainable and climate-resilient.

27. The project addresses the abovementioned barriers to the long-term solution through two components. Component 1 will: i) develop a **scientific knowledge base to support improved land use planning and decision-making**; ii) enhance the **technical capacity** of relevant departments and units (e.g. DoSWC; Department of Rangeland Management (DRM) in MFLR; LMS and DWA in Ministry of Energy, Meteorology and Water Affairs (MoEMWA); and BOS;) iii) realign the LRP to **integrate climate risk considerations** into localised policies, development plans and bylaws iv) introduce **climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management practices**; and v) **train local communities** to implement climate-smart rehabilitation and management practices. Component 2 will **strengthen the integration of climate risk considerations into sub-national development strategies and promote effective knowledge management**.
28. No single initiative can completely remove all of the barriers aforementioned. Nonetheless, this project will work in coordination with other adaptation and water-related initiatives both in government and NGO community to build on their advances in overcoming these barriers.

2. STRATEGY

2.1. Country ownership: country eligibility and country drivenness

29. In line with the LDCF eligibility criteria²³, Lesotho is an LDC that has ratified the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)²⁴ and has formulated its National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA). Under the UNFCCC and the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA), Lesotho has committed to: i) adapt to climate change; and ii) manage existing climate risks, including enhancing preparedness for and response to climate-induced disasters. The LDCF-financed project will contribute towards achieving these goals. In addition, the project is consistent with country priorities identified in the NAPA (see Section 2.2).
30. Lesotho submitted the First (FNC) and Second National Communications (SNC) to the UNFCCC in 2000 and 2013, respectively. These reports guide the development of Lesotho's policy, legal and institutional framework for adaptation to climate change. The LDCF-financed project is aligned with the FNC and SNC through: i) promoting the efficient use of land resources by integrating climate risk considerations into land use planning and decision making; ii) empowering rural communities with skills to maintain a balance between agricultural production and demands for non-agricultural land uses; iii) strengthening the community-based management of natural resources; and iv) addressing institutional and technical limitations. Furthermore, the project addresses several objectives identified within various national policies and strategies related to rural development, poverty alleviation, and improved land management, including *inter alia* the GoL's Vision 2020, National Strategic Development Plan (NSDP, 2012/13-2016/17), Poverty Reduction Strategy, and the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (see Section 2.2).

2010.

²³ Updated Operational Guidelines for the Least Developed Countries Fund. GEF/LDCF.SCCF.13/04. Available at: <http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/Updated%20Operational%20Guidelines%20LDCF%20Oct.16.pdf> Accessed on 26 May 2014.

²⁴ Ratification occurred on 7 February 1995.

31. The LDCF-financed project will be aligned with the **Lesotho United Nations Development Assistance Plan** (LUNDAP, 2013-2017), by supporting the following LUNDAP outcomes:
 - Outcome 2: by 2017, national institutions (public and private) deliver quality services for increased agricultural growth and food security;
 - Outcome 4: by 2017, national and lower level institutions make evidence based policy decisions; and
 - Outcome 6: by 2017, Lesotho adopts environmental management practices that promote a low-carbon climate-resilient economy and society, sustainably manages natural resources and reduces vulnerability to disasters.
32. Extensive stakeholder consultations were conducted during the inception mission on 11-20 June 2014 as well as during later consultations led by national consultants. Stakeholders included local communities, NGOs and government departments. The objectives of the stakeholder consultation phase included: i) identify specific climate change effects to be addressed in each of the selected Community Councils ii) collect baseline data; and iii) inform stakeholders about the LDCF-financed project. The main stakeholder consultation events are described below:
 - An inception workshop was held in Maseru on 12 June 2014. This workshop served to inform stakeholders of the outline of the LDCF project.
 - A preliminary field trip to the Maseru's Hoek District was held on 19 June 2014. Introductory meetings were held with representatives from the MFLR, Khoelenya Community Council and NGOs.
 - The national consultants conducted field-visits from 5-9 August 2014. During the field-visit, meetings were held with the relevant Community Councils in Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele to establish the baseline with regards to the communities' climate change vulnerability and to assess the communities' priorities for ecosystem adaptation.

2.2. Project rationale and policy conformity

33. The LDCF-financed project will enable the GoL to strengthen institutional capacity for climate change adaptation, particularly at the community and district level. By doing so, the project will reduce the vulnerability of the communities and ecosystems in the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin to climate-induced disasters. The LDCF-financed project focuses on the implementation of NAPA Priority 2 "Promoting Sustainable Crop Based Livelihood Systems in Foothills, Lowlands and Senqu River Valley." Other relevant priorities include: i) Priority 1 "Improve Resilience of Livestock Production Systems under Extreme Climatic Conditions in Various Livelihood Zones in Lesotho"; and ii) Priority 3 "Capacity Building and Policy Reform to Integrate Climate Change in Sectoral Development Plans".
34. **Lesotho's Vision 2020** was formulated to provide a long-term perspective within which national short to medium-term plans could be developed. The objectives of this vision include: i) exploring options for economic, political and human development up until 2020; ii) identifying alternative development strategies suitable for the Lesotho situation; iii) promoting a process of open dialogue and consultation with socio-economic groups countrywide; and iv) developing a focused direction in which development plans can be rolled out. To realise this vision, the current limitations of management capacity, strategic and operational planning, and research in science and technology need to be addressed. Therefore, technical and institutional capacity building in ecosystem management and the use of a community-based approach aligns the LDCF-financed project with the priorities of the Vision 2020.
35. Lesotho's **NSDP** 2012/13-2016/17 is the implementation strategy for the National Vision 2020. The NSDP succeeded the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper and the Interim National Development Framework 2009/10-2010/11 in March 2012. The LDCF-financed project will support the following strategic goals identified by the NSDP:
 - *Strategic Goal 1: create high, shared and employment generating growth.* The project will contribute to promoting sustainable commercialisation and diversification of agriculture, strengthening the capacity of farmers and institutions, as well as reducing vulnerability and managing risk.

- *Strategic Goal 2: develop key infrastructure.* The project will contribute to the sustainable management of the water sector by expanding water-harvesting infrastructure.
 - *Strategic Goal 3: enhance skills base, technology adoption and foundation for innovation.* The project will contribute to the revision of curricula to align with national development needs and include climate risk management, as well as the development of retention strategies and mechanisms to use skills to reduce the migration of labour skilled in climate science to South Africa and elsewhere.
 - *Strategic Goal 5: reverse environmental degradation and adapt to climate change.* The project will contribute to the following strategic objectives under this goal: i) reverse land degradation and improve watershed management; ii) increase biodiversity conservation and promote sustainable use; iii) improve national resilience to climate change; iv) improve land use, administration and management; v) improve the delivery of environmental services; and vi) improve coordination, enforcement of laws, information and data for environmental planning and increase public knowledge and protection of the environment.
36. The Lesotho **Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan** (BSAP) aims to protect Lesotho's biodiversity while supporting the sustainable use of the country's natural resources. The LDCF project will contribute to the following goals of the BSAP:
- Goal 1: conserve the diversity of landscapes, ecosystems, habitats, populations, species and genes in Lesotho;
 - Goal 2: attain sustainable use of Lesotho's biological resources and minimise adverse impacts;
 - Goal 4: expand Lesotho's capacity to conserve and manage biodiversity; and
 - Goal 5: create conditions and incentives for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use.
37. The LDCF-financed project is consistent with the strategic objectives of the LDCF, namely: i) reduce vulnerability to the adverse effects of climate change; ii) increase adaptive capacity to respond to the effects of climate change; and iii) promote transfer and adoption of adaptation technologies. The project aligns with these LDCF objectives in that it will: i) increase adaptive capacity to respond to the effects of climate change; ii) enhance national and sub-national institutional and technical capacity for managing ecosystem resilience; iii) implement on-the-ground interventions that increase the resilience of Basotho communities and their supportive ecosystems to the effects of climate change; iv) enhance communities' capacity for natural resource management to increase the adaptive capacity of surrounding ecosystems; v) demonstrate cost-effective interventions for rehabilitating ecosystems; vi) improve the quality and availability of water through sustainable land use and watershed management practices; vii) promote food security by decreasing agricultural losses resulting from climate change; and viii) reduce vulnerability to the adverse effects of climate change.
38. The LDCF-financed project is aligned with the GEF Results-Based Management Framework for Adaptation to Climate Change. By strengthening the governance systems to mainstream climate risks in policies across all sectors²⁵, the project will support the upscaling of successful land rehabilitation initiatives. This is in line with Objective CCA-1 – *Reduce vulnerability to the adverse impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level*. Particularly, the project will contribute to Outcome 1.1 – *mainstreamed adaptation in broader development frameworks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas*, and Outcome 1.2 – *reduced vulnerability to climate change in ecosystem and land based productive sectors*. By increasing the resilience of communities and enhancing the adaptive capacity of national and sub-national governments to plan, budget and deliver climate change interventions, the project also supports Objective CCA-2 of the LDCF Programme Framework – *Increase adaptive capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level*. Within this Objective, the project is consistent with Outcome 2.1 – *Increased knowledge and understanding of climate variability and change-induced threats at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas*, and Outcome 2.3 – *Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes at local level*.

²⁵ particularly water and agriculture

2.3. Design principles and strategic considerations

Alignment with the LDCF Results-Based Management Framework for Adaptation to Climate Change

National Policy processes

39. The Basotho have enshrined environmental concerns in the National Constitution. This underscores the notion that Lesotho considers the right to a healthy environment as a fundamental human right. The National Environmental Policy (1998) was developed to enable the GoL, the public and the private sector to integrate environmental considerations in their development plans. The objectives of the Policy are to address a broad range of environmental problems. In particular, the Policy identified key national development priorities: i) social and economic dimensions of the environment; ii) sustainable management of natural resources; and iii) people's participation in environmental planning and management.
40. The National Vision 2020 was projected against the backdrop of the National Environmental Policy. Contextually, the National Vision 2020 signalled the opportunity for all national development plans – including environment, natural resources and agriculture – to articulate and align with the National Environment Policy for sustainable development.
41. The National Forestry Action Plan was launched in 1996 to pursue Lesotho's development objectives, focusing on forestry as a means to alleviate poverty, increase livelihood security and environmental protection, as well as enhance the participation of women in forestry. Consequently, the GoL has committed to promoting the use of trees in support of soil conservation and improvements of catchments areas. A new National Forest Policy was subsequently launched in 2008, which focuses on: i) sustainable forest management; ii) social and economic dimensions of forestry development; and iii) enhancing peoples' participation in forestry development.
42. The Department of Forestry is currently piloting programmes for devolving the management of State Forest Reserves to the Local Government Community Councils under the Forest Policy and Programme. This process is accompanied by training of communities and their councils on various aspects of forest management, business opportunities and cottage industries. This project is in the spirit of decentralisation and empowers local government council in the management of natural resources.
43. In light of the apparent failures of the traditional *Maboella* system within the grazing zones, several strategies of managing communal grazing lands have been implemented in Lesotho. A National Range Resources Management Policy is currently in draft format. The key objectives of this policy are to: i) raise public awareness and promote community and stakeholder participation in rangeland resources management; ii) develop and implement efficient and effective strategies to avert land and vegetation degradation; iii) improve and maintain productivity of rangeland resources at optimum level so as to promote ecosystem balance; iv) rehabilitate and improve the quality of rangeland so as to enhance productivity of livestock and wildlife habitat; v) conserve and increase the availability of native plant species for economic, social and cultural use; vi) protect water resources and improve the water quality and yield; vii) enhance the aesthetic beauty of the landscape to increase opportunities for sustainable eco-tourism; and viii) promote disaster risk reduction.
44. The need to address the problems of land administration in Lesotho precipitated the need for a new Land Act. This provided an opportunity and the means for land administration reform that has four sub-activities: i) policy and legal reform; ii) improvement of rural allocation processes; iii) modernisation and improvement of land administration services; and iv) public outreach and training. The Land Act 2010 was subsequently promulgated and a Land Administration Authority established in 2011. This provides a clear legal framework for land use planning.

On-going country interventions

Wool and Mohair Promotion Project

45. The LDCF-financed project will complement IFAD's Wool and Mohair Promotion Project to address rural poverty. The livelihoods of the smallholder producers of merino sheep and angora goats are threatened by the degradation of the rangelands and the predicted effects of climate change. The rangelands are overstocked with cattle, horses, donkeys, sheep and goats. This has negatively affected the production performance of sheep and goats, which includes poor reproductive performance and low yields of wool or mohair. In addition, the loss of ground cover on the rangelands leads to increased water runoff which leads to soil erosion. Consequently, Lesotho's limited agricultural land is further reduced. WAMPP identified various issues that need to be addressed in order to increase overall productivity, increase financial returns from wool and mohair and maximise the project's impact on reducing poverty and increasing employment.
46. WAMPP will focus on introducing climate-smart rangeland management to establish a sustainable system of communal grazing and rangeland management. The project will build climate change resilience of those involved in the rangeland sector through delineating grazing areas, establishing stocking rates and developing grazing plans. In addition, the WAMPP will improve livestock production and management through increasing the quality of wool and mohair produced by smallholder farmers in Lesotho. In doing so, production standards will be raised and returns will be maximised for smallholder producers. The increased returns from wool, mohair and animal sales will also contribute to improving food security within herding communities.

National and Local Benefits

47. The LDCF-financed project will address the problems of land degradation, poverty and vulnerability of the Basotho to climate change in the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin. Community and District Councils will also be assisted to mainstream climate change considerations into local development strategies. These interventions will directly contribute to the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) 7: "ensure environmental sustainability" – Target 7A: "integrate the principle of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources." Because local communities depend on natural resources for their livelihoods, improved environmental management will reduce poverty and increase food security, thereby contributing to attaining MDG 1: "eradicate extreme poverty and hunger" as well as other MDGs that are closely linked to the natural resource base. Additionally, training communities to rehabilitate and manage ecosystems in a climate-smart manner will increase their resilience to climate shocks as well as improve their livelihoods through greater income-generating opportunities. The project will therefore contribute to reducing poverty in the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils of the Mphahlele District.
48. Without the project, local communities and the ecosystems upon which they depend will be increasingly at risk from the impacts of climate change. As a result, progress towards poverty reduction and socio-economic development is likely to be hampered. The project will provide practical tools, technologies and capacities for an adaptation programme that promotes ecosystem management by communities. Households will be trained to implement climate-smart rehabilitation. This will be done through practical demonstrations over 50,000 ha to improve the maintenance and enhancement of ecosystem functioning, integrity and resilience. At least 7,000 households in the Mphahlele District will directly benefit from LDCF resources. These benefits will accrue because improved soil quality and ground cover will lead to increased water infiltration and reduced run off, as well as a decrease in soil erosion. The combined effect of improved soil and vegetation cover will also increase rangeland productivity. Strengthening the livelihood assets on which communities depend – such as rangelands – safeguards household income as households are less prone to – and in a better position to recover from – climate-induced disasters. In addition, the project will upscale the lessons learned to enable replication elsewhere in Lesotho.²⁶

²⁶ Scaling up of the project initiatives over 200,000 ha will upscale the benefits to potentially cover 50,000 households throughout the country.

49. The immediate benefits of the project will be that government institutions, NGOs and vulnerable communities have increased adaptive capacity as they: i) are more aware of the linkages between climate resilience and ecosystem management; and ii) acquire the necessary skills to apply adaptive approaches. This increased capacity will also support long-term benefits by promoting adaptation planning beyond the life-span of the project.

Site Selection

50. The site selection process for the LDCF-financed project was designed to be transparent and inclusive. The overlap of NAPA and the Lesotho Vulnerability Assessment Committee delineations is important to understanding climate change adaptation and livelihood resilience in Lesotho, as the effects of climate change are worse on poor livelihoods. Consequently, overlapping these two delineations is fundamental to the site selection process. The intersection of NAPA and LVAC delineations resulted in the identification of three Community Councils in the Mphahle's Hoek District: Khoelenya, Lithipeng and Thaba Mokhele (see Annex 10). These Community Councils have been selected because they provide a contiguous stretch of the Lowlands, Foothills and Senqu River Valley. The approach for selecting participating villages was watershed/catchment-based in accordance with on-going criteria utilised by the MFLR in selecting participating communities in the LRP. GIS databases were used to delineate important catchments using topography and major drainage systems. These were enlarged to highlight the main land uses – for example rangelands, forests and other range resources, water and wetlands.
51. A national village map was overlaid on the catchments – prioritised in each physiographic region within the three Community Councils – to show villages within the major catchments. The GIS technology was also used to estimate the area of the various catchments to ensure that the overall target area exceeded 50,000 ha and that each ecological zone was well represented.
52. The site selection criteria were validated in a meeting of the national consultants, key line ministries and NGOs held during July 2014. The *ad hoc* committee included representatives from MFLR; MoGYSR; and MAFS. The following NGOs were also represented in the *ad hoc* committee: Rural Self-Help Development Association (RSDA); Send-A-Cow; and World Vision. Thereafter, an extensive site selection process was conducted, which included consultations with Community Councils to identify possible project areas. This was followed by further consultation with community structures to confirm areas where the baseline projects were active and where there were resources under threat from climate changes. The following selection criteria were then applied to select the 50 most appropriate villages, covering an area of ~50,000 ha:
- poverty level (using NAPA and LVAC compound index approach);
 - water supply (focus on domestic use), reliability and sanitation;
 - reliance on rainfed agriculture (crops and livestock): all communities in the region equally reliant on rainfed agriculture;
 - frequency and intensity of intense rain events (predicted and existing);
 - frequency and intensity of drought (within each zone this is uniform);
 - land degradation in the rangelands, croplands and wetlands;
 - local governance structures, especially grazing associations and/or youth associations;
 - willingness/awareness/readiness of local community; and
 - avoidance of duplication.

Gender and youth considerations

Youth considerations.

53. In Lesotho, the youth (people between the ages of 15 and 35) unemployment rate is 34%²⁷. Youth currently make up a large portion of the LRP workforce, and will continue to do so under the LDCF-financed project. To encourage youth participation, the project will adopt a consultative approach using

²⁷ http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/ourwork/povertyreduction/projects_and_initiatives/projects_lesotho/ (Accessed on 4 September 2014)

recreational activities as a means to engage the youth in training and awareness-raising initiatives (see section 2.4).

Gender Considerations.

54. The GEF recognises that climate change can affect men and women in different ways, and adaptation efforts tend to be most effective when the gender perspectives are reflected in the climate change risk management solutions²⁸. Gender is a complex issue in Lesotho, as the Bill of Rights of the Constitution prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex, but exempts customary law from the non-discriminatory principle²⁹. Significant attempts have subsequently been made to redress the situation including the enactment of gender responsive laws such as the Capacity of Married Persons Act (2006). Consequently, there is increasing recognition for women as natural resource managers, evident in their greater leadership representation in structured community organisations³⁰. The LDCF-funded project will build on and seek to alleviate gender disparities likely to be imposed by climate change regimes on natural resource based livelihoods.
55. In alignment with the rights-based approach to development put forward by Lesotho's Gender and Development Policy, the LDCF-financed project will identify opportunities to increase youth and female participation in the project's activities and decision-making processes. These will include:
- Inclusion of youth and gender-disaggregated indicators and targets in the result framework of the project, specifically for participation at government and community training workshops, demonstration activities and management committees.
 - Targeting of gender- and youth-differentiated vulnerabilities into project interventions so that the most climate vulnerable groups within a community receive support from the LDCF-financed project.
 - Participation of stakeholders in the MoGYSR throughout project planning and implementation to ensure that youth and gender considerations are appropriately mainstreamed into project activities.

Comparative Advantage of UNDP

56. The LDCF-financed project is aligned with UNDP's comparative advantage in capacity building, providing technical and policy support, as well as providing expertise in project design and implementation. Specifically, the project will build upon UNDP's comparative advantage stemming from experience in working with governments and communities in Lesotho as well as globally on: i) establishing and strengthening institutional, policy and legislative mechanisms; ii) building capacity; iii) undertaking risk assessments; iv) mainstreaming climate change adaptation, disaster risk reduction and early warning systems into development planning; and v) harnessing best practices and community-based approaches across different thematic areas for climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction.
57. UNDP is particularly well positioned to provide support for the design and implementation of demonstration activities at the community level. This is largely owing to the CO's: i) on-the-ground presence, established networks and working relationships in country; and ii) extensive experience in implementing projects in constrained institutional and organisational environments at the local level, while still maintaining quality and responsiveness to local needs. The UNDP has supported Lesotho to reduce poverty and increase food security through sustainable livelihoods from appropriate land management and biodiversity conservation³¹. In supporting Lesotho to achieve MDGs, UNDP has: i) implemented integrated watershed management plans; ii) supported Lesotho in implementing international conventions related to climate change and desertification; iii) provided technical and financial assistance to improve the Poverty Reduction Strategy; iv) increased capacity of government for land and environmental management; urban development and settlement planning; v) promoted

²⁸ GEF programming strategy on adaptation to climate change for the Least Developed Countries Fund and the Special Climate Change Fund (2014)

²⁹ African Development Bank (2005) Kingdom of Lesotho: Multi-sector country Gender Profile

³⁰ Shackelton, S and Campbell, B (2000) Empowering Communities to Manage Natural Resources: Case Studies from Southern Africa

³¹ Lesotho Country Action Programme 2005 -2007.

sustainable land management to combat desertification and degradation³², for example through the UNDP's Sustainable Land Management Project; vi) been instrumental in implementing "Youth and Environment for Development" programmes; and vi) strengthened the role of communities and of women in promoting sustainable development.

58. The project will benefit from the UNDP's considerable experience in implementing a wide range of climate change adaptation projects – including those focusing on ecosystems as well as the agriculture and water sectors – in LDCs. For example, UNDP has already assisted the GoL to design and implement several adaptation programmes, including the Africa Adaptation Programme (AAP) and other GEF projects. Through the AAP, UNDP has supported the GoL to formulate a Climate Change Policy and build national level institutional capacities for tackling climate change and development.
59. UNDP also has a successful track record of facilitating the implementation of the GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP) in Lesotho since 2007. This is a fully fledged Country Program with a portfolio of 16 projects that are being implemented by 16 local NGOs and/or Community Based Organisations (CBOs). The total grant amount is US\$ 500,000. UNDP is also supporting various green jobs/cash for work initiatives in Lesotho, including: i) designing, funding and piloting a community-based project on risk management; and ii) implementing the Strengthening Rural Livelihoods Severely Affected by Climate Change-Induced Drought, project, which seeks to mainstream management for climate change into council plans. As an implementing agent, UNDP thus has the experience and capacity to support the 'cash for work' initiatives of the LRP.
60. The UNDP CO is also supported by Regional Technical Advisors at UNDP offices in Bratislava and Addis Ababa, as well as by policy, adaptation, economics and climate modelling experts in New York, Cape Town and Bangkok. A network of global Senior Technical Advisors provide additional technical oversight and leadership helping to ensure that programs on the ground achieve maximum policy impact. There are also other LDCF, SCCF and Adaptation Fund-financed projects within the region with similar objectives currently supported by UNDP. Consequently, there is substantial in-house technical expertise that can support the GoL with project implementation. UNDP is also uniquely positioned to exercise Results-Based Management and leverage its extensive knowledge of the similarities and differences between countries at different stages of development, and to translate that into evidence-based recommendations for effective, adaptable development solutions.

2.4 Project Objective, Outcomes and Outputs/activities

61. The project objective is "to mainstream climate risk considerations into the Land Rehabilitation Programme of Lesotho for improved ecosystem resilience and reduced vulnerability of livelihoods to climate shocks." The project will support the integration of climate change adaptation into national and sub-national land use planning and decision-making. By doing so, the project will reduce the vulnerability of local communities in the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin to climate change through the implementation of climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures.
62. The LDCF project will address the barriers to mainstreaming climate risk considerations into local development plans and policies by creating an enabling environment that will guide interventions on climate change adaptation. Furthermore, the adaptation interventions in this project will focus on implementing Priority 2 of Lesotho's NAPA, which focuses on promoting sustainable crop based livelihood systems in the Foothills, Lowlands and the Senqu River Valley. The project activities will include capacity-building of youth, women and CBOs to enable them to prepare more effectively for the risks and natural hazards associated with climate change.
63. The GoL has consequently requested LDCF funding to increase ecosystem resilience to climate change in the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Valley by delivering five integrated and complementary project Outcomes. Outcome 1 will increase technical capacity and management of

³² Lesotho Country Action Programmes (2005-2007) (2008-2012).

climate risks.) Outcome 2 will increase the technical capacity of technical staff and communities regarding climate change adaptation and appropriate interventions. Outcome 3 will improve natural resource management through the implementation of climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures. Outcome 4 will review national strategies for rangeland and wetland management strategies and make recommendations to include climate risk considerations. Outcome 5 will integrate the provisions of the NSDP and climate risk considerations into sub-national development plans. Climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures that reduce climate change vulnerabilities will be identified and integrated into the LRP. These will inform the upscaling of adaptation interventions throughout Lesotho.

COMPONENT 1. KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS AND INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY TO SUPPORT LAND REHABILITATION PROGRAMME TO FACTOR IN ADDITIONAL RISKS FROM CLIMATE CHANGE, INCREASE RESILIENCE AND REDUCE VULNERABILITY

Outcome 1: Increased technical capacity of the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation and relevant departments to apply up-to-date climate science for the management of evolving risks and uncertainty linked to climate change.

Co-financing amounts for Outcome 1: US\$ 4,000,000
LDCF project grant requested: US\$ 1,000,000

Without LDCF intervention (baseline):

GIS Resources for climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation

64. Lesotho has several independent GIS units within the MFLR, MAFS, Department of Water Affairs within MEMWA, Department of Lands and Survey (DoLS) within MoLGCA, BOS, and Department of Geography and Environmental Sciences of the National University of Lesotho. The national GIS capability is, however, in its infancy and is characterised by a lack of coordination and linkages between the government ministries with relevant expertise. Furthermore, the GIS units within each ministry are relatively small and generally have a sector-specific focus. For example, MAFS focuses on GIS information related narrowly to land under crops whilst the MFLR focuses on catchment areas. As a result, the geospatial data and information on Lesotho's ecosystems are fragmented. This is because there is no mechanism to analyse and collate these fragmented geospatial datasets nor to disseminate harmonised geospatial data for use by GIS practitioners. Consequently, ongoing initiatives relating to land management, water management, ecosystem rehabilitation and climate change adaptation are implemented without the benefit of appropriately packaged geospatial data. For example, land rehabilitation works are implemented without an understanding of the localised impacts of climate variability on important ecosystem characteristics such as productivity of plants and susceptibility to erosion. In addition, there is limited capacity within initiatives such as the LRP to apply GIS modelling techniques that incorporates local information related to climate change, land degradation and the generation of income streams from natural resources.

Capacity development for climate risk management

65. In general, institutional capacity for climate risk management is weak in Lesotho. This is a result of limited resources and technical skills within line ministries – a point highlighted in Lesotho's NAPA as a challenge to implementing climate change adaptation programmes. It is widely recognised that the MFLR and other relevant government departments and institutions – including the MAFS, DWA and BOS – require training and capacity building to support the implementation of climate change adaptation interventions. For example, the MFLR's district offices have insufficient resources – particularly in terms of technically skilled staff and equipment – to carry out their present workload in a timely and efficient manner. The capacity of MAFS' extension offices to supervise climate change projects is also constrained by the limited number of staff within the district's GIS units who have had formal training in GIS. In addition, the collection of data by extension offices is challenged by the inadequate allocation of budget for field work.

66. The end result of the gaps in capacity within various line ministries is that climate risks and climate change-related information are not included within business-as-usual development planning at local and national levels. Policy- and decision-makers have limited information regarding the costs of environmental degradation, particularly as they relate to risks emanating from climate change. Consequently, the impacts of current land use practices, and the implications of ongoing land degradation for local livelihoods under climate change scenarios, are not properly understood by government officials. Technical staff are unable to apply up-to-date, localised scientific information to support implementation of on-the-ground interventions. Activities are therefore not focused on forward-looking risk reduction, preparedness and adaptation. Currently, on-the-ground interventions are not designed and implemented to manage evolving risks and uncertainty linked to climate change. Technical staff are in need of capacity building and training to assist communities, planners and decision makers to understand the implications of their immediate planning decisions and land use practices. In addition, there is a low level of understanding within local communities regarding the predicted impacts of climate change in Lesotho and potential adaptation options to reduce the negative impacts of climate change. In consequence, without interventions, the livelihoods and wellbeing of local communities in Lesotho will remain vulnerable to the current and future impacts of climate change.

With LDCF Intervention (adaptation alternative):

67. The LDCF-financed project will strengthen capacities for the generation and timely use of information on ecosystem-specific risks related to climate change. In addition, appropriate methods and approaches will be developed for the LRP to guide ecosystem rehabilitation to improve productivity and resilience under climate change scenarios. The MFLR will be provided with information on climate risks that are currently reducing the effectiveness of the baseline project described in Section 1.1. By using cutting edge knowledge, skills and technologies, the project will identify effective climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management practices that will reduce the vulnerability of local communities and their livelihoods to the impacts of climate change.
68. Under outcome 1, the LDCF-financed project will: i) improve the GIS capacity of relevant line ministries and institutions, as well as increase the quality of the available GIS and climate science data; ii) study the socio-economic benefits of climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures and use the results of these assessments in the selection of adaptation interventions; iii) identify climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions for the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils; and iv) generate and disseminate technical guidelines for climate change adaptation. To support the design and implementation of effective climate change adaptation measures in the short- and long-term, the project will address information and knowledge gaps relating to the following questions *inter alia*: i) which landscapes/ecosystems are critical for what aspect of vulnerability; ii) how climate change is likely to impact the ability of these critical ecosystems to continue providing ecosystem services that reduce vulnerability and promote resilience; iii) how management choices affect the interactions between ecosystem health and resilience of livelihoods; iv) how degradation of natural ecosystems aggravates vulnerability of production systems and livelihoods; and v) how vulnerability and associated impacts are likely to evolve under the projected effects of climate change.
69. This outcome will strengthen the GIS skills and decision-making capacity of institutions to promote the integration of climate risk considerations into the selection of adaptation interventions. Consequently, the project will contribute to reducing the climate change vulnerability of local communities in the Lowlands, Foothills and the Lower Senqu River Basin.

Output 1.1: A geo-based climatic agro-ecological and hydrological information system to support better planning for climate change adaptation under the Land Rehabilitation Programme.

70. This output will increase the availability of information and knowledge to support the integration of climate risks into planning and decision-making. Furthermore, up-to-date climate change predictions will be included within ongoing planning in the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community

Councils to reduce the vulnerability of local communities. The LDCF-financed project will strengthen the role of existing GIS units to support better land use planning with the benefit of a geo-based climatic, agro-ecological and hydrological information system. The information system will combine multiple existing geospatial datasets – particularly those relating to ecosystems, natural resources, land use planning and climate change vulnerability – to support the identification of critical areas for agro-ecological and hydrological services and their role in livelihoods. The improved availability of geospatial information will form the basis for future monitoring of the impacts of climate variability and climate change, particularly with respect to the impacts of climate change on ecosystems and resilience of livelihoods. The information system will be used as a national hub for all research and data collection on geo-based, climatic, agro-ecological and hydrological information including land use systems and changes in Lesotho and will support other ongoing and future initiatives.

71. The cross-sectoral nature of the geo-based information system requires that access be made available to the MFLR, MAFS, MEMWA and other institutions involved in climate change adaptation. The BOS is the institution which is mandated to collate and host a national database including environmental data and is, therefore, considered to be the most appropriate institution to host the central geo-based information system. At present, BOS is developing an Environmental and Energy Statistics Unit (EESU). Therefore, the LDCF-financed project will capacitate the EESU to host the information system in close collaboration with the technical ministerial departmental and institutional GIS units including the NUL. Memoranda of understanding will be established between the EESU and relevant institutions to support collaboration and sharing of data and expertise. In addition, an inter-ministerial committee will be established to assist in the design of the information system and its linkages with the existing GIS units. The committee will also evaluate the status of the existing GIS units and advise accordingly with respect to capacity building needs. Furthermore, the committee will advise on the hardware and software requirements for the EESU as well as the existing GIS units. Expert input will be secured to develop training materials and programmes for GIS specialists.
72. Under Activity 1.1.6, the project will develop a strategy to build technical capacity and GIS skills within the EESU, MFLR, MAFS, MEMWA GIS units. The project will collaborate with NUL to develop the skills required to interpret multiple layers of information, run simulation models/assessments and undertake climate risk analysis to support MFLR and other relevant line ministries to incorporate climate change adaptation into land use planning and decision-making.
73. The project will address the challenge of human resource constraints at the level of technical staff within individual GIS units through a combination of strategies that will include: i) better linkages to other capacitated entities; ii) specialised training of climate scientists and GIS specialists; and iii) on-the-job training of the current staff. These complementary measures will support the MFLR to undertake comprehensive analyses of geospatial data. As a result, MFLR technical staff will benefit from enhanced capacity to identify and prioritise appropriate activities related to improved management of natural resources and ecosystems in addition to the design of appropriate climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management practices.
74. Indicative activities under Output 1.1 include:
 - 1.1.1 Collate existing data from existing GIS units as well as remote-sensing imagery to develop a GIS-based database of climatic, geographical, geological, hydrological, soils, agricultural and land use characteristics of the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin. Data should include biophysical and meteorological data.
 - 1.1.2 Develop models that incorporate climate projections and land use changes to identify priority locations for ecosystem rehabilitation.
 - 1.1.3 Establish an inter-ministerial committee which will be responsible for providing technical guidance to the EESU.
 - 1.1.4 Memoranda of understanding are to be prepared and entered into between the various GIS units regarding data collection and information sharing.
 - 1.1.5 Undertake capacity assessments to identify gaps in staffing and skills of the GIS units.
 - 1.1.6 Develop a strategy to build technical capacity of GIS units to enable comprehensive analysis of climate data through both on-the job training and engaging local researchers.

- 1.1.7 Train the various GIS units, relevant line ministries and departments as well as institutions on climate science, the application of GIS and integrated vulnerability mapping.

Output 1.2: A socio-economics unit in the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation

75. This output will allow for the integration of social capital and livelihood considerations into the design, implementation and M&E aspects of climate change adaptation interventions. The MFLR's planning unit is currently responsible for financial analysis and forecasting, cost-benefit analysis and M&E of the activities of the LRP. This planning unit will provide a foundation for the pilot socio-economic unit, which will undertake socio-economic and baseline analysis of community livelihoods in addition to the planning unit's ongoing activities.³³ Furthermore, the proposed socio-economic unit will undertake monitoring and evaluation of the changes in social capital structures and livelihoods as a result of the LDCF-financed project's activities.
76. The results of the baseline and socio-economic analyses will be used in conjunction with the assessment undertaken in Output 1.3 to identify appropriate strategies and techniques for ecosystem rehabilitation and management. In addition, the analyses will inform the development of proposed revisions to the rangelands and wetlands management strategies. All research and analysis on the potential benefits and effects of ecosystem rehabilitation and management will be made available to policymakers through the Lesotho Sustainable Land Management Platform. The results of the analyses undertaken by the project will be used to inform the selection, implementation and design of further adaptation interventions. The pilot socio-economic unit has the potential to be integrated into the MFLR's planning unit following project termination. Should the MFLR decide to make the socio-economic unit a permanent feature, this would enable the integration of socio-economic considerations into future climate-smart land rehabilitation and climate change adaptation projects.
77. Indicative activities under Output 1.2 include:
- 1.2.1 Undertake a capacity assessment to identify gaps in staffing and skills within the MFLR's planning unit and targeted districts.
 - 1.2.2 Develop and implement a capacity development programme to bridge the capacity gaps identified in the above assessment.
 - 1.2.3 Prepare technical protocols to support the integration of social capital and livelihoods needs into the LRP.
 - 1.2.4 Undertake a cost benefit analysis of recommended mitigation measures identified in Activity 1.3.5.

Output 1.3: Assessment of climate-driven vulnerability in the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils and cost-benefit analysis of specific adaptation interventions.

78. The LDCF-financed project will support the EESU and MFLR – in collaboration with existing GIS units – to produce an integrated map of climate-related hazards, vulnerabilities and climate-sensitive natural resources. Information from existing geographical, geological and land use maps will be combined with remote sensing imagery using GIS-based technology. This output will rely upon the information system developed under Output 1.1.
79. Under this output, a strategic environmental assessment (SEA) will be undertaken to identify threats to ecosystem resilience and the generation of associated ecosystem goods and services. The SEA will include *inter alia*: i) mapping and quantifying of benefits generated by ecosystems at the landscape level; ii) assessment of localised distribution of ecosystem benefits; and iii) areas of overlap between ecosystem services. In addition, the SEA will provide information on the implications of land use change for the capacity of ecosystems to buffer communities from the adverse effects of climate change.

³³ The Socio-economics unit will collaborate with representatives from the Ministry of Development Planning.

80. Under Activity 1.3.1, the information and data generated by the information system established under Output 1.1 will be used to: i) identify specific locations for ecosystem rehabilitation and management in Activity 1.3.2; ii) support research in Activity 3.2.1; and iii) support the proposed revisions of policies and strategies to include climate risk considerations in Activity 4.1.1 and Activity 5.2.1. The information gathered will be collated in detailed maps that integrate data on climate-related hazards and the climate change vulnerability of local ecosystems and communities at a sub-district level for the pilot Community Councils. The information gathered under this output will be used to identify appropriate interventions to be implemented at each selected site based on local context.
81. Indicative activities under Output 1.3 include:
 - 1.3.1 Undertake a strategic environmental assessment using the GIS-based data generated under Output 1.1 with the cost-benefit analysis generated under Output 1.2.
 - 1.3.2 Generate maps identifying risk areas posing a threat to ecosystem resilience and livelihoods of local communities in the selected Community Councils.
 - 1.3.3 Undertake integrated map-based assessment of climate-related hazards, vulnerabilities and climate sensitive natural resources based upon the maps generated under Activity 1.3.2.
 - 1.3.4 Develop recommendations for mitigating threats to ecosystem resilience for inclusion into the LRP based upon the assessment undertaken in 1.3.3.
 - 1.3.5 Propose ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures for implementation in the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils. Social capital and livelihoods needs should be addressed in the selection, implementation and maintenance of ecosystem rehabilitation and management practices using the protocols established in Activity 1.2.3.

Output 1.4: Technical guidelines for climate change adaptation interventions

82. The LDCF-financed project builds on lessons learned from other initiatives that have experience in climate change adaptation, agro-forestry and conservation agriculture in Lesotho. Based upon these lessons – and in conjunction with the integrated map-based assessments generated under Output 1.3 – the project will develop technical guidelines for the design and implementation of appropriate climate change adaptation interventions.
83. The design of the climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures will include considerations of simplicity, sustainability and ease of maintenance. Therefore, wherever possible, the project will promote techniques that are user-friendly and easy to maintain in favour of complex and expensive systems that require technical knowledge for maintenance and repairs.
84. The list of potential adaptation interventions to be promoted by the project will be developed with explicit consideration of local socio-economic and environmental context. Criteria that will be considered in the design of the adaptation interventions will also include *inter alia*: i) demonstrable effects in reducing risk of climate-induced disasters; ii) clear, viable and sustainable benefits to youth, women and other vulnerable groups; iii) cost-effectiveness and iv) minimal maintenance requirements.
85. Indicative activities under Output 1.4 include:
 - 1.4.1 Develop technical guidelines for the implementation of selected climate change adaptation interventions in each of the agro-ecological zones – the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin.
 - 1.4.2 Disseminate the technical guidelines to relevant line ministries, departments, institutions and other stakeholders that will be involved in the implementation of rehabilitation measures.
 - 1.4.3 Review and adapt training programmes – where necessary – to take into account the technical guidelines developed under Activity 1.4.1.

Outcome 2: Communities empowered with skills, knowledge, partnerships and institutions for managing natural resources to reduce vulnerability to climate change and increase resilience of natural and social capital (over 7,000 households with potential for upscaling to cover over

20,000).

Co-financing amounts for Outcome 2: US\$ 2,000,000

LDCF project grant requested: US\$ 642,000

Without LDCF Intervention (baseline):

86. Legal instruments – including customary laws – are the oldest instruments used to govern the management and rights of access to environmental resources. In Lesotho, the overarching legislation that guides environmental management is the National Environment Act (2008). In addition, there are multiple pieces of parallel legislation and sector-specific strategies, including *inter alia* the Draft Range Management Policy (2013), Soil and Water Conservation Strategy (1998) and the National Water Resources Management Plan (1999). Furthermore, Lesotho is a signatory to multiple international conventions related to management of natural resources. However, Lesotho is constrained in its ability to translate global conventions and agreements into national environmental management policies that can be effectively implemented. The problem is not the lack of policies or knowledge, but rather limited technical, financial and human resources. Consequently, existing laws are not being effectively applied or enforced. This has led to widespread land use practices that threaten natural resources. These practices include deforestation, overgrazing, unsustainable cropping systems and the poor use of soil and water conservation measures.
87. In the context of governance of natural resources, the Local Government Act (1997) provides for the decentralisation of natural resource use and management from national ministries to Community Councils. The process of decentralisation of governance of natural resources is further detailed in the Lesotho Local Development Programme Concept Paper. However, the existing legislation does not clearly indicate the implications of the decentralised functions in terms of the roles of central and local government in facilitating the process of decentralisation of natural resource management. The laws only state that local authorities will control natural resources and environmental protection activities without differentiating between different types of natural resources. As a result, confusion and duplication of efforts are reportedly relatively common. As a result of multiple logistic and capacity challenges, MFLR's extension staff have a limited capacity to transfer climate change awareness and potential adaptation options to local communities.
88. The process of capacitating Community Councils to take leadership roles in the management of natural resources and planning of ecosystem rehabilitation activities is slow and challenged by capacity and logistic constraints. Furthermore, there is no explicit strategy or policy that provides guidance to support Community Councils to initiate and develop local development plans that respond to local climate change adaptation needs. Significant development of capacity building and measures to improve coordination between stakeholders – including local government representatives, technical and extension staff within line ministries, NGOs and local community members – is required to support the implementation of Lesotho's environmental and climate change policies.
89. The GoL has made significant investments in addressing land degradation, in participation with local authorities and community members, to encourage smallholder farmers to engage in rehabilitation activities. However, information related to climate change and the expected consequences for ecosystems is not included in the training provided to local communities. At present, there is little support for raising awareness of climate change amongst local communities. Information on climate change is also conceptually inaccessible as it has yet to be translated into a format that local communities can understand. As a result, the success and the long-term sustainability of climate change adaptation programmes – and indeed of land rehabilitation related to such programmes – is at risk of being undermined by the constraints that hinder the adoption of decentralised approaches to climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation.

With LDCF Intervention (adaptation alternative):

90. The LDCF-financed project will advance knowledge on the climate resilience of livelihoods. This will enable policy-makers and other stakeholders to have a comprehensive understanding of the factors and processes influencing vulnerability and resilience at the community and household levels. LDCF funds will enable the GoL to strengthen institutional capacities to secure benefits emerging from the ecosystem under the effects of climate change. Consequently, community members and government officials will receive targeted training on their specific roles in the mainstreaming and implementation of climate change adaptation.
91. Capacity development will take place through providing districts and technical staff with current skills, tools and technologies to implement an updated extension service package. In addition, the operational capacity of the extension services will be boosted to enable communities to mainstream climate risk considerations into the implementation of baseline projects. Effective advisory services and deeper involvement of extension staff in training and field activities will foster wider acceptance of climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management practices. Technical staff will also engage with the local communities in the design and implementation of climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management practices. In combination with awareness raising campaigns, these actions will ensure the buy-in of local communities and the sustainability of the adaptation interventions beyond the duration of the project.
92. The project will establish the framework for a regulatory body at the community level, which will be responsible for overseeing environmental planning at a landscape level. Furthermore, community-led committees will be established to draft local bylaws regulating natural resources. Rather than seeking to offset damage already done to the environment, the bylaws will focus on supporting the sustainable use of natural resources.

Output 2.1: Training of technical staff of the District Technical Teams, Community Council staff and land managers on restoring and managing ecosystems and agro-ecological landscapes in a climate-smart manner.

93. Output 2.1 will provide knowledge and training for technical staff and land managers to undertake climate change risk assessments. Training will be provided at all levels within the current institutional framework, but will also include other stakeholders at the national, district and community levels. Participants will include elected officials and resource users from the three selected Community Councils: Lithipeng; Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele. A target of 50% youth participation is set for the training sessions to support meaningful engagement of the youth.
94. Existing training protocols and programmes within MFLR, MGYSR and other line ministries will be updated based upon a comprehensive needs assessment which will identify gaps in staffing skills. Training will be informed by international best practices as well as technical inputs generated by other past and ongoing initiatives related to climate change adaptation. The design of training and capacity-building activities will emphasise the inclusion of mid- and long-term climate change projections in the design, implementation and maintenance of climate-smart interventions. Various innovative approaches for the design and implementation of both traditional and modern conservation agriculture, agroforestry and water harvesting technologies will also be included in the training. The project will aid extension services by assisting farmers to adopt these new and additional climate-smart technologies and methodologies.
95. In addition to building the technical expertise of LRP, the project will design a skills development programme for land managers. Specifically, the skills development programme will focus on enhancing the capacity of land managers to: i) assess the economic viability of community-based climate change adaptation interventions; ii) carry out community-based vulnerability assessments for climate change adaptation; and iii) develop community-driven climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management practices. The enhanced capacity of land managers and LRP technical staff will support the implementation of climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management practices in accordance with the revised LRP.

96. Indicative activities under this Output include:
- 2.1.1 Assess MFLR's and MEMWA's capacity for developing and presenting training on climate change adaptation. This should include in-house capacity and outsourcing to service providers.
 - 2.1.2 Develop an organisational strategy to strengthen MEMWA's and MFLR's capacity for delivering training on climate change adaptation. This strategy will outline the respective roles of MFLR and other agencies in developing and delivering the training.
 - 2.1.3 Undertake a detailed capacity needs assessment of the LRP to identify gaps in staffing and skills of the MFLR.
 - 2.1.4 Conduct a comprehensive needs assessment for climate change adaptation training. This will be initiated and coordinated by MEMWA and MFLR following its standard procedures. The needs assessment will include a stock-taking exercise to identify existing training materials on climate change adaptation in Lesotho as well as an assessment of the types of training required to build district and sub-district capacities.
 - 2.1.5 Update and extend the portfolio of training modules to include aspects that are not covered within the current portfolio. The training programme will be tailored to the local context with respect to: i) types of climate-induced disasters; ii) prevailing socio-economic conditions; iii) environmental considerations; and iv) the needs of women and the youth, as well as other vulnerable groups.
 - 2.1.6 Develop and disseminate easily comprehensible, user-friendly literature on climate change adaptation and monitoring for NGOs, CBOs and land managers. Knowledge products will provide guidance on how to: i) assess the economic viability of community-based climate change adaptation interventions; ii) carry out community-based vulnerability assessments for climate change adaptation; and iii) develop community-driven climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management practices.

Output 2.2: Training of engineering, planning and monitoring sections of the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation on climate science.

97. A skills development plan for the engineering, planning and monitoring section of the MFLR will be formulated. The LDCF-financed project will provide the MFLR staff with training on climate science and the benefits of incorporating climate risk considerations into the design, implementation and maintenance of hard infrastructure, land use planning and decision-making.
98. Indicative activities under this output include:
- 2.2.1 Review current awareness on climate science in the MFLR and the effect of current awareness raising initiatives. Use the results as a basis for developing a training programme under Activity 2.2.2.
 - 2.2.2 Formulate and implement a training programme for various sections of the MFLR focused upon climate science and the benefits of integrating climate risk considerations into the design of hard infrastructure, land use planning and decision-making, including the socio-economic benefits thereof.

Output 2.3: Local community members (farmers, pastoralists and rural households) from the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils trained on the construction and maintenance of climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions

99. Under this output, a skills development plan will be established for the local communities. The skills development plan will include training on the following topics: i) the recognition of land management practices that decrease the vulnerability of local communities to climate shocks and change; ii) the adoption and maintenance of climate-smart land rehabilitation techniques that increase resilience of the individual farms, community projects and landscapes to climate shocks, while improving the productivity of the land; iii) maintaining soil and water conservation technologies and infrastructure on individual farms and the landscapes; and iv) monitoring trends in weather variation and using the information in decision-making. The training will also incorporate indigenous knowledge that has been traditionally used to deal with climate variability and change.

100. Back up support and training will be provided to the selected local communities in the Khoelenya, Lithipeng and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils. Extension officers and NGOS will participate actively in facilitating community-based work as part of the on-going learning-by-doing approach throughout the duration of the LDCF-financed project. Such training will include adaptive management practices that will prepare communities to assume responsibility for management of the project's interventions beyond the implementation period. To support the ongoing management of project interventions by community-based structures, the project will also develop a strategy to gradually phase out the involvement of MFLR and other government departments from the demonstration sites.
101. The training and capacity-building activities of this output will be complemented by activities focused on raising awareness of the benefits of climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management using locally appropriate media. Awareness-raising materials will be based on data and information generated at pilot interventions and demonstration sites under Output 3.1 and Output 3.2. This information will be analysed and collated for dissemination to District Councils, Community Councils, schools, media outlets and the public. Messages will be tailored towards the intervention sites where they are disseminated. For example, certain areas will focus on the benefits of rooftop harvesting, whereas other areas will include lessons to prevent soil erosion. Local community discussion forums will be hosted to share lessons learned on water harvesting, conservation agriculture, agro-forestry and other ecosystem management interventions successes and failures. These lessons will also be collated to create material for use in other discussion forums.
102. Indicative activities under this output include:
- 2.3.1 Review current awareness in local communities and the effect of such initiatives. Use the results as a basis for developing a training programme under Activity 2.3.2.
 - 2.3.2 Formulate and implement a training programme for local communities incorporating: i) indigenous knowledge; ii) climate-smart land rehabilitation techniques that increase resilience of the individual households as well as landscapes to the negative effects of climate change while improving productivity of the land; and iii) maintaining soil and water conservation technologies and infrastructure on individual/ organised group farms and landscapes.
 - 2.3.3 Train NGOs and/or CBOs to monitor and advise farmers, pastoralists and rural households on appropriate climate change adaptation interventions.
 - 2.3.4 Host local community discussion forums to share lessons learned on climate change adaptation experiences.
 - 2.3.5 Use local media – including radio – to target specific audiences with appropriate ecosystem management information.

Output 2.4: Inter-council land rehabilitation committees operational in the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils.

103. The Local Government Act (1997) makes provision for the establishment of inter-council committees. At present, there are no standing inter-council committees. The LDCF-financed project will facilitate the establishment of an inter-council committee on land rehabilitation. This committee will fall within the auspices of the standing Land Committees of the Community Councils. The establishment of such committee will be aligned with the existing structures such that an elected representative from each of the Community Councils' Land committees will sit on the committee. The chairperson of the committee will rotate annually as shall be agreed upon by the members. The Community Council Secretaries shall be *ex-officio* members and may also rotate annually to service the inter-council land rehabilitation committee. Akin to user groups or associations, inter-council land rehabilitation committees will adopt defined and agreed resource management roles and functions on behalf of their respective Community Councils. These roles will include the development and implementation of community council bylaws on natural resource use and management, as well as developing working agreements between neighbouring Chiefs and user groups.
104. The inter-council land rehabilitation committees will facilitate the management of landscapes and ecosystems in their entirety. The rehabilitation and management interventions under Output 3.1 will

be implemented across a landscape, rather than be limited to a community council's jurisdictional area. Adjacent landscapes will therefore be taken into consideration when determining appropriate rehabilitation and management measures. Consequently, activities on site will not be determined in isolation of the surrounding landscape.

105. These committees will also be responsible for implementing and enforcing community council bylaws through a policy advocacy programme. The programme would provide aggrieved communities with an opportunity to raise environmental concerns – particularly where activities have caused environmental degradation – which have resulted in harm to land users within the community. By establishing an inter-council committee, land users would be able to lay complaints against other land users who have undertaken activities that result in loss or harm to the individual or community. This would enable the management of a landscape and an ecosystem in its entirety.
106. Indicative activities under Output 2.4 include:
- 2.4.1 Develop an organisational strategy for the establishment of inter-council land rehabilitation committees.
 - 2.4.2 Propose recommendations for community bylaws for the management of natural resources.
 - 2.4.3 Develop practical guidelines for monitoring cross-landscape/ecosystem risk management.
 - 2.4.4 Facilitate the establishment of a policy advocacy programme for dealing with grievances regarding environmental damage.

Output 2.5: A strategy for maintaining technical capacity in the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation and relevant departments.

107. There is a general tendency in Lesotho for trained professionals to seek opportunities outside the public sector or the country. This contributes to a negative cycle of capacity constraints and high rates of staff turnover in government departments. The LDCF-financed project will strengthen the capacity of government departments through training and the addition of supplemental staff, if necessary.
108. A capacity development strategy will be formulated that will include measures to increase the sustainability of LDCF investments in technical staff, skills and procured equipment. Implementation of the strategy will support the retention of adequately skilled technicians and climate scientists. The LDCF-financed project will also establish links with existing platforms for knowledge management on climate change science and development to support ongoing capacity development and the exchange of techniques, methodologies and information on climate change adaptation.
109. Indicative activities under this Output include:
- 2.5.1 Develop and implement a capacity development strategy.
 - 2.5.2 Develop and disseminate easily comprehensible, user-friendly literature on climate change adaptation and monitoring for NGOs, CBOs and village leaders.

Outcome 3: Over 50,000 ha of land across the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin rehabilitated through operationalization of the climate-smart Land Rehabilitation Programme.

Co-financing amounts for Outcome 3: US\$ 15,000,000
LDCF project grant requested: US\$ 5,716,358

Without LDCF Intervention (baseline):

110. Agriculture is the main source of income for many Basotho despite only 9% of land in Lesotho being arable. Because Lesotho's ecosystems are fragile and characterised by widescale degradation, agricultural productivity is increasingly being carried out in marginal areas. As a result, indigenous vegetation cover is being reduced and steeper slopes are increasingly being cleared. The Basotho have adopted several techniques to combat erosion, such as construction of terraces, water diversion furrows and contour ploughing. However, these techniques are inconsistently applied and poorly

maintained. Furthermore, these conventional techniques are merely stopgaps that cannot avert long-term erosion without substantial changes in water catchment and land management such as conservation agriculture³⁴ and crop rotation.

111. Multiple ongoing initiatives with a focus on land rehabilitation are being implemented. However, these initiatives do not yet take the predicted effects of climate change into account in their approaches. The combined impacts of unsustainable land management and climate change impacts will undermine the effectiveness of the existing initiatives. In particular, rural communities who depend on natural resources for their livelihoods will be affected detrimentally. A new approach – based on climate risk and resilience – is required to enable these initiatives to provide increased protection of assets and livelihoods from the negative effects of climate change.
112. Another factor that reduces the effectiveness of ongoing initiatives is a lack of a system for collecting and collating relevant data and information from the various sectors and their lead ministries. Results-based management principles – working with baseline indicators, tracking of output, and documentation of concrete results – are not yet mainstreamed into operational practice. The benefits of adaptation interventions are therefore not analysed and do not contribute to the knowledge base.

With LDCF Intervention (adaptation alternative):

113. To address the anticipated effects of climate change, the LDCF-financed project will promote land use practices that reduce the vulnerability of local communities to the negative effects of climate change. Such land use practices will include a range of climate-smart agriculture, agro-forestry, water harvesting and other ecosystem rehabilitation techniques in the Foothills, Southern Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin.
114. Local communities in the Community Councils of Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele will be trained in the implementation and maintenance of various adaptation techniques. In addition, awareness raising of the benefits of ecosystem rehabilitation and management will be undertaken in the selected Community Councils. The project will identify appropriate adaptation interventions that reduce the extractive pressure on existing water and land resources under climate change scenarios. These adaptation interventions will include measures based on traditional wetland and rangeland management techniques – such as stone lines and diversion furrows – that have been proven to be effective over time. New techniques – such as micro catchments – will also be introduced to provide additional water resources.
115. Under Outcome 3.2, the LDCF-financed project will implement a research programme to assess the environmental and socio-economic effects of demonstrated adaptation interventions in Lesotho. The purpose of the research programme will be to measure the effectiveness of adaptation interventions using vegetation cover as a proxy for ecosystem productivity³⁵. The results generated will be used to determine the environmental and socio-economic effects of the various treatments. The MFLR will use the evidence generated to inform a replication strategy for other areas at risk of soil erosion.
116. The identified adaptation interventions of the LDCF-financed project will: i) incorporate traditional and innovative adaptation techniques; ii) require locally available or simple inputs; and iii) respond to the anticipated effects of climate change on youth, women and other vulnerable groups. This project will include local communities in selecting and prioritising interventions that are tailored to the local context and in accordance with the Lithipeng and Khoelenya Community Council Adaptation Plans. This approach will promote local community “buy-in” and ownership of the project’s activities. Households and community members in these selected Community Councils will directly benefit from the project through an increased capacity for climate risk management, as well as increased community

³⁴ which incorporates aspects of reduced tillage, crop rotation and crop residue cover or adaptation strategies based on crop substitution and /or alternative crops and associated value chain enterprise developments.

³⁵ The project will directly manipulate the variable – stone lines – to test the cause-and-effect relationship between treatments and effects.

coordination and ownership. This will have a direct effect on the capacity of communities to prepare for climate change impacts and minimise the damage caused.

117. The sustainability of the project will be further enhanced by establishing collaborative relationships with stakeholders who are active in the Mphahle's Hoek District, including MAFS extension officers, MGYSR district officers and local NGOs/CBOs. The LDCF-financed project will build on lessons learned from other initiatives related to agro-forestry and conservation agriculture in Lesotho. In addition, a comprehensive monitoring framework will be developed and implemented to: i) measure progress on specific interventions to determine the efficacy of implementation; ii) track changes in vulnerability to climate change to determine effectiveness of interventions; and iii) support cost-benefit analysis of adaptation interventions.

Output 3.1: Climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions in the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils, including: i) protection of critical fens and bogs; ii) adoption of conservation agriculture and agro-forestry practices; and iii) strategic interventions in sensitive areas, including construction of check dams, and rehabilitation of old gulleys and rills.

118. Under this output, the LDCF-financed project will support local communities to rehabilitate critical landscapes identified via the information system and climate-driven vulnerability assessments developed under Output 1.1 and Output 1.3. In particular, the project will facilitate improved management, protection and rehabilitation of ecosystems in the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils – covering over 50 000 ha of the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin.

119. The identified adaptation interventions will increase vegetation cover, water infiltration and baseflow³⁶ of rivers, thereby increasing the ability of the landscape to regulate water flow during droughts and floods. As a result, the project will increase ecological protection from climate change-induced droughts and floods. Adaptation interventions will include: i) changes in land use practices; ii) reforestation of degraded lands; iii) the construction of contour stone walls, farm ponds, check dams and silt traps; iv) slope stabilisation measures; v) water-efficient irrigation practices; vi) conservation agriculture, including the planting of short-cycle, drought-tolerant crop varieties; and vii) planting of multiple-use tree species for agroforestry. A more detailed description of these interventions is provided in Annex 8.

120. Local communities in the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils will be provided with training on appropriate techniques to decrease their vulnerability to the negative effects of climate change by addressing localised environmental degradation. Project activities will be implemented on demonstration plots – either on communal land or within volunteer's farms – in areas that have been identified as being particularly vulnerable to climate-induced disasters by the information system and maps developed under Outcome 1. The demonstration of adaptation interventions will be complemented by community outreach campaigns to sensitise communities to the benefits of the project's activities in an appropriate language and format.

121. This output will also comprise the adoption of climate-smart farming practices, including: i) the diversification of crop mixes on farms; ii) crop-livestock integration; iii) fodder production schemes; iv) gravity-fed irrigation and v) the adoption of higher yielding varieties.

122. Conservation agriculture (CA) has proven to be an effective solution to reversing the spiral of declining productivity caused by land degradation. In particular, those practices suitable for small-scale and poor resource farmers will be implemented through this project. When implemented correctly, CA should increase the efficiency of nutrient and water use, as well as generate higher yields. Intensive training and support for local farmers will be required. This will include training in conservation tillage –

³⁶ Base flow is the dry weather flow in a stream or river. It is the primary source of running water in a stream during dry weather.

no/minimum tillage, ridge plantation and mulching. If done effectively, adoption of this form of cultivation can reduce production costs because it minimises the cost of ploughing while increasing yields.

123. Agroforestry will benefit groundwater recharge through: i) reducing erosion; and ii) reducing soil degradation by raindrop impacts on bare soil. Farmers will be provided with assistance to establish agroforestry plots on their land and will receive training on water harvesting and conservation agriculture. The climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures will include planting trees along terraces, on rehabilitated land and around homesteads to: i) stabilise the banks; ii) provide shade to reduce evaporation; and iii) create windbreaks for homesteads to reduce wind damage, provide shelter for the livestock and fodder. Agroforestry species will be selected according to the specific local agro-climatic conditions of the intervention sites³⁷. These species will provide additional benefits such as the supply of fruit, forage for livestock and other non-timber forest products (NTFPs). Areas in which these activities will likely be implemented include the Monehela, Thaba-Phiri and Ramamonyatsi Electoral Divisions within the Thaba-Mokhele Community Council, the Soko and Maphutsaneng Electoral Division within the Khoelenya Community Council, as well as the Lithipeng and Shalane Electoral Divisions within the Lithipeng Community Councils.
124. The LDCF-financed project will also undertake water harvesting activities to increase drinking water availability for vulnerable households in the targeted electoral divisions. These activities will take place in areas for which water harvesting has been identified as a priority activity. Likely areas in which water harvesting activities will take place include the Morifi, Soko and Maphutsaneng Electoral Divisions within the Khoelenya Community Council.
125. Various water harvesting techniques will be demonstrated, including rooftop harvesting, which is a simple and cost-effective technique that does not contribute to the depletion of existing water resources. Another technique that will be demonstrated is inter-row water harvesting to improve water infiltration. These systems consist of small contour ridges or bunds between rows of planted crops that increase the infiltration of water by causing water to concentrate in the crop row. This technique has the dual effect of reducing evaporation from soils and promoting development of crop roots, thereby preventing heat damage to the shallower root system of a flat field.
126. Catchment harvesting systems will also be demonstrated. Micro-catchment harvesting systems will be demonstrated in sloped areas. Their function is to channel run-off towards crops and increase the rate of water infiltration. Sediment and organic material is also trapped to provide nutrients for crops. These harvesting systems will be demonstrated on rehabilitated terraces and in untterraced hillside fields. Medium catchment water harvesting systems – including terracing – will also be demonstrated in sloped catchments ranging in size from 0.1–200 ha. These catchments will increase the infiltration of water into agricultural soils and will also be used to supply water into storage tanks.
127. To complement the abovementioned simple approaches, other more technologically complex approaches to water harvesting – including check dams – will also be demonstrated. Local communities will be trained in the required maintenance to support sustainability of check dams. This will include the removal of silt, fine sand, clay and organic material to retain recharge rates. The training will also promote the use of the trapped sediment as mulch for the creation of inter-row ridges and micro-catchments for the agricultural fields. Finally, water use efficiency in small scale irrigation systems will be promoted to address climate-induced irregularity of rainfall patterns while improving productivity of the land.
128. Due to the limited operational capacity in the Mohale's Hoek District, the LDCF-financed project will sub-contract the services of a local NGO to facilitate the field work, under the supervision of a technical advisor. MFLR staff will assist in the implementation of activities envisaged under this Output.

³⁷ Species that are already found growing in proximity to the intervention sites will be prioritised.

129. Overall, the activities under this Output will provide practical, low-cost and low-input methods. It is anticipated that many of the measures will be simple and can be implemented through the LRP's "cash for work" programme.

130. Indicative activities under Outcome 3.1 include:

- 3.1.1 Identify appropriate adaptation interventions for each site utilising the information generated under Output 1.1 and Output 1.3. These interventions will be tailored to reflect the geographical context of local communities concerning community livelihood strategies as well as the type of climate risks at individual sites. Activities to be undertaken will include *inter alia* identification of critical landscapes for rehabilitation; selecting the appropriate measures for rehabilitation; establishing tree nurseries; planting selected multi-purpose trees/shrub species on field boundaries; planting of deep-rooted plant species in gullies and creeks on sloping land to control soil erosion.
- 3.1.2 Implement selected adaptation interventions according to the technical guidelines developed under Output 1.4.
- 3.1.3 Develop and disseminate information and materials to promote public awareness on climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management approaches to reduce vulnerability to climate change. This dissemination will take place through appropriate media such as national/local radio programmes. Information materials to be distributed include: i) best practices for climate-resilient agriculture; ii) best practices for climate-resilient agro-forestry and iii) best practices for climate-resilient biophysical interventions.
- 3.1.4 Develop strategies for the withdrawal of NGOs, CBOs and government agencies from the intervention sites at the end of the project. These strategies should include handing over responsibilities to community groups, youth and households.

Output 3.2: A long-term strategy for monitoring and evaluating climate-smart ecosystem restoration and management interventions for the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation and relevant departments, including an experimental design impact evaluation using grass cover as a proxy for rangeland productivity.

131. Under this output, a research programme will be designed and implemented to assess the effectiveness of adaptation interventions to address soil erosion under predicted climate change scenarios. The LDCF-financed project will focus on soil erosion because it is highlighted as one of Lesotho's major environmental challenges. The project will: i) identify areas at risk of soil erosion; ii) collect baseline information on soil erosion, soil type, soil chemistry, susceptibility of the soil clay to disperse and form a crust, grass cover and local measures to control soil erosion; and iii) select treatment and comparison groups at a household/village level; and iv) implement different treatments at the selected sites. Proposed sites for inclusion in the research programme include the Ha Makhabane and Anone Electoral Divisions within the Khoelenya and Lithipeng Community Councils respectively. These areas are characterised by extensive erosion gullies covering areas of approximately 20–30 ha.

132. The LDCF-financed project will use the information system developed under Output 1.1 and the maps generated under Output 1.3 to identify locations for the construction of stone walls. Chosen locations will be divided into treatment and control units. These control units will continue implementing soil erosion interventions – stone walls – as per the current techniques in the LRP while the treatment units will implement experimental techniques.

133. Data from each of the treatment and control units will be collected and analysed. The results of the research programme will be used by the MFLR to inform best practices and support the development of a replication strategy and climate-proofing LRP future interventions.

134. A participatory monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system will be designed and implemented at all intervention sites, including the treatment and control units for the research programme. The participation of local communities in M&E activities will increase local awareness of the benefits of climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures, and inform a process of adaptive

management – whereby adaptation interventions will be continuously modified as the circumstances change to improve their efficiency. The M&E system will include representatives from Community Councils, MFLR extension officers and NGOs throughout the implementation period to enable the replication and sustainability of project interventions beyond the period of implementation. In addition, the M&E system will provide for the regular monitoring of the interaction between local bylaws, national policy and the LRP. This will be necessary to ensure that the field experience in the Mphahle's Hoek District informs and facilitates the replication of the intervention measures through the climate-smart LRP across Lesotho.

135. Indicative activities under output 3.2 include:

- 3.2.1. Identify treatment and control sites for the research programme, utilising the information system and maps generated under Outcome 1.
- 3.2.2. Design various different techniques for addressing soil erosion. These will include stone lines of varying proportions – height, width and length – as well as varying distances between each stone line.
- 3.2.3. Undertake baseline assessments of soil erosion, soil type, soil chemistry, susceptibility of the soil clay to disperse and form a crust, grass cover and existing techniques to control soil erosion.
- 3.2.4. Implement the research programme techniques within the selected treatment sites.
- 3.2.5. Review current M&E systems used by institutions and donor agencies to identify best practices and opportunities.
- 3.2.6. Develop and implement a participatory M&E system based upon the information gathered in Activity 3.2.1.
- 3.2.7. Develop a results-based monitoring framework to enable harmonised monitoring, evaluating and reporting of expenditure as well as progress of interventions for climate change adaptation.
- 3.2.8. Assign responsibilities and mandates for data collection to specific institutions, agencies and community groups. Follow up with required training, monitoring and support.
- 3.2.9. Establish monitoring points at intervention sites and set up systems – in conjunction with the MFLR – to collect data on the long-term impacts of climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures. Monitoring points should also be established at the treatment and control units.
- 3.2.10. Analyse data from pilot interventions and research programmes. Collate the results for dissemination to schools, media, public institutions and other stakeholders.

COMPONENT 2: CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION MAINSTREAMED INTO LOCAL AND NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING AND FINANCE

Outcome 4: National strategies for rangelands and wetlands management strengthened by the integration of climate change/variability and ecosystems management.

Co-financing amounts for Outcome 4: US\$ 1,500,000

LDCF project grant requested: US\$ 219,908

Without LDCF Intervention (baseline):

136. The management of Lesotho's environment and natural resources is guided by a multitude of sectoral laws, policies and strategies, including *inter alia* the National Environmental Action Plan (1989), Land Act (2010), Environment Act (2008), draft Range Management Policy (2013), Soil and Water Conservation Strategy (1998), and National Water Resources Management Policy (1999).

137. The National Environment Act (2008) is the overarching legislation, which makes provision for the protection and management of the environment and the sustainable utilisation of Lesotho's natural resources. Despite including extensive provisions for environmental management – including management of rangelands, reforestation/afforestation and land use planning – the Act does not include explicit provisions for climate change adaptation.

138. Decision-makers and planners rely upon implicit policy guidance from strategic papers, policies and plans which guide Lesotho's approach on climate change adaptation. For example, the NSDP provides a policy framework guiding the integration of climate change into national development plans. The NSDP therefore commits to providing resources to relevant line ministries to reverse land degradation, protect water resources and improve natural resilience to climate change. This is because Lesotho does not, at present, have a comprehensive climate change policy.
139. Despite the growing awareness of climate change and adaptation issues in Lesotho, policy-makers and planners lack the practical tools and methodologies to apply climate analyses to their work. Where national policies address climate change, there are no specific guidelines for adaptation. Consequently, sectoral policies and strategies related to wetland and rangeland management contain limited information related to climate change. This is partly due to limited accessible information and guidelines on best practices for integrating climate risk considerations into land use planning. Consequently, the objectives of the LRP will be undermined as a result of the inadequate consideration of climate change in the design of the programme.

With LDCF Intervention (adaptation alternative):

140. Under this Outcome, the LDCF-financed project will strengthen the institutional framework to support effective national and local strategies for natural resource-based livelihoods in Lesotho. Sectoral policies will be reviewed and opportunities for amending such policies to address climate risk considerations will be identified. The review process will be based upon information generated by the analytical studies undertaken in Outcome 1. Furthermore, the revised sectoral policies will be informed by the additional measures identified to strengthen programmes such as the LRP. Thereafter, recommendations will be provided for the integration of climate change and variability into the policies.

Output 4.1: Policy guidelines for incorporating climate science in the review/formulation processes of national sectoral strategies by the Departments of Rangelands Management and Water Affairs

141. The LDCF-financed project will support the integration of climate change adaptation measures into policies which regulate natural resource management. For example, the DoRRM and DWA will be supported in reviewing sector-specific national policies on natural resource management – particularly for rangelands and wetlands – through the development of evidence-based policy briefs. These briefs will inform policy- and decision-makers on the importance of climate change adaptation in their specific sectoral mandates. Consequently, existing national policies – including the draft Rangeland Management Policy and Wetlands Management Policy – will be revised to better reflect the risks posed by climate change and provide a climate-smart management approach. By doing so, the strategies will also influence the sustainability of programmes implemented in accordance therewith, including the LRP.
142. Indicative activities under Output 4.1 include:
- 4.1.1 Review the existing rangelands and wetlands management strategies and identify opportunities for strengthening policy support for climate change adaptation utilising information from the analytical studies undertaken in Output 1.3.
 - 4.1.2 Develop policy briefs for the integration of climate change adaptation into the national wetland and rangeland management strategies. The briefs are to address the implications of climate change adaptation for vulnerable groups, including youth and women.
 - 4.1.3 Conduct capacity assessments of the DoRRM and DWA and other stakeholders to identify institutional and organisational capacity gaps for the implementation and enforcement of policies.
 - 4.1.4 Develop recommendations for relevant sector policies, plans and strategies describing institutional and implementation modalities, functional and technical capacities, assessment methods and M&E systems for climate change adaptation.

Outcome 5: NSPD mainstreamed into local development strategies to support the constituency-

wide adoption of the climate-smart Land Rehabilitation Programme.

Co-financing amounts for Outcome 5: US\$ 3,600,000

LDCF project grant requested: US\$ 419,994

Without LDCF Intervention (baseline):

143. The Local Government Act (1997) provides for the decentralisation of governance through the establishment of local authorities, including *inter alia* Community Councils, to transfer certain decision-making powers from national to local authority level. In accordance with the Act, the local authorities will be responsible for management and protection of natural resources (e.g. forest and rangeland areas) as well allocation of land and rights of use.
144. District Coordination Offices (DCOs) are mandated to facilitate the formulation of development strategies at a local level with technical support from the relevant line ministries – including MFLR. Despite efforts to improve the effectiveness of decentralisation through DCOs and the provision of technically-skilled extension services, there are still some challenges which impede implementation of initiatives and the integration of climate change adaptation into development planning at a local scale. These challenges include: i) inadequate operational resources (human, material and financial); ii) inadequate understanding of climate change information; iii) inadequate capacity-building opportunities; iv) limited coordination, collaboration and networking amongst state and non-state actors; and v) weak linkages between researchers, extension officers, resource managers, and land users – which weakens the application of climate science to ecosystem management.

Capacity constraints

145. The GoL maintains advisory services/technical support in multiple sectors, including agriculture, forestry and others. However, the DCOs and implementing units at the community council levels are challenged by multiple capacity constraints, including coordinating logistics and implementing technical works. The MFLR's 2012 review of the LRP states that the MFLR's district offices have both limited staff and equipment. In addition, many extension offices lack technical expertise which undermines the efficacy of their services. Furthermore, the extension packages generally have a sector-specific focus and do not include information or techniques related to climate change adaptation and climate risks. Poor governance and inefficient governing institutions therefore contribute to continuous environmental degradation.
146. The DCOs and local authorities are also unclear about their responsibilities for integrating climate change adaptation into development planning. In addition, they have limited skills and finances to enforce the mainstreaming of climate change considerations into development plans. Consequently, there is a need to improve access to and mobilisation of resources for climate change adaptation.

Coordination and cooperation

147. Planning is largely decentralised between the various line ministries and departments, resulting in duplication and poor coordination of activities. Discussions with district officers and community councillors highlighted the problem of ineffective inter-ministerial and inter-departmental coordination. This is evidenced in the MFLR's 2012 review of the LRP, which states that inter-ministerial cooperation in project implementation is minimal despite three additional ministries being concerned with the extent of land degradation in Lesotho, namely the MEMWA, Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Culture (MTEC), and MAFS.
148. Limited coordination between government institutions hinders collective decision-making; allocation of resources; and active engagement and support from partners to achieve shared objectives. Furthermore, it increases the likelihood of there being duplication of efforts. Coordination efforts by government need to be strengthened to ensure alignment, resourcing and integration of responses into development planning.

With LDCF Intervention (adaptation alternative):

149. The requirements for creating an enabling policy environment to promote local development – led by climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures – include greater collaboration and coordination between government departments and institutions at various levels. Coordination and cooperation from the MFLR, MAFS and other relevant line ministries is essential for providing inputs required to sustain climate change adaptation interventions. In particular, there should be greater coordination between DCOs.
150. The LDCF-financed project will support the decentralisation process through the establishment of an institutional framework and capacity development of local authorities. The decentralisation process provides an opportunity to mainstream climate change considerations into land use planning and development decisions at a local level. Mainstreaming mandatory climate change considerations into district and Community Councils' policies, programmes and plans will make developments more resilient to the effects of climate change.
151. With LDCF resources, the capacity of DCOs to integrate climate risk management approaches into existing planning and budgeting processes will be strengthened at district and community council levels. The capacity built within this output will be complementary to the technical skills developed under Outcome 1 and Outcome 2.
152. The efficiency of governance, at a national and sub-national level, will be increased by developing mechanisms to improve coordination between line ministries, government departments and local government. Examples of such mechanisms include, *inter alia* delegating technical staff from different line ministries to work for the project and the establishment of an inter-ministerial committee for project implementation with rotational chair responsibility. Improved coordination of development plans and projects will allow for the prioritisation of projects and streamlining of public expenditure. Consequently, the duplication and overlap of activities related to climate change adaptation will be reduced, resulting in more efficient use of investments and wider distribution of adaptation benefits to communities.

Output 5.1: Strategy for improved coordination between regional and district development teams to reduce vulnerability to extreme climatic events in the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin

153. The LDCF-financed project will support the process of mainstreaming the provisions of the NSDP into development strategies at a local level. In particular it will include consideration of the role of healthy ecosystems in buffering livelihoods and natural capital against the negative effects of climate change. The mainstreaming process will be supported through the strengthening of inter-ministerial and departmental coordination at the district and Community Council levels – particularly of the DCOs.
154. The institutional framework for inter-sectoral cooperation will be strengthened following an in-depth analysis of institutional arrangements. Based upon the findings of the institutional analysis, the project will develop innovative institutional mechanisms that will integrate climate change risks into planning and management across all sectors. For example, inter-council land rehabilitation committees will strengthen the coordination between Community Councils and provide a forum for developing draft bylaws to regulate land use. Furthermore, inter-ministerial cooperation will be facilitated by the expansion of multi-disciplinary teams to include specialists from Public Works, Agriculture, Livestock and Social Science. This will require collaboration between the respective line ministries.
155. Indicative activities under this output include:
- 5.1.1 Review institutional arrangements and prepare recommendations to improve coordination of decision-making processes and project management by DCOs, as well as the extension officers from *inter alia* the MFLR and the MAFS.
 - 5.1.2 Develop innovative institutional mechanisms to increase collaboration through improved coordination of the DCOs.

- 5.1.3 Expand the MFLR's multi-disciplinary team to provide linkages between the ministries who are involved in land rehabilitation activities. These expanded teams should include specialists from the district offices of the Public Works, Agriculture and Livestock.

Output 5.2: Revised local policies across productive sectors – particularly agriculture, infrastructure development and rural development – include identified best practices for climate-smart interventions

156. The LDCF-financed project will capacitate the district authorities and officers of the relevant line ministries and department officials to recognise climate risk problems in new and existing projects. Relevant line ministry staff and department officials will be capacitated to understand how to integrate data and information on the expected impacts of climate change on local communities and ecosystems into local policies. Community Council members will also be sensitised and familiarised with the new planning process.
157. To support the improved mainstreaming of climate risks into local development programmes and planning, the project will review, and propose revisions to, local policies. The DCOs and technical staff – who received training in climate resilient development under Outcome 2 – will play a strategic role in developing the climate-smart local policies. Consequently, targeted risk reduction and risk management measures will be recommended and applied. The policies will be guided by the information generated under Outcome 1, particularly the technical guidelines under Output 1.4.
158. Bi-annual briefing sessions will be held for the relevant line ministries on the progress achieved in promoting climate adaptation technologies and mitigation of risks in sectoral policies through the project.
159. Indicative activities under this output include:
- 5.2.1 Review local policies for the productive sectors, including *inter alia* agriculture and rural development.
 - 5.2.2 Develop guidelines to support the integration of climate risks and ecosystem management into the design and approval processes of local development programmes, plans and activities.
 - 5.2.3 Integrate climate-smart interventions into *inter alia* agricultural, rural development and infrastructural policies at the local level.
 - 5.2.4 Update the relevant line ministries including, *inter alia* MFLR, MAFS and MoLGCA on a quarterly basis regarding progress in promoting and integrating climate change into sectoral policies.

Output 5.3: Policy recommendations for the integration of climate risk considerations in the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils' development plans, as well as the Mohale's Hoek District development plan

160. The LDCF-financed project will build climate resilience into both district and community council development plans by creating discussion forums to coordinate and facilitate discussions between relevant district and community council stakeholders. These discussions will be guided by information generated under Outcome 1 and Outcome 4. GIS information and socio-economic analyses generated in Output 1.1 and Output 1.2, respectively, will support the inclusion of up-to-date information and evidence-based approaches into the local development plans. This will include the information generated by the project on the costs and benefits of climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions. In so doing, the project will support increased investment in ecosystem restoration and climate change adaptation interventions.
161. By enhancing coordination of efforts between the district level and community council technical teams, the project will support the incorporation of climate risk considerations into the design, appraisal and approval process of council, district and communal development plans. Policy-makers will have the benefit of the best available information and technical guidance to inform the development of appropriate sector-specific budgets and adaptation plans in the Mohale's Hoek District. This approach

will facilitate upscaling of lessons learned through the field implementation at the intervention sites to the rest of the district and nationally.

162. Indicative activities under output 5.3 include:

- 5.3.1 Create a discussion forum to facilitate dialogue on climate change adaptation between the district and community council stakeholders.
- 5.3.2 Review district and community council development plans
- 5.3.3 Integrate climate risk considerations into the district and community council development plans using models and maps developed under Activity (output 1.3).

Output 5.4: Training on climate-resilient construction, climate-smart land uses, climate-smart water resource planning, and climate risk management for relevant officials. Trained staff will include: structural engineers; urban and rural infrastructure planners; local authorities; district planning units; officers of the Ministry of Development Planning; and teaching staff from technical colleges and vocational training institutes.

163. To support the integration of climate change adaptation into local development planning, training undertaken in Outcome 2 will be further extended to other stakeholders. Participants will include representatives from the following sectors: land use planning, construction, financial, administration and education. In so doing, the project will encourage the inclusion of climate risk considerations into all aspects of development planning. Support will be provided to institutions and vocational training colleges to revise their curricula to emphasize the role of ecosystems and their impact on climate resilience of local communities.

164. Indicative activities under this output include:

- 5.4.1 Formulate and implement training programmes for a wide range of stakeholders, including: structural engineers; urban and rural infrastructure planners; local authorities; district planning units; officers of the Ministry of Development Planning and Ministry of Finance; and teaching staff from technical colleges and vocational training institutes.
- 5.4.2 Collaborate with institutions of higher learning to support the integration of the above courses into the regular training curricula.

Output 5.5: Best practices and documentation on climate-smart land management in the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils disseminated through existing national and international platforms

165. Under this output, the research and knowledge products generated by the project's activities –under Output 1.4 and Output 3.2 – will be made publicly available to support other ongoing and future climate change adaptation initiatives. The project will disseminate knowledge on climate-smart land management to local communities in all regions through a versatile approach. Experience-sharing programs – combining workshops, visitations to model farming systems, networking and distribution of training manuals and relevant literature materials – will be promoted by responsible organisations.

166. Conventional extension methodologies will be improved with the adoption of a facilitative, “learning by doing” approach that introduces participatory experiential learning methods. To support the sharing of lessons and successful approaches on a national scale, the project will facilitate the establishment of the Farmer Field Schools’ mode of extension. The Field School approach will include the organisation of field visits to pilot demonstration sites by the project’s target constituencies as well as communities from adjacent landscapes and ecosystems. The purpose of the field visits will be to support the replication and upscaling of successful approaches to other districts across Lesotho.

167. The project will implement awareness-raising measures to increase the understanding of Basotho communities on the effects of climate change, as well as potential methods for adaptation, through the use of appropriate local media. Awareness-raising initiatives will be facilitated by using local media and community radio networks to assist in the broadcasting of adaptation advice such as: i) adapted planting calendar – sowing, planting and harvesting times; ii) climate-smart farming methods –

including drought-resistant varieties of local crops, suitable seed provision and mulch application; and iii) water-efficient irrigation technologies. Finally, best practice guides for climate risk management will be published in local languages to support the widespread adoption of the approaches promoted by the project.

168. Youth and school groups will be encouraged to participate in various climate change adaptation interventions. This will be undertaken through field days and study tours, as well as school projects and youth competitions. Lessons learned from the project will be made available for inclusion into educational curricula.
169. The LDCF-financed project will support the wide scale dissemination of information and lessons generated from the pilot initiatives. This will be done in conjunction with output 3.2. Best practice and lessons learned from the project on climate change adaptation will be disseminated nationally through the Lesotho SLM Platform – established under the GEF LD project – and globally via the UNDP's Adaptation Learning Mechanism (ALM), wikiADAPT. Knowledge sharing platforms will be used to advocate for a shift from fragmented and/or sectoral to joint planning.
170. Indicative activities under this output include:
- 5.5.1 Publish guideline documents including, *inter alia*: i) best practices for climate resilient agriculture; ii) best practices for climate-resilient agroforestry; and iii) best practices for climate-resilient biophysical interventions in local languages.
 - 5.5.2 Conduct a public awareness campaign using local media to inform local populations on the effects of climate change and appropriate adaptation measures.
 - 5.5.3 Adopt experiential learning methods by facilitating the establishment of Farmer Field Schools.
 - 5.5.4 Coordinate field visits and study tours to publicize project activities and lessons learnt from implementation experience. These field visits will include school and youth groups who will be encouraged to participate in various activities and competitions.
 - 5.5.5 Collate and synthesise lessons learned and best practices from project results, including the benefits of adaptation interventions.
 - 5.5.6 Best practices and lessons learned under Activity 5.6.5 to be disseminated nationally through the Lesotho SLM platform.
 - 5.5.7 Best practices and documentation to be shared globally via the UNDP's Adaptation Learning Mechanism (ALM) and wikiADAPT, as well as the Global Adaptation Network (GAN) and the Africa Adaptation Knowledge Network (AAKN).

2.5. Key indicators, risks and assumptions

2.5 Key indicators, risks and assumptions

171. Indicators for the LDCF-financed project are based on UNDP's Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for Climate Change Adaptation. In addition, project indicators are aligned with the UNDP Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool (AMAT). The Project Results Framework in Section 3 details indicators, baseline information, targets and sources of verification at the Objective and Outcome level (See Annex 1).
172. The Project objectives are aligned with the following Climate Change Adaptation focal areas:
- CCA-1: Reducing Vulnerability: Reduce vulnerability to the adverse impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level.
 - CCA-2: Increasing Adaptive Capacity: Increase adaptive capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level.

The project's Outcomes and Objectives will be monitored according to the following indicators:

Outcome 1: Increased technical capacity of the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation and relevant departments to apply up-to-date climate science for the management of evolving risks and uncertainty linked to climate change.

Indicators:

- Capacities of the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation and relevant departments to identify, prioritize, implement, monitor and evaluate adaptation measures.
- A geo-based climatic, agro-ecological and hydrological information system formulated, tested in pilot area and ready for upscaling to the rest of the districts in Lesotho.
- A socio-economics unit established within the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation.
- Number of climate-driven vulnerability assessments and cost-benefit analyses of specific adaptation interventions undertaken for each of the selected Community Councils.
- Number of technical guidelines on climate change adaptation interventions identified for the selected Community Councils.

Outcome 2: Communities empowered with skills, knowledge, partnerships and institutions for managing natural resource to reduce vulnerability to climate change and increase resilience of natural and social capital (over 7,000 households with potential for upscaling to cover over 20,000).

Indicators:

- % change in climate change vulnerability index in targeted populations.
- % change in targeted population's awareness of predicted adverse impacts of climate change.
- Number of technical staff trained in climate change adaptation, including restoring and managing ecosystems and agro-ecological landscapes.
- Number of training sessions conducted and participants within the engineering, planning and monitoring sections of the MFLR trained in climate science.
- Number of households participating in training programmes on implementation of climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures.
- An inter-council land rehabilitation committee established and operational.
- Finalised strategy for maintaining technical capacity of relevant departments and agencies.

Outcome 3: Over 50,000 ha of land across the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin rehabilitated through operationalization of the climate-smart Land Rehabilitation Programme.

Indicators:

- The number of ha of land successfully protected, better managed and rehabilitated under the climate-smart Land Rehabilitation Programme. .
- Number of villages and households therein adopting climate-smart livelihood strategies
- Appropriate climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions identified, including *inter alia*: conservation, agro-forestry and water harvesting for the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba Mokhele Community Councils.
- Number of functioning long-term monitoring field sites established at intervention sites for measuring the effects of climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions on relevant ecosystem services.

Outcome 4: National strategies for rangelands and wetlands management strengthened by the integration of climate change/variability and ecosystems management.

Indicators:

- Number of briefs on suggested policy revisions to the rangeland and wetland management strategies developed by the LDCF-financed project to address climate change and ecosystem management.

Outcome 5: NSPD mainstreamed into regional development strategies to support the constituency-wide adoption of the climate-smart Land Rehabilitation Programme.

Indicators:

- Climate change adaptation (as provided for in the NSDP) integrated into local development strategies.
- Appropriate coordination strategy – tailored for inter- ministerial and departmental coordination at all levels – is clearly defined.
- Local policies across productive sectors – agriculture, infrastructure and rural development – revised to include best practices and budgets for climate-smart interventions. (AMAT 1.1.1.2)
- Number of policy briefs for design, appraisal and approval processes for council, district and communal development plans for Mphahle's Hoek District and in each of the Community Councils.
- Number of people trained by the LDCF-financed project on climate-resilient construction; land use and water resources planning; climate risk problems; and risk reduction and management measures.
- Best practices identified and guidelines developed for climate-smart land management in the Khotelenya, Lithipeng and Thaba Mokhele Community Councils.

2.6. Cost-effectiveness

173. The activities of the LDCF-financed project have been designed to be cost-effective. At least 7,000 households will benefit directly from LDCF resources. These benefits will include, *inter alia* increased fodder production, increased crop yields, food security, increased household water supply and opportunities for income-generative activities (see section 2.3). The total land-area directly benefitting from the implementation of climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management practices that increase protection against the effects of climate change will be at least 50,000 ha.

174. In order to reduce costs and to avoid duplication, the LDCF-financed project will pursue an active partnership strategy with other ongoing initiatives, including projects such as the GEF SGP and collaborative synergy with NGOs on the ground. Through this collaboration, the LDCF-financed project will build on the lessons learned and best practices from past and current projects and ensure that cost-effectiveness is included as a selection criteria for identification of appropriate adaptation practices and implementation protocols.

175. Interventions under Component 1 form a package of enabling activities designed to strengthen the GoL's capacity for assessing, analysing and addressing climate change. Enhancing the GoL's capacity will support improved decision-making at the policy-level. Additionally, the project will take a comprehensive multi-sectoral approach to addressing capacity constraints in Lesotho, rather than focusing on a single sector. Furthermore, facilitation of an economy-wide approach to reducing climate vulnerability will promote more sustainable and efficient management of climate risks.

176. The LDCF-financed project will enhance and make use of existing national and sub-national structures where possible. For example, the BOS' EESU will coordinate data collection and analyses undertaken by ministerial GIS units as well as host the geo-based agro-ecological and hydrological database established under Output 1.1. The project will also utilise the MFLR's planning unit as the nucleus of the socio-economic unit. Increasing the capacity of existing agencies will reduce project costs, strengthen institutional buy-in and increase the potential for project approaches and newly capacitated staff to be integrated into departments, ministries and institutions beyond project termination. This will contribute to an enabling environment for integrating climate change adaptation into long-term planning.

177. The LDCF-financed project focuses on building adaptive capacity and the use of both hard and soft adaptation measures that are locally appropriate. The use of exclusively hard infrastructure – such as check dams, gabions and stone lines – was rejected for various reasons. Firstly, hard adaptation measures are considerably more expensive than softer measures like ecosystem management. Therefore, the exclusive implementation of hard interventions would result in fewer interventions being implemented and consequently fewer beneficiaries. Secondly, hard interventions may have unintended negative consequences such as transferring local risks up- or down-stream. Finally, hard

interventions often have a focus on preventing damage from climate change and disaster events rather than reducing the risk of these occurring. Instead, a mix of hard and soft climate-smart ecosystem-based rehabilitation and management adaptation interventions were proposed. These interventions will be thoroughly assessed and costed by the socio-economic unit established under Output 1.2. The analysis will demonstrate the cost effectiveness and likely effect of the following adaptation interventions: i) changes in land use practices; ii) reforestation of degraded lands; iii) the construction of contour stone walls, farm ponds, check dams and silt traps; iv) slope stabilisation measures; v) water-efficient irrigation practices; vi) conservation agriculture, including the planting of short-cycle, drought-tolerant crop varieties; and vii) planting of multiple-use tree species for agroforestry. The use of both hard and soft adaptation interventions, is expected to prove less costly and provide protection to more beneficiaries than the exclusive implementation of hard infrastructure.

178. Costs were determined for small-scale, on-the-ground adaptation measures identified through consultations undertaken with community members as well as other national and sub-national stakeholders. Using a community-based approach to adaptation – while ensuring that development plans are informed by science and local knowledge – empowers vulnerable communities to plan for and adapt to the impacts of climate change. Interventions proposed in the project were selected based on available knowledge of proven or promising adaptation technologies. Furthermore, project activities will be informed by the expertise of relevant GoL institutions – such as the MFLR and MAFS – to ensure their suitability to the local context. For example, the MFLR and MAFS will provide guidance on the most appropriate trees to plant in the ‘greening the village’ and ‘greening the gullies’ activities as well as supervision and skills development for management of drip irrigation sites.
179. In addition, the effectiveness of these activities in reducing vulnerability to climate change will be tested and measured – through socio-economic and cost-benefit analyses – during the course of the project. The most successful activities will be prioritised for up-scaling to neighbouring communities. Furthermore, details regarding their implementation will be widely disseminated at workshops and training events undertaken by this project.
180. The project aims to reach approximately 7,000 households. These households will directly benefit from initiatives that focus on reducing climate vulnerability through community livelihood enhancement. Crop insurance was identified as a potential solution to compensate farmers for losses incurred through climate-induced natural disasters. However, such insurance mechanisms are reliant on *inter alia*: i) comprehensive climate monitoring systems that are explicitly linked to crop yields; ii) the ability of farmers to pay insurance premiums; and iii) the willingness and ability of government to subsidise insurance premiums. The implementation of such an insurance scheme was deemed unfeasible for Lesotho for a number of reasons. Firstly, there is insufficient capacity for climate monitoring that is directly linked to crop yields to inform if/when insurance pay-outs should occur. Secondly, the majority of farmers in Lesotho practice rainfed subsistence agriculture which leads to low levels of income. As such, they would be unable to service insurance premiums and would consequently be unable to participate in insurance schemes. Finally, the GoL is not able to subsidise insurance premiums to the extent required to implement such a scheme. Based on this analysis, the LDCF-financed project will instead focus on diversifying and strengthening agricultural livelihoods to increase the income earned by subsistence farmers. The project will for example explore the possibility of value chains with low investment and high return such as fruit and honey production and processing. This will allow farmers to increase their savings and/or further invest in productive assets, thereby strengthening their capacity to recover from climate shocks.

2.7. Sustainability

181. The LDCF-financed project has been designed to support the sustainability of the project interventions beyond the implementation period. Sustainability will be supported by multiple measures, such as:
182. A consultative approach supports the sustainability of interventions beyond the duration of the project by ensuring that the long-term needs of climate-vulnerable local communities are prioritised. Local stakeholders were consulted during the PPG phase and similar consultation will be ongoing as part of

the LRP work programme. The project design team engaged with relevant national stakeholders and experts to align activities with national priorities and development goals. This will support long-term political and financial commitment of policy- and decision-makers to the project interventions. Additionally, a decentralised approach will foster and support community and household ownership of project interventions, resulting in greater buy-in by the project beneficiaries. Several project interventions – including terraces, stone walls, catchment harvesting, homestead windbreaks and inter-planted orchards – will be implemented at a community and household level. The maintenance of such interventions is relatively low cost and does not require technical skill, enabling maintenance by local communities beyond the duration of the project.

183. To support the mainstreaming of climate change into planning and policies across multiple sectors, the project will strengthen the capacity of relevant government stakeholders and departments to plan and implement climate-smart land use. This capacity building will be complemented by a strategy for maintaining technical capacity in the MFLR and relevant departments. These interventions will strengthen the institutional environment for adaptation planning both during and after the project period. In addition, the project will propose revision of policies to better integrate climate change adaptation by initiating the policy revision process. Close involvement of numerous GoL institutions and departments in the project's development and implementation promises potential for future incorporation of the project's approaches into on-going planning and strategies.
184. Improved generation and collation of information on climate-smart land use planning will support technical staff within MFLR to apply the project approach on an ongoing basis. Specifically, the project will establish a socio-economic unit in the MFLR (Output 1.2), which will conduct socio-economic analyses of livelihoods and will also develop the evidence base for integrating climate risk into sector policies. Once the LDCF-financed project is complete, this unit will be integrated into MFLR planning unit, helping to build long term awareness of climate change impacts and effective adaptation. Additionally, the LDCF-financed project will implement a long-term strategy for monitoring and evaluating climate-smart ecosystem restoration and management interventions for the MFLR and relevant departments (Output 3.2). Lessons learned and best practices from the project regarding environmental sustainability and climate resilience will be shared and up-scaled across the country to increase the project's impact.

2.8. Replicability

185. The interventions implemented by the project are designed as pilot demonstration measures that can be replicated in other councils and districts in Lesotho. The design of the project's activities include several measures that will support replicability of successful activities beyond the project implementation period. For example:
186. Pilot projects will inform future related initiatives. The benefits of the interventions piloted in the Mphahle's Hoek district will be assessed through experimental design and impact evaluations (Outcome 3) to determine which are most successful and context-appropriate. Lessons learned from this process will be collated and disseminated to support replication of climate-smart land use planning and management in other LRP sites around Lesotho. In particular, pilot projects will generate evidence on the cost-effectiveness of climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation interventions. Best practices and lessons from the project will be disseminated nationally via the Lesotho Sustainable Land use Management Platform.
187. The project's interventions will increase the availability of information and planning tools to support future climate change adaptation initiatives in Lesotho. For example, the geo-based climatic, agro-ecological and hydrological information system developed under Output 1.1 will generate climate change data that is housed in the BOS. This system will generate climate change data not only for pilot sites, but at a national scale. Additionally, methodologies, results and lessons learned will be compiled and disseminated to other Community Councils and districts through: i) a range of communication media; ii) exchange visits; and iii) adopting a "learning-by-doing" approach via the Farmers Field School concept, which has been adapted to Lesotho's extension systems. Up-to-date

information tailored to the local context will support the GoL to create similar climate-smart rehabilitation projects elsewhere in Lesotho.

188. The LDCF-financed project will adopt a “learning by doing” approach to build technical capacity for climate change adaptation. This will address ecosystem priorities at the sub-national and local level while also informing national development plans and policies. Generating evidence on the cost-effectiveness of climate change adaptation interventions will facilitate policy and budgetary adjustments. The direct involvement of government institutions will demonstrate the potential for integration of approaches and strategies proposed under this project into on-going planning processes. Furthermore, the project will initiate formulation and review of policy and legal frameworks for enhanced adaptation interventions. As a result, the capacity built and information generated by the LDCF-financed project will be sustained to provide a foundation to support ongoing and future climate change related initiatives in Lesotho.

189. The LDCF-financed project is working closely with the MFLR to incorporate climate-smart rehabilitation and management into the LRP. Consequently, there is potential for replicating these approaches into subsequent MFLR programmes and projects. Furthermore, knowledge and awareness raising activities will be undertaken at a national level to increase awareness of cost-effective adaptation interventions amongst government stakeholders.

2.9. Stakeholder involvement plan

190. Stakeholders at both national and local levels will be engaged during implementation of the LDCF-financed project. This process commenced during the PPG phase with the inception workshop (detailed in Annex 2) and continued throughout the project's design. During the validation mission, the plan for stakeholder engagement during project implementation was discussed and agreed upon during bilateral consultations, one-on-one meetings with relevant stakeholders as well as during the validation workshop (detailed in Annex 2).

Outcome	Output	Stakeholders	Key Responsibilities
Outcome 1. <i>Increased technical capacity of the MFLR and relevant departments to apply up-to-date climate science for the management of evolving risks and uncertainty linked to climate change.</i>	Output 1.1. A geo-based climatic, agro-ecological and hydrological information system to support better planning for climate change adaptation under the LRP.	MFLR GIS Unit, MAFS GIS Unit, DWA GIS Unit, BOS EESU and new project funded GIS unit at LMS.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participate in training sessions on GIS and climate change. (MFLR GIS Unit, MAFS GIS Unit, DWA GIS Unit, LMS GIS Unit). Collect and analyse data. (MFLR GIS Unit, MAFS GIS Unit, DWA GIS Unit, LMS GIS Unit). Host and coordinate national geo-based climatic, agro-ecological and hydrological database (BOS EESU).
	Output 1.2. A socio-economics unit in the MFLR.	MFLR Planning Unit.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Host socio-economic unit. Participate in training sessions on social capital and livelihoods. Undertake cost-benefit analysis of climate change adaptation and mitigation interventions.
	Output 1.3. Assessments of climate-driven vulnerabilities in the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils and cost-benefit analysis of	MFLR, MAFS GIS Unit, DWA GIS Unit, LMS GIS unit, BOS EESU, Community Councils.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undertake strategic environmental assessments – using GIS data generated in Output 1.1 and socio-economic data collected in Output 1.2.

	specific adaptation interventions.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undertake integrated map-based assessments of climate-related hazards, vulnerabilities and climate sensitive natural resources. • Propose context-appropriate ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions.
	Output 1.4. Technical guidelines for climate change adaptation interventions identified in Output 1.3.	MFLR.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement technical guidelines for climate change adaptation interventions. • Disseminate technical guidelines to relevant stakeholders.
Outcome 2. Communities empowered with skills, knowledge, partnerships and institutions for managing natural resources to reduce vulnerability to climate change and increase resilience of natural and social capital (over 7,000 households with potential for upscaling to cover over 20,000).	Output 2.1. Training of technical staff of the District Technical Teams, Community Council staff and land managers on restoring and managing ecosystems and agro-ecological landscapes using a climate-smart approach.	MFLR, Mohale's Hoek District Council, Community Councils, Chiefs, local land managers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct a comprehensive needs assessment for climate change adaptation training (MFLR). • Update and extend portfolio of training modules based on needs assessment (MFLR). • Develop and disseminate user-friendly training material on climate change adaptation and monitoring to relevant stakeholders (MFLR). • Participate in training sessions on climate change adaptation, including restoring and managing ecosystems and agro-ecological landscapes.
	Output 2.2. Training of engineering, planning and monitoring sections of the MFLR on climate science.	MFLR Engineering Unit, MFLR Planning Unit, MFLR Monitoring Unit.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess current awareness on climate science in MFLR and update training material accordingly. • Participate in training sessions on integrating climate science into their activities.
	Output 2.3. Local community members farmers, pastoralists and rural households) from Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils trained in construction and maintenance of climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions.	MFLR, NGOs (e.g. CARE, World Vision, Rural Self-Help Development Association RSDA), CBOs, Community Councils, local communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and implement training for local communities on climate change adaptation as well as ecosystem rehabilitation and management (MFLR, NGOs). • Participate in training sessions on climate change adaptation as well as ecosystem rehabilitation and management (local communities). • Develop and participate in training NGOs and/or CBOs on appropriate climate change adaptation interventions as well as monitoring and evaluation (MFLR, NGOs). • Host local community discussion forums to share

			lessons learned on climate change adaptation experiences (Community Councils, local communities).
	Output 2.4. Inter-council land rehabilitation committees operational in Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils.	MoLGCA, Mohale's Hoek District Council, inter-council land rehabilitation committees, Community Councils.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish inter-council land rehabilitation committees. • Support operation of inter-council land rehabilitation committees. • Propose recommendations for Community bylaws for the management of natural resources (inter-council land rehabilitation committees). • Approve and implement bylaws proposed by inter-council land rehabilitation committees (MoLGCA and MFLR).
	Output 2.5. A strategy for maintaining technical capacity in the MFLR and relevant departments.	MFLR.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and implement a strategy for maintaining the technical capacity of relevant MFLR departments. • Develop and disseminate user-friendly literature on climate change adaptation and monitoring to relevant stakeholders.
Outcome 3. <i>Over 50,000 ha of land across the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin rehabilitated through operationalization of the climate-smart Land Rehabilitation Programme.</i>	Output 3.1. Climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions in Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils, including: i) protection of critical fens and bogs; ii) adoption of conservation agriculture and agro-forestry practices; and iii) strategic interventions in sensitive areas, including construction of check dams and rehabilitation of old gulleys and rills.	MFLR, Community Councils, NGOs (e.g. CARE, World Vision, RSDA), local communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement interventions – developed under Output 1.4 – in sites selected under Outputs 1.1 and 1.3. • Develop and disseminate information on climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management approaches (MFLR). • Develop and implement strategies for community ownership of interventions beyond project termination to relevant stakeholders.
	Output 3.2. A long-term strategy for monitoring and evaluating climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions for the MFLR and relevant departments, including an experimental design to evaluate the impact of interventions using grass cover as a proxy for rangeland productivity.	MFLR, Community Councils, local communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undertake baseline assessments of soil erosion, grass cover and existing interventions to control soil erosion. • Identify treatment and control sites, and implement experimental design treatments. • Establish monitoring points at intervention and control sites as well as establish systems to collect data on the long-term impacts of climate-smart

			<p>ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collect long-term data on the impacts of climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions. • Analyse data from pilot interventions and experimental design; collate the results; and disseminate to schools, media, public institutions and relevant stakeholders (MFLR).
<p>Outcome 4. <i>National strategies for rangelands and wetlands management strengthened by the integration of climate change/variability and ecosystem management.</i></p>	<p>Output 4.1. Policy guidelines for incorporating climate science in the review/formulation processes of national sectoral strategies by the Departments of Rangelands Management and Water Affairs.</p>	<p>MFLR (DRM), MEMWA (DWA).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review existing rangeland and wetland management strategies and identify opportunities for strengthening policy support for climate change adaptation. • Integrate climate change adaptation into the ongoing revision of the national wetland and rangeland management strategies. • Conduct capacity assessments of DRM and DWA as well as other relevant stakeholders to identify capacity gaps for the implementation of policies. • Develop and disseminate policy briefs and recommendations for integrating climate change adaptation into relevant sector policies, plans and strategies.
<p>Outcome 5. <i>NSDP mainstreamed into local development strategies to support the constituency-wide adoption of the climate-smart Land Rehabilitation Programme.</i></p>	<p>Output 5.1. Strategy for improved coordination between regional and district development teams to reduce vulnerability to extreme climatic events in the Foothills, Lowlands and Lower Senqu River Basin.</p>	<p>MFLR, MAFS, MoLGCA, Ministry of Public Works and Transport (MoPWT), MoDP, MoEMWA, Ministry of Social Development (MoSD), MTEC.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review management arrangements and recommendations to improve coordination of decision-making and project management • Expand MFLR and MAFS inter-disciplinary teams to include specialists from other relevant departments (MFLR, MAFS, MoPWT, MoDP, MoEMWA, MoSD, MTEC).
	<p>Output 5.2. Revised local policies across productive sectors – particularly agriculture, infrastructure development, and rural development – include identified best practices for climate-smart interventions.</p>	<p>MFLR, MAFS, MoLGCA, MoPWT, MoEMWA, MTEC.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review local policies for productive sectors. • Develop guidelines to support the integration of climate-risk analysis and ecosystem management into the design and approval process of local development programmes, plans and activities. • Prepare recommendations for the integration of climate-

			smart interventions into local policies.
	Output 5.3. Policy recommendations for the integration of climate risk considerations into the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils' development plans, as well as the Mohale's Hoek District development plan.	MFLR, MAFS, MoLGCA, Mohale's Hoek District Council, Community Councils, NGOs (e.g. CARE, World Vision, RSDA).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish a discussion forum to facilitate dialogue on climate change adaptation between district and community council stakeholders (MFLR, MAFS, Mohale's Hoek District Council, Community Councils, NGOs). Review District and Community Council development plans (MoLGCA, Mohale's Hoek District Council, Community Councils). Prepare recommendations to include climate risk considerations into District and Community Council development plans (MFLR, MoLGCA, Mohale's Hoek District Council, Community Councils).
	Output 5.4. Training on climate-resilient construction, climate-smart land use and water resource planning, and climate risk management for the relevant officials. Trained staff will include: structural engineers; urban and rural infrastructure planners; local authorities; district planning units; officers of the Ministry of Development Planning (MoDP); and teaching staff from technical colleges and vocational training institutes.	MFLR, MAFS, MoPWT, MoDP, Ministry of Education and Training (MoET), MoTICM, technical colleges and vocational training institutes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop and implement training programmes for staff from a wide range of stakeholders. Integrate the abovementioned training into regular technical and vocational college curricula (MoET, technical colleges and vocational training institutes).
	Output 5.5. Best practices and documentation on climate-smart land management in the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils disseminated through existing national and international platforms.	MFLR, MAFS, local communities, NGOs (e.g. CARE, World Vision, RSDA), SLM, UNDP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish farmers Field Schools (MAFS, MFLR, NGOs, local communities). Coordinate exchange visits to project sites. (MFLR, MAFS, NGOs, local communities). Best practices and project documents disseminated nationally through the Lesotho Sustainable Land Management platform (SLM). Best practices and project documents disseminated globally through Adaptation Learning Mechanism (ALM), wikiADAPT, Global

			Adaptation Network (GAN) and African Adaptation Knowledge Network (AAKN) (UNDP).
--	--	--	--

Matrix of stakeholder participation

Stakeholder	Capabilities/current role for promoting climate change adaptation	Role in project
Natural resource users e.g. youth groups and farmers, particularly women and the elderly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive indigenous technical knowledge. • Familiarity with concepts of group action and committee operations. • Commitment to climate change adaptation because of livelihood interests in a sustainable environment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leading agents of LRP through user groups or associations. • Primary beneficiaries of “cash for work” programme and implementers of the climate-smart initiatives.
District Councils	Coordinate the functions and activities of Community Councils	Local level governance. Coordination of technical teams.
Community Councils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal authority for natural resources management. • Little capacity to exert this authority at field level. • Committed to fulfilling their natural resource management responsibilities, but currently uncertain how to go about this. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locus of legal authority for LRP. • Supervise government field staff – who are administratively answerable to the Community Councils. • Supervise and guide resource user groups acting on their behalf. • Provide modest levels of resourcing to these groups for their daily operations. • Key participants in coordinated management to ensure rehabilitation measures are implemented and impacts are monitored.
Chiefs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traditional natural resource management authorities. • Some have extensive technical knowledge. • Two chiefs are elected by their peers as members of each Community Council and can play a formal role in Council’s natural resource management decision making. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some chiefs can contribute as Community Council members. • All chiefs can contribute as leading and knowledgeable members of their communities.
MFLR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through its Forestry, Soil and Water Conservation, and Range Management Divisions, the MFLR can provide technical knowledge and practical/programmatic experience. • Domestic budget will be used for co-financing with GEF contribution. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leading technical agency. • Chair of Steering Committee. • Source of co-finance. • Provide guidance and technical support to communities and stakeholders. • Should actively participate in knowledge management and networking activities.
MAFS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasingly active in promoting on-farm soil and water conservation through soil fertility and soil structure management and conservation agriculture techniques. • Responsible for agricultural extension services for both croplands and livestock services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be an active member of project Steering Committee. • Provide guidance and technical support to communities and stakeholders. • Should actively participate in knowledge management and networking activities.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responsible for promotion and advocacy of irrigation systems 	
MoLGCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responsible for guiding the decentralisation process and the establishment of the new local government system in Lesotho. Consequently, responsible for assisting Community Councils' with their natural resource management role. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should be an active member of project Steering Committee. Should actively participate in knowledge management and networking activities. Should advise and facilitate Community Council's development of natural resource management bylaws, which must be approved by the Minister of Local Government. Provide guidance and technical support to Community Councils.
Department of Environment nee National Environment Secretariat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy coordination role, with particular reference to Lesotho's global obligations and commitments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GEF Focal Point: key liaison role. Member of Project Steering Committee.
UNDP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extensive experience of sustainable rural development strategies and challenges in Lesotho. Experience of GEF project delivery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key agency for channelling and supervision of GEF resources and providing advice on GEF procedures. Key member of project Steering Committee.
Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technical expertise in agriculture and natural resources including vast technical and sociological experience conservation agriculture and other climate change adaptation initiatives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordinator of conservation agriculture network. Potential collaborator in networking and knowledge management, with particular reference to on-farm conservation agriculture.
NGOs and CSOs e.g. CARE; World Vision; RSDA; Serumula Development Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong technical and institutional expertise in LRP and related fields. Detailed understanding of local development needs, opportunities and constraints. Currently engaged in various natural resource management related activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members of Project Steering Committee. Potential collaborators in LRP model development, training and knowledge management/ networking activities. Should actively participate in policy reviews.

2.10 Compliance with UNDP safeguards

191. The UNDP environmental and social safeguard requirements have been followed in the development of this LDCF-financed project. As outlined below, the project is not expected to have any negative environmental or social impacts.

192. The LDCF-financed project does include activities that support upstream planning processes. However, the envisaged revisions that will be proposed to national policies and strategies are not likely to have any negative environmental or social impacts. To the contrary, the project will have positive environmental and social impacts through influencing policies and strategies for climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures.

193. The implementation of community and landscape-based approaches to climate change adaptation – proposed under Outcome 3 – will protect ecosystems, assets and livelihoods from the effects of climate-induced disasters. These proposed interventions will not affect natural resources negatively. For example, landscape-based approaches will stabilise soil, improve water infiltration, increase the diversity of crops and restore natural vegetation. In addition, the increase in biomass as the result of

revegetation of slopes and improved agricultural and land use practices will increase carbon sequestration.

194. Although the project will benefit local communities, it is not expected that this will lead to localised population increases. Rather, it is expected that the approaches used will be spread to surrounding communities. The use of a community and household approach that is cost effective and does not require advanced infrastructure makes it easily replicable. It is therefore possible for the benefits in the project sites to be realised in adjacent Community Councils. The benefits of the project interventions will also reduce the vulnerability of communities to natural disasters. Communities will have a greater access to natural resources. Communities are also expected to have improved income through improved livelihoods. Consequently, the project is expected to have positive socio-economic effects.
195. Gender equality, youth empowerment and the use of a community and household- based approach are focus areas of the LDCF-financed project. Consequently, project interventions will promote social equity and equality. All social consequences of the project are expected to be positive. In addition, the farming approaches that will be introduced are not expected to negatively affect local traditions. Approval of the local community on the interventions will first be sought – prior to implementation. As the LDCF-financed project is expected to have either no effects or positive effects on the environment and community, it is not necessary for a full environmental and social review.

3. Project Results Framework

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD: <i>Outcome 2: By 2017 Lesotho adopts environmental management practices that promote a low-carbon, climate-resilient economy and society, sustainably manages natural resources and reduces vulnerability to disasters.</i>					
Country Programme Outcome indicators: Number of national/sectoral policies and strategies that promote low-carbon, climate resilient economy and society; number of national/sectoral policies that promote conservation of natural resources; and number of local communities that implement disaster risk reduction measures.					
Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one): Promote climate change adaptation					
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Programme: <i>CCA-1: Reducing Vulnerability:</i> Reduce vulnerability to the adverse impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level. <i>CCA-2: Increasing Adaptive Capacity:</i> Increase adaptive capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level.					
Applicable LDCF Expected Outcomes: <i>Outcome 1.1:</i> Mainstreamed adaptation in broader development frameworks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas. <i>Outcome 1.2:</i> Reduced vulnerability in development sectors. <i>Outcome 2.1:</i> Increased knowledge and understanding of climate variability and change-induced risks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas. <i>Outcome 2.3:</i> Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes at local level.					
Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: <i>Indicator 1.1.1:</i> Adaptation actions implemented in national/sub-regional development frameworks. <i>Indicator 1.2.15:</i> Number of people benefitting from climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management practices through implementation of hard and soft measures to reduce vulnerability. <i>Indicator 2.1.1:</i> Relevant risk information disseminated to stakeholders. <i>Indicator 2.3.1:</i> % of targeted population awareness of predicted adverse impacts of climate change and appropriate responses.					
Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Source of verification	Risks and assumptions
Project Objective: To mainstream climate risk considerations in the Land Rehabilitation Programme of Lesotho for improved ecosystem resilience and reduced vulnerability of livelihoods to climate shocks.	The use of climate-driven vulnerabilities and cost-effective planning to inform the implementation of the Land Rehabilitation Programme.	Climate change risks are not integrated into the Land Rehabilitation Programme. Target sites are chosen on an <i>ad hoc</i> basis. Rehabilitation and management measures are not tailored to specific ecosystems.	Climate-driven vulnerabilities and cost-effective planning are used to inform site prioritisation of target sites and the implementation of appropriate climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures.	Climate driven vulnerability assessments and cost-benefit analysis Project implementation report Review of Land Rehabilitation Programme practices	
Outcome 1: Increased technical capacity of the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation and relevant departments to identify, prioritise, implement, monitor and evaluate adaptation measures.	Capacities of the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation and relevant departments to identify, prioritise, implement, monitor and evaluate adaptation measures.	Baseline estimated at a score of 3. Baseline to be verified during year 1 of project implementation.	Capacity increased to a score of 7. Target to be verified during year 1 of project implementation.	To capture evidence of the capacity of institutions to identify, prioritise, implement, monitor and evaluate adaptation measures, a scoring methodology that considers the following five criteria, expressed as questions: (a) Does the institution have access to and does it make	Assumptions The geo-based, climatic, agro-ecological and hydrological information system established during the project will support climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures.

uncertainty linked to climate change.				<p>use of climate information in decision- making?</p> <p>(b) Are climate change risks as well as appropriate adaptation strategies and measures integrated into relevant institutional policies, processes and procedures?</p> <p>(c) Does the institution have adequate resources to implement such policies, processes and procedures?</p> <p>(d) Are there clear roles and responsibilities within the institution, and effective partnerships outside the institution to address adaptation?</p> <p>(e) Is the institution equipped to monitor, evaluate and learn from its adaptation actions?</p> <p>Each question is answered with an assessment and score for the extent to which the associated criterion has not been met: not at all (=0), partially (=1) or to a large extent/completely (=2). An overall score is calculated, with a maximum score of 10 given five criteria.</p>	<p>Trainees leave training with improved capacity.</p> <p>Risks</p> <p>The geo-based agro-ecological, climatic and hydrological information system is not sustained beyond the lifetime of the project.</p> <p>Poor uptake of training on climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures</p>
Output 1.1	A geo-based climatic, agro-ecological and hydrological information system formulated, tested in pilot area and ready for upscaling to the rest of the districts in Lesotho.	Lack of a coordinated information system that compiles GIS information on climatic, agro-ecological and hydrological variables.	By the end of the first year, a geo-based climatic, agro-ecological and hydrological information system developed.	Maps and vulnerability assessments generated utilising the geo-based climatic, agro-ecological and hydrological information system.	
Output 1.2	A socio-economics unit is established within the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation.	No dedicated unit considering social capital issues in the selection of intervention methods.	By the end of the first year, a socio-economics unit is established.	Socio-economics unit Project implementation report Assessments Cost benefit-analysis	
Output 1.3	Number of climate-driven vulnerability assessments and cost-benefit analyses of specific adaptation	No rigorous assessments of climate-driven vulnerability or cost benefit analyses of climate change adaptation	By the end of the first year, at least 1 climate-driven vulnerability assessment and 1 cost-benefit analysis	Project implementation report	

	interventions undertaken for each of the selected Community Councils. (Adapted from AMAT 2.1.1.2)	interventions undertaken at the level of Community Councils.	of specific adaptation interventions undertaken for each of the Community Councils identified.		
Output 1.4	Number of technical guidelines on climate change adaptation interventions identified for the selected Community Councils.	No guidelines on climate change adaptation interventions have been developed for the selected Community Councils.	By the end of the first year, at least 1 technical guideline on climate change adaptation interventions produced for the selected Community Councils.	Technical guidelines Project implementation report	
Outcome 2: Communities empowered with skills, knowledge, partnerships and institutions for managing natural resources to reduce vulnerability to climate change and increase resilience of natural and social capital (over 7,000 households with potential for upscaling to cover over 20,000).	% of targeted population awareness of predicted adverse impacts of climate change and appropriate responses (score) – disaggregated by gender. 1= No awareness level (<50% correct) 2= Moderate awareness level (50-75% correct) 3= High awareness level (>75% correct)	Baseline level of awareness in target population to be verified during year one of project implementation.	Increase level of awareness in target population from 1 (No awareness level) to 2 (Moderate awareness level)	Methodologies for both climate change awareness and vulnerability indices will be developed during year one of project implementation.	Assumptions Communities see climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures as desirable given development imperatives as well as lifestyle preferences, and support project interventions. Chiefs support project interventions and facilitate roll out within their constituencies. Risks Communities are unwilling to adopt new climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures. Chiefs in target areas unwilling to support project interventions. High staff turnover and poor institutional memory result in disruptions or delays in project implementation and coordination.
Output 2.1	Number of technical staff trained in climate change adaptation, including restoring and managing ecosystems and agro-ecological landscapes (disaggregated by gender).	Technical staff of the District Technical Teams, Regional Council staff and land managers have received limited training on climate change adaptation.	Within the first year of the project, at least 50 technical staff of the District Technical Teams, District and Community Council staff and land managers trained in climate change adaptation, including restoring and managing ecosystems and agro-ecological landscapes. Trainees must include representatives from the Mohale's Hoek District and the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils.	Field visits Surveys Project implementation report	
Output 2.2	Number of training sessions conducted and participants within the engineering, planning and	Engineering, planning and monitoring sections of the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation have	By project end-point 10 staff (50% men and 50% women) within the engineering, planning and	Training course reports, attendance lists and completed evaluation forms Project implementation reports	

	monitoring sections of the MFLR trained in climate science (disaggregated by gender).	received limited training on climate science.	monitoring sections of the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation have attended workshops on climate science.		
Output 2.3	Number of households participating in training programmes on implementation of climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures (disaggregated by gender).	Local communities and households have limited capacity to plan, implement and maintain climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures.	By project end-point at least 7,000 households trained in the implementation and maintenance of climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures.	Training course reports, attendance lists and completed evaluation forms	
Output 2.4	An inter-council land rehabilitation committee established and operational.	No inter-council land rehabilitation committees are in operation.	By project mid-point at least 1 inter-council land rehabilitation committees established. By project end-point, a minimum of 8 inter-council land rehabilitation committee meetings held.	Council records Project implementation report	
Output 2.5	Finalised strategy for maintaining technical capacity of relevant departments and agencies.	There is no strategy for maintaining the technical capacity of relevant departments and agencies.	By project mid-point, a strategy for maintaining technical capacity is developed. By project end-point, the strategy for maintaining technical capacity is implemented.	Finalised Strategy	
Outcome 3: Over 50,000 ha of land across the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin rehabilitated through operationalization of the climate-smart Land Rehabilitation Programme.	1. The number of ha of land successfully protected, better managed and rehabilitated under the climate-smart Land Rehabilitation Programme.	Baseline and target to be established during implementation.	By project end-point, at least 50,000 ha of land in the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin under climate-smart LRP.	Field visits and physical assessments Data collection at project sites Project implementation reports	Assumptions Cost-effective climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures will be identified. Risks Climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures are not cost-effective.
Output 3.1	Number of households across three Community Councils adopting climate-smart livelihood strategies (disaggregated by gender). (Adapted from AMAT 2.3.1.2)	The number of households adopting climate-smart livelihood strategies will be determined during implementation.	At least 7,000 households engaging in climate change adaptation activities, including climate-smart farming or agro-forestry practices.	M&E Strategy Field visits and physical assessments Data collection at project sites Project implementation report	

	Appropriate climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions identified, including inter alia conservation, agro-forestry and water harvesting for the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils.	Climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions are not currently implemented in the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils.	By project end-point at least 50% of conventional management systems are replaced by climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions implemented in the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils.	Field visits and physical assessments Data collection at project sites	
Output 3.2	Number of functioning long-term monitoring field sites established at intervention sites for measuring the effects of climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions on relevant ecosystem services.	Monitoring is limited to recording of outputs from quarterly and annual reports – because the LRP has no Monitoring and Evaluation Unit.	By project end-point, at least 3 long-term monitoring sites – including a control, experiment and benchmark – established within each of the agro-ecological zones – the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin.	M&E Strategy Field visits and physical assessments Data collection at project sites Project implementation report	
Outcome 4: National strategies for rangelands and wetlands management strengthened by the integration of climate change/variability and ecosystems management.	Number of briefs on suggested policy revisions to the rangeland and wetland management strategies developed by the LDCF-financed project to address climate change and ecosystem management.	National strategies do not adequately include climate risk considerations.	By project end-point, at least two policy briefs developed that include recommendations for the incorporation of climate risk considerations into each of the national rangeland and wetland management strategies.	Review of recommendations for national strategies Revised/updated national strategies with specific sections on climate change adaptation policy Project implementation report	Assumptions Recommendations for policies, strategies and plans will be accepted and mainstreamed. Risks Policies, strategies and plans are not accepted by decision-makers or local communities and cannot be enforced
Outcome 5: NSDP mainstreamed into local development strategies to support the constituency-wide adoption of the climate-smart Land Rehabilitation Programme	Climate change adaptation (as provided for in the NSDP) integrated into local development strategies. (adapted from AMAT 1.1.1)	Development strategies do not adequately include climate change (as provided for in the NSDP).	By project end-point, climate change adaptation is integrated into local policy processes and development strategies. (A score of 2= integrated to a large extent/completely)	The extent to which climate change adaptation (as provided for in the NSDP) is integrated into local development strategies will be scored as follows: not at all (=0), partially (=1) or to a large extent/completely (=2).	Assumptions Recommendations for sectoral policies, strategies and plans will be accepted and mainstreamed. Risks Sectoral ministries are unwilling to adopt recommendations on policies.
Output 5.1	Appropriate coordination strategy – tailored for inter-ministerial and departmental coordination at all levels – is clearly defined.	No strategy in place to ensure coordination between national and district development teams	By project mid-point, a coordination strategy is clearly defined. By project end-point, the coordination strategy is implemented.	Coordination strategy Project implementation report	
Output 5.2	Local policies across productive sectors – agriculture, infrastructure and rural development –	Policies do not adequately refer to climate risk considerations.	By project end-point, at least one policy brief developed for each productive sector –	Policy briefs Budgets Project implementation report	

	revised to include best practices and budgets for climate-smart interventions. (adapted from AMAT 1.1.1.2)		agriculture, infrastructure and rural development – to include identified best practices and budgets for climate-smart interventions		
Output 5.3	Number of policy briefs for design, appraisal and approval processes for council, district and communal development plans for Mohale's Hoek District and in each of the Community Councils.	There is no programmatic approach to mainstreaming climate risk considerations into development plans.	By project mid-point, at least one policy brief to be developed for the integration of climate risk considerations into the Mohale's Hoek District Plan. By project end-point, at least one policy brief developed for each productive sector – agriculture, infrastructure and rural development – to include identified best practices and budgets for climate-smart interventions. By project mid-point, at least one policy brief to be developed for the integration of climate risk considerations into the Mohale's Hoek District Plan.	Policy briefs Project implementation report	
Output 5.4	Number of people trained by the LDCF-financed project on climate-resilient construction; land use and water resources planning; climate risk problems; and risk reduction and management measures (disaggregated by gender).	Limited training has been conducted on climate-resilient construction; land use and water resources planning; climate risk problems; and risk reduction and management measures.	By project end-point, at least 1000 people (50% women and 50% men) trained. Trainees must include representatives from local authorities; district planning units; structural engineers; urban and rural infrastructure planners; officers of the Ministry of Development Planning, Ministry of Finance; and teaching staff from technical colleges and vocational training institutes.	Climate change adaptation modules for training courses	
Output 5.5	Best practices identified and guidelines developed for climate-smart land	No guidelines for best practices and climate-smart land management.	By project end-point, guidelines developed for best practices and climate-	Developed guidelines	

	management in the Khoelenya, Lithipeng and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils.		smart land management in the Khoelenya, Lithipeng and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils.		
--	--	--	---	--	--

4. Total Budget and Workplan

Award ID:	00084520	Project ID(s):	00092485
Award Title:	Reducing vulnerability from climate change in the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin		
Business Unit:	LSO01		
Project Title:	Reducing vulnerability from climate change in the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin		
PIMS no	4630		
Implementing Partner (Executing Agency)	MFLR (002932)		

LDCF Outcome/ Atlas Activity	Implementing Agent	Fund ID	Donor Name	Atlas Budgetary Account Code	ATLAS Budget Description	Amount Year 1 (USD)	Amount Year 2 (USD)	Amount Year 3 (USD)	Amount Year 4 (USD)	Amount Year 5 (USD)	Amount Year 6 (USD)	Total (USD)	Budget Note
OUTCOME 1: Increased technical capacity of the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation and relevant departments to apply up to date climate science for the management of evolving risks and uncertainty linked to climate change	MoFLR	62160	LDCF	71200	International Consultants	39,000	30,000	-	-	-	15,000	84,000	1a
				71300	Local Consultants	42,000	42,000	-	-	-	14,000	98,000	1b
				71400	Contractual services - Individuals	15,045	15,045	15,045	15,044	15,045	15,044	90,268	1c
				72100	Contractual services - Companies	22,250	50,250	15,250	15,250	15,250	79,000	197,250	1d
				71600	Travel	36,000	39,000	-	-	-	6,000	81,000	1e
				72500	Supplies	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	12,000	1f
				73100	Rental & Maintenance Premises	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	60,000	1g
				72200	Equipment and furniture	30,000	35,000	23,000	23,000	23,000	23,000	157,000	1h
				74200	AV & Print Production	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	18,000	1i
				75700	Training Workshop & Conference	120,000	46,986	-	-	-	-	166,986	1j
				74500	Miscellaneous	5,916	5,916	5,916	5,916	5,916	5,916	35,496	1k
				Total Outcome 1		325,211	279,197	74,211	74,210	74,211	172,960	1,000,000	
OUTCOME 2: Communities empowered with skills, knowledge, partnerships and institutions for managing natural	MoFLR	62160	LDCF	71200	International Consultants	12,000	-	12,000	-	12,000	-	36,000	2a
				71300	Local Consultants	21,000	7,000	21,000	7,000	21,000	7,000	84,000	2b
				72100	Contractual services - Companies	52,000	45,000	57,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	184,000	2c
				71600	Travel	18,000	14,000	18,000	14,000	18,000	14,000	96,000	2d

resources to reduce vulnerability and increase resilience of natural and social capital				73400	Rental & Maintenance of Equipment	6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500	39,000	2e
				74200	AV & Print production	10,500	10,500	10,500	10,500	10,500	10,500	63,000	2f
				75700	Training Workshop & Conference	70,000	-	70,000	-	-	-	140,000	2g
				Total Outcome 2		190,000	83,000	195,000	48,000	78,000	48,000	642,000	
OUTCOME 3: A climate-smart Land Rehabilitation Programme operationalised across 50,000 ha of the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin.	MoFLR	62160	LDCF	71200	International Consultants	36,000	38,000	16,000	5,000	5,000	17,000	117,000	3a
				71300	Local Consultants	29,000	21,000	21,000	15,358	22,000	14,000	122,358	3b
				72100	Contractual services Companies	301,000	270,000	270,000	270,000	270,000	270,000	1,651,000	3c
				71600	Travel	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	210,000	3d
				72600	Grants	237,000	237,000	237,000	237,000	237,000	237,000	1,422,000	3e
				72300	Materials & goods	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	1,800,000	3f
				72200	Equipment & furniture	40,000	-	-	-	-	-	40,000	3g
				73400	Rental & Maintenance of other equipment	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	54,000	3h
				74200	AV & Print Production Costs	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	300,000	3i
				Total Outcome 3		1,037,000	960,000	938,000	921,358	928,000	932,000	5,716,358	
OUTCOME 4: National Strategies for rangelands and wetlands management strengthened by the integration of climate change/variability and ecosystems management	MoFLR	62160	LDCF	71200	International Consultants	18,000	-	18,000	-	-	18,000	54,000	4a
				71300	Local Consultants	25,000	25,000	25,000	20,000	25,000	25,590	145,590	4b
				75700	Training workshop & conference	6,772	-	6,773	-	6,773	-	20,318	4c
				Total Outcome 4		49,772	25,000	49,773	20,000	31,773	43,590	219,908	
OUTCOME 5: NSDP mainstreamed into local development strategies to support the constituency-wide adoption of the climate-smart Land Rehabilitation Programme	MoFLR	62160	LDCF	71200	International Consultants	12,000	-	12,000	-	-	6,000	30,000	5a
				71300	Local Consultants	28,000	28,000	28,000	28,000	28,000	28,000	168,000	5b
				72100	Contractual service Companies	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	60,000	5c
				71600	Travel	10,500	4,500	10,500	4,500	4,500	7,500	42,000	5d
				74200	AV & Print Production Costs	3,599	3,599	3,599	3,599	3,599	3,599	21,594	5e

				75700	Training Workshop & Conference	19,600	10,000	19,600	10,000	19,600	19,600	98,400	5f
				Total Outcome 5		83,699	56,099	83,699	56,099	65,699	74,699	419,994	
Project management unit	MoFLR	62160	LDCF	71400	Contractual services - individual	28,235	28,235	28,235	28,235	28,235	28,235	169,410	PM1
				71400	Contractual services - individual	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	144,000	PM2
				74100	Professional services	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	18,000	PM3
				75700	Training Workshops & Conference	12,500	-	-	10,001	-	10,001	32,502	PM4
				71200	International Consultants	12,000	-	-	12,000	-	12,000	36,000	PM5
				Total Management		79,735	55,235	55,235	77,236	55,235	77,236	399,912	
				PROJECT TOTAL (USD)		1,765,417	1,458,531	1,395,918	1,196,903	1,232,918	1,348,485	8,398,172	

Summary of Funds:

	Amount Year 1	Amount Year 2	Amount Year 3	Amount Year 4	Amount Year 5	Amount Year 6	Total
GEF	\$1,765,417	\$1,458,531	\$1,395,918	\$1,196,903	\$1,232,918	\$1,348,485	\$8,398,172
Government of Lesotho: MFLR	\$4,400,000	\$4,300,000	\$4,300,000	\$4,300,000	\$4,300,000	\$4,400,000	\$26,000,000
Government of Lesotho: MoCLGA	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$200,000	\$150,000	\$100,000	\$50,000	\$1,000,000
UNDP	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$600,000
TOTAL	\$6,515,417	\$6,108,531	\$5,995,918	\$5,746,903	\$5,782,918	\$5,848,485	\$35,998,172

Budget Note	Description of cost item
1a.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remote sensing/GIS specialist –specialist will integrate existing GIS data with remote sensing imagery to develop a geo-based climatic, agro-ecological and hydrological information system. This specialist will oversee the baseline assessments and the integrated mapping of climate-related hazards, vulnerabilities and climate-sensitive natural resources. This specialist will facilitate the needs assessment for GIS training and tailor the portfolio of training modules. This specialist will also devise a training schedule to provide appropriate trainings at different levels (e.g. national, district, sub-district and community). The specialist will also assist in designing training modules based on up-to-date scientific knowledge and best practices concerning climate change adaptation. • Institutional Capacity Development Specialists –per day. This specialist will conduct the capacity assessment of MFLR and design an organisational strategy for developing MFLR’s capacity. In addition, this specialist will conduct a gap analysis of the current knowledge management systems under the existing GIS units. The specialist will facilitate the establishment of an inter-ministerial advisory committee for the GIS unit. • Education and training expert –. This specialist will design training modules based on up-to-date scientific knowledge and best practices concerning climate change adaptation. This specialist will also provide training for the GIS units, relevant line ministries and departments as well as institutions on climate science. • Socio-economic development expert – FeThis specialist will provide advice regarding the establishment of the socio-economics unit and training of relevant personnel. This specialist will prepare technical protocols to facilitate the integration of social capital and livelihoods needs into ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions.
1b.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate change adaptation expert – Fees: 60 days @ \$350 per day. • Education and training expert – Fees: 40 days @ \$350 per day. This specialist will assist with the design of training modules based on up-to-date scientific knowledge and best practices concerning climate change adaptation. This specialist will also provide training for the GIS units, relevant line ministries and departments as well as institutions on climate science. • Capacity development expert – Fees: \$40 days @ \$350 per day. This specialist will assist in the undertaking of capacity assessment of MFLR as well as the design and implementation of an organisational strategy for developing MFLR’s capacity. In addition, this specialist will conduct a gap analysis of the current knowledge management systems under the existing GIS units and implement organisational strategies for the efficient functioning and coordination of the GIS unit. • Geospatial expert – Fees: 80 days @ \$350 per day. This specialist will assist in the development of a geo-based climatic, agro-ecological and hydrological information system. This specialist will also facilitate the undertaking of a baseline assessment and the integrated mapping of climate-related hazards, vulnerabilities and climate-sensitive natural resources. • Socio-economic development expert – Fees: 60 days @ \$350 per day.
1c.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This budget wi • It be used to contract an individual to coordinate technical input from the line the technical staff of line ministries, civil society, academic institutions and the private sector – and channel the assistance to the communities. Due to the long-term nature of the initiative, a service contract will be more appropriate than a consultant contract –6 years @ \$1,205 per month.
1d.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service provider for technical support to the GIS units at MFLR, BOS, LMS, MAFS and MEMWA. GIS consultants will be contracted on a short-term basis @ 15 days per year @ \$350 per day. Additional time is provided for in Year 1 and Year 6 during which the baseline assessments and mapping are being undertaken. • Newly capacitated GIS units with the input of international and national consultants will undertake baseline assessments and generate integrated vulnerability and hazard maps.

1e.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14 x travel cost for International Consultants @ \$3000 per mission. • Local travel to Community Councils for needs assessments, training etc. At least 10 days of site visits in Year 1 and Year 2 to each of the three pilot sites.
1f.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Office supplies including stationery, printing, publications (e.g. workshop reports) and other printed/electronic media.
1g.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rent of office space for PMU and support staff and payment of associated utilities.
1g.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Office equipment for PMU and support staff including furniture, desks, computers, printers (including Mapmaking printer), software licensing and other equipment.
1i.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Printing of training materials, knowledge/awareness products and policy briefs.
1j.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training sessions on GIS for MFLR, BOS, LMS, MAFS and MEMWA technical staff @ \$9500 per individual (14 individuals to receive training over two years). The MoLGCA subscribes to a training institution in Nairobi, Kenya. This institution give specialised courses in GIS and Remote Sensing for up to six months. • Climate change awareness training, including a national workshop for line ministries, district workshop and community council workshops including follow up training manuals.
2a.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate change adaptation training specialist – Fees: 60 days @ \$600 per day. This specialist will review the current awareness of the MFLR and tailor the training modules to the local context, particularly with regard to the youth and other socially vulnerable group. Additional time required during Year 1 to undertake capacity assessments and gap analysis. In addition, this specialist will conduct a gap analysis of the current knowledge management systems under the Ministry.
2b.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National climate change adaptation expert – Fees: 60 days @ \$350 per day. This specialist will provide input into the formulation of training programmes and training on the interventions and methods of implantation. They will be responsible for collating the lessons learned from on-the-ground interventions and providing feedback for the updating of training materials. • National education and training expert – Fees: 20 days per year @ \$350 per day. This specialist is to conduct a comprehensive needs assessment for climate change adaptation training, including two workshops. This will be initiated and coordinated by MFLR following its standard procedures. The needs assessment will include a stock-taking exercise to identify existing training materials on climate change adaptation in Lesotho as well as an assessment of the types of training require to build district and sub-district capacities. In addition, the specialist will update and extend the portfolio of training modules to include aspects that are not covered within the current portfolio. • National governance and policy expert – Fees: 40 days @ \$350 per day. This specialist is to assist with the establishment of inter-council land rehabilitation committees and the formulation and review of community council bylaws. This will include facilitating discussion forums. Discussions are to include members of Parliament who are responsible for environmental issues.
2c.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service provider for awareness raising and publicity campaign. This will include the establishment of local community discussion forums in workshops or other appropriate format. Also includes use of local media – including radio – to target specific audiences with appropriate ecosystem management information. Finally, this contract will include the creation of a discussion forum to facilitate dialogue. • Service provider to formulate and implement 3 training programmes based on identified capacity and training needs assessments. Training programmes will be tailored to identified needs of the 3 target groups, namely i) local communities; ii) technical staff and land managers; and iii) representatives of engineering, planning and monitoring sections of MFLR. It is envisaged that an appropriate NGO/CSO based in the project area will be preferred service provider. This will include developing and disseminating training materials. • Service provider - train NGOs and/or CBOs to monitor and advise farmers, pastoralists and rural households on appropriate climate change adaptation interventions.
2d.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travel for international consultants per mission at \$3000 per mission (missions to take place in Year 1, Year 3 and Year 5).


	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local travel for international consultants to Community Councils for needs assessments, training, monitoring field activities. Assume two field trips of 5 days, for at least two field staff at three sites.
2e.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintenance of project vehicles, including annual service and other associated costs.
2f.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Printing of training materials to promote climate-resilient ecosystem rehabilitation to be targeted at i) technical staff and land managers; and ii) representatives of engineering, planning and monitoring sections of MFLR. Graphic design @ \$250 and printing of 1000 copies @ \$5000 for training materials.
2g.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undertake training for various sections of the MFLR focused upon climate science and the benefits of integrating climate risk considerations into the design of hard infrastructure, land use planning and decision-making, including the socio-economic benefits thereof. This will include a national workshop for line ministries, a district workshop and 3 community council workshops, as well as follow up training and the printing of training materials.
3a.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Climate change adaptation expert – Fees: 60 days at CCAE @ \$600 per day. This specialist will oversee the design of the climate-smart LRP interventions, including conservation agriculture and agro-forestry as well as biophysical interventions. This specialist will also facilitate the identification of appropriate sites for intervention measures. This specialist will oversee the implantation of the experimental design and long-term research. Capacity development expert – Fees: 40 days @ \$600 per day. The specialist is to facilitate the development of a withdrawal strategy for participant NGOs/CBOs. Education and training expert – Fees: 20 day per year @ \$600 per day. This specialist will provides strategic advice regarding the implementation of training programmes in the community councils. This specialist will assist with updating the training programmes on an annual basis taking into account the lessons learned. Remote sensing/GIS specialist – Fees: 15 days @ 600 per day. This specialist will assist with identifying appropriate sites for intervention measures based upon the integrated maps of hazards and vulnerabilities. They will also assist with identifying the location for the experimental design plots Project M&E system design specialist – Fees: 70 days at \$600 per day. This specialist will design an M&E system for the project to monitor, evaluate and report on the success of interventions in order to guide adaptive management of project activities. They will provide advice regarding the long-term research and experimental design.
3b.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Climate change adaptation expert – Fees: 20 days per year @ \$350 per day. This specialist will facilitate the implementation of appropriate climate-smart interventions and the identification of suitable sites. Education and training expert – Fees: 20 days per year @ \$350 per day. This specialist will assist with the implementation of training programmes, particularly of the local communities. Training should be updated on an annual basis taking into account the lessons learned. Capacity development expert – Fees: 60 days @ \$350 per day. This specialist will assist in the development and implementation of strategies for the withdrawal of CBOs/NGOs and government agencies at the termination of the project. This specialist will facilitate the handing over of responsibilities to community groups and households. Geospatial expert – Fees: 40 days @ \$350 per day. This specialist will assist with identifying appropriate sites for intervention measures based upon the integrated maps of hazards and vulnerabilities. They will also assist with identifying the location for the experimental design plots.
3c.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Travels costs for International Consultants x 2 missions per year. (9 missions will take place in Year 1, Year 2, Year 3, Year 5 and Year 6). Local travel for consultants to community councils for needs assessments, training, monitoring field activities.
3d.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chief Technical Advisor – Fees: Annually renewable contract @ \$600 per day for 60 days per year Field facilitators – there will be one facilitator based in each of the Community Councils. They will assist with coordination of project activities between the national and district/sub-district levels, e.g. facilitating local travel to community councils for implementation of climate-smart LRP – oversee project implementation at project sites.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service provider to undertake baseline assessment of soil erosion, soil type, soil chemistry, as well as existing techniques to control soil erosion. • Service provider –this service provider will identify and assist in the implementation of appropriate adaptation interventions in the pilot Community Councils. This contract will preferably be awarded to a competent NGO or CSO with expertise and presence in the pilot area. • Service provider - this service provider will develop and implement an awareness-raising and publicity campaign to promote public awareness on climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation within the community councils, including information products and materials. • Service provider - this service provider will assist with the design of treatments, choosing sites and implementing experimental designs. They will also assist with data collection, analysis and interpretation for information generated by research programme. This includes stipends for researchers/academics to develop reports and scientific papers based on field sites.
3e.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grants for the implementation of climate-smart LRP activities through the “cash for work” modality. (M947.80 for 20 days)
3f.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Materials and goods grants for inputs for climate-resilient bio-physical interventions of households. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Agricultural equipment for climate-smart agriculture ○ Seeds etc. for climate-smart agriculture ○ Cement, gabion baskets for bio-physical interventions ○ Seedlings/saplings for nurseries ○ Shade netting, poles and other materials for establishment of nurseries • Implement ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures, based on indicative costs of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Drip irrigation ○ Fruit tree seedlings ○ Eragrostis grass seed ○ 5000 litre water tank
3g.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two off-road, raised chassis vehicles for supporting extension services and visits to field sites.
3h.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Printing of training materials to promote climate-resilient ecosystem rehabilitation to be targeted at participating households.
4a.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity development expert - Fees 30 days @ \$600 per day. The specialist will be required to conduct capacity assessments to identify institutional and organizational capacity gaps for the implementation and enforcement of national and sectoral policies for improved environmental management.
4b.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate change adaptation expert. This specialist will provide strategic advice for the integration of climate risk considerations into national strategies. In particular, they will identify sustainable land use management practices. • Capacity development expert: Fees - 20 days per year @ \$350 per day. This specialist will be required to assist in undertaking capacity assessments to identify institutional and organisational capacity gaps for the implementation and enforcement of national and sectoral policies for improved environmental management. The specialist will also be responsible for making recommendations regarding institutional arrangements. • Governance and Policy Expert. This specialist will develop policy briefs for the integration of climate change adaptation into the national wetland and rangeland management strategies. The briefs are to address the implications of climate change adaptation for vulnerable groups, including youth and women. In addition, they are required to make recommendations for relevant sector policies, plans and strategies describing institutional and implementation modalities, functional and technical capacities, assessment methods and M&E systems for climate change adaptation.
4c.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training and Capacity Building Workshop for relevant line ministries and community councils to discuss the review of policies and plans.
5a.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity development expert. This specialist will be required to investigate and implement appropriate institutional mechanisms for improved inter-ministerial coordination. This specialist will review the institutional arrangements and prepare recommendations to improve coordination between DCOs, extension officers and other technical staff.

5b.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Climate change adaptation expert – Fees: 20 days per year @ \$350 per day. This specialist will provide strategic advice for integrating climate risks into local development policies. This specialist will provide input into the training materials and course curricula. This specialist will also synthesise the lessons learned through the project and facilitate the dissemination of appropriate materials. Capacity development expert – Fees: 20 days per year @ \$350 per day. This specialist will assist in the development of innovative institutional mechanisms to increase collaboration between DCOs, extension officers and technical staff, as well as inter-ministerial coordination. Governance and policy expert – Fees: 20 days per year @ \$350 per day. This specialist will be required to review local policies and develop guidelines to support the integration of climate risk and ecosystem management into the design and approval processes of local development programmes, plans and activities. This specialist will also provide progress reports to the relevant ministries. Education and training expert – Fees: 20 days per year @ \$350 per day. This specialist will be required to collaborate with institutions of higher learning to support the integration of climate risk considerations into the regular training curricula. This specialist will facilitate the adoption of a “learning by doing” approach through introducing participatory experiential learning methods, including the establishment of Farmer Field Schools and coordinating field trips/study tours.
5c.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Travel for international consultants. (5 missions to take place in Year 1, Year 3 and Year 6). Local travel for consultants.
5d.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service provider – companies. Public awareness campaign will include the establishment of local community discussion forums in workshops or other appropriate format. Also includes use of local media – including radio – to target specific audiences with appropriate ecosystem management information.
5e.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Printing of quarterly policy briefs updating the relevant line ministries, and guidelines to support the integration of climate risks and ecosystem management into the design and approval processes of local development programmes, plans and activities.
5f.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workshop with relevant line ministries regarding the integration of climate-smart interventions into inter alia agricultural, rural development and infrastructural policies at the local level. Discussion forums to be held with community councils and district technical staff, as well as MOLGCA regarding the integration of climate risks and ecosystem management into the design and approval processes of local development programmes, plans and activities. Undertake field visits and study tours to publicize project activities and lessons learnt from implementation experience. These field visits will include school and youth groups who will be encouraged to participate in various activities and competitions.
PM1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project management: Project Manager – Fees: 6 years @ \$28,235 per year
PM2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administration and Financial Officer – Fees: 6 years @ \$24,000 per year
PM3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inception workshop 2 x Lessons learned workshops
PM4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual audit – Fees: 6 years @ \$3000 per year.
PM5.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> International Consultant – Inception Process International Consultant – Mid-term review International Consultant – Terminal Evaluation

5. Management Arrangements

5.1 Project structure



5.2 Implementation Modality

196. The project will be implemented through the National Implementation Modality (NIM) by the MFLR.

5.3 Implementing Partner

197. The MFLR will be the lead government agency in implementing the LDCF-financed project. In this capacity it will work closely with the MAFS (Department of Crops, Department of Livestock Services, Department of Field Services and Department of Agricultural Research), the MEMWA (Department of

Rural Water Supply, Department of Water Affairs and LMS), MLGCA (Department of Landuse Planning), MGYSR (Department of Youth), BOS and the Disaster Management Authority.

5.4 Project Steering Committee

198. The **Project Steering Committee (PSC)** is responsible for overall management and decision-making for the LDCF-financed project, and will provide administrative support and guidance to the Project Manager (PM). The PSC plays a critical role in project monitoring and evaluations by quality assuring these processes and products, and using evaluations for performance improvement, accountability and learning. It ensures that required resources are committed and arbitrates on any conflicts within the project or negotiates a solution to any problems with external bodies. In addition, it approves the appointment and responsibilities of the PM and any delegation of its Project Assurance responsibilities. Based on the approved Annual Work Plan, the PSC can also consider and approve the quarterly plans (if applicable) and also approve any essential deviations from the original plans.
199. In order to ensure UNDP's ultimate accountability for the project results, PSC decisions will be made in accordance with standards that shall ensure management for development results, best value money, fairness, integrity, transparency and effective international competition. In case consensus cannot be reached within the PSC, the final decision shall rest with the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) or PM, with the CTA having final authority.
200. Potential members of the PSC are reviewed and recommended for approval during the PSC meeting. Representatives of other stakeholders can be included in the committee as appropriate. The members of the PSC will fulfil four distinct roles, including:
- **PSC Executive:** A senior representative of the MFLR will fulfil this role to represent the project and co-chair the PSC.
 - **Senior Supplier:** An individual or group from the UNDP CO representing the interested parties providing co-financing for specific cost-sharing projects and/or technical expertise to the project. The Senior Supplier's primary function within the PSC is to provide guidance regarding the technical feasibility of the project.
 - **Senior Beneficiary:** An individual or group representing the interests of the local communities who will ultimately benefit from the project. The Senior Beneficiary's primary function within the PSC is to ensure the realisation of project results from the perspective of project beneficiaries. A Senior Beneficiary is still to be selected for the project, but potential candidates include representatives of the MAFS, MEMWA, MLGCA, MGYSR and MTEC.
 - **Project Assurance:** An individual that supports the PSC Executive by carrying out objective and independent project oversight. The PM and Project Assurance roles cannot be held by the same individual. The UNDP CO will select a representative from within its organisation to fulfil this role.
201. The PSC will be constituted with representatives from the following line ministries and departments:
- MFLR: Forestry, Soil and Water Conservation, Rangelands, Chief Economic Planner, Mohale's Hoek DCO;
 - MAFS: Crops, Livestock, Research, Planning;
 - MEMWA: Water Affairs, LMS, Energy;
 - MLGCA: Land Use Planning;
 - MTEC: Director of Environment;
 - BOS: Head EESU;
 - Project Manager;
 - Lesotho National Farmers' Union;
 - LCN; and
 - UNDP.
202. The collaborating ministries and departments will be represented in the PSC by directors or higher ranking officers to expedite consultation and authoritative decision-making. The PSC will be co-chaired

by the Principal Secretaries of MFLR, MAFS, MEMWA, MLGCA and MGYSR. Meetings will be held bi-annually to review progress and reports received from the national level technical team and district level project implementation committee.

5.5 Project Management Unit

203. The **Project Management Unit** (PMU) will act as an advisory body to the LDCF-financed project providing high-level technical guidance, policy input and support. The PMU will have a role in facilitating communication, technical cooperation and coordination among stakeholder agencies and other project partners. This body will review technical documents and provide advice and information to consultants working to complete project activities. The PMU will have responsibility for project implementation and management of resources on a day-to-day basis, as well as for the preparation of work plans, budgets, project proposals, and progress reports. The PMU will consist of an international CTA, PM, a national Administration and Finance Officer, three Project Field Facilitators and a driver.
204. **Project Manager:** The PM has the authority to run the project on a day-to-day basis on behalf of the Implementing Partner within the constraints laid down by the PSC. The PM is responsible for delivering the results and outcomes specified in the project document, to the required standard of quality and within the specified constraints of time and cost. The PM will report on a weekly basis to the CTA on the progress and challenges encountered on the ground during the execution of activities. In particular, the PM will: i) provide on-the-ground information for UNDP progress reports; ii) engage with stakeholders; iii) organise the PSC meetings; iv) provide technical support to the project, including measures to address challenges to project implementation; and v) participate in training activities, report writing and facilitation of consultant activities that are relevant to his/her area of expertise.
205. **Project Support:** The Project Support role provides project administration, management and technical support to the PM. This role will be undertaken by the Administration and Financial Officer, who will be employed for the duration of the project.
206. **Project Field Facilitators:** The Project Field Facilitators will be responsible for field operations in each of the participating Community Councils.

5.6 Technical Advisory Committee

207. A technical team will be established at the national level to provide overall technical guidance for project implementation and adaptation practices for demonstration at the watershed level. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) will constitute representatives from the following line ministries and agencies:
- MFLR: Forestry, Soil and Water Conservation, Rangelands, Head GIS Unit, Mohale's Hoek DCO;
 - MAFS: Crops, Livestock, Irrigation, Horticulture, DAR, Head GIS Unit;
 - MEMWA: Wetlands, Rural Water Supply, Agro-climatology, Renewable/Biomass Energy, Heads of GIS Units;
 - MLGCA: Land Use Planning GIS Unit;
 - BOS: Head EESU, BOS GIS Unit; and
 - Project Manager.
208. Members of the TAC will participate in the national level training for capacity building and awareness programmes.

5.6 District Project Steering Committee

209. A District Project Steering Committee (DPSC) will be established for reviewing overall progress of the LDCF-financed project and endorsing overall decision-making at the district and inter-council level. The following local authorities and agencies will be represented on the DPSC:

- District Administrator (Chairperson);
- District Council Secretary;
- Chairpersons of participating Community Councils;
- Participating Community Council Secretaries;
- District Economic Planner;
- Principal Chief(s) of participating Community Councils;
- MFLR: District Coordinator
- MAFS: District Agricultural Officer;
- Project Manager; and
- NGOs.

210. The DSPC will meet bi-annually to review progress and reports received from the respective Community Councils and recommendations from the PSC and the project implementation committee at the district level.

5.7 District Project Implementation Committee

211. A District Project Implementation Committee (DPIC) will be established for providing overall guidance on the implementation of the project activities in the selected pilot sites. The following line ministries and agencies will be represented on the DPIC:

- MFLR: Forest Officer, Soil and Water Conservation and Range Management;
- MAFS: Crops, Livestock, Veterinarian, Extension Officer and GIS Unit;
- Community Council Physical Planners;
- NGOs;
- Project Field Facilitators; and
- Project Manager.

212. The DPIC will meet quarterly to review the project progress and provide directions to the PMU. It will also ensure that the LDCF-financed project's activities are integrated into the district strategy.

6. Monitoring Framework and Evaluation

213. The project will be monitored through the following M&E activities. The M&E budget is provided in the table below.

Project start:

214. A Project Inception Workshop will be held within the first 2 months of project start with those with assigned roles in the project organization structure, UNDP country office and where appropriate/feasible regional technical policy and programme advisors as well as other stakeholders. The Inception Workshop is crucial to building ownership for the project results and to plan the first year annual work plan.

215. The Inception Workshop should address a number of key issues including:

- Assist all partners to fully understand and take ownership of the project. Detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP CO and RCU staff vis à vis the project team. Discuss the roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference for project staff will be discussed again as needed.
- Based on the project results framework and the relevant SOF (e.g. GEF) Tracking Tool if appropriate, finalize the first annual work plan. Review and agree on the indicators, targets and their means of verification, and recheck assumptions and risks.
- Provide a detailed overview of reporting, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements. The Monitoring and Evaluation work plan and budget should be agreed and scheduled.
- Discuss financial reporting procedures and obligations, and arrangements for annual audit.

- Plan and schedule PSC meetings. Roles and responsibilities of all project organisation structures should be clarified and meetings planned. The first PSC meeting should be held within the first 12 months following the inception workshop.

216. An Inception Report will be prepared, capturing the findings of the inception phase, which include any changes in project design and activities required as well as a further detailing of implementation. The Inception Report is a key reference document and must be prepared and shared with participants to formalize various agreements and plans decided during the meeting.

217. Quarterly:

- Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results-Based Management Platform.
- Based on the initial risk analysis submitted, the risk log shall be regularly updated in ATLAS. Risks become critical when the impact and probability are high. Note that for UNDP GEF projects, all financial risks associated with financial instruments such as revolving funds, microfinance schemes, or capitalization of ESCOs are automatically classified as critical on the basis of their innovative nature (high impact and uncertainty due to no previous experience justifies classification as critical).
- Based on the information recorded in Atlas, a Project Progress Reports (PPR) can be generated in the Executive Snapshot.
- Other ATLAS logs can be used to monitor issues, lessons learned etc. The use of these functions is a key indicator in the UNDP Executive Balanced Scorecard.

218. Annually

- Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR): This key report is prepared to monitor progress made since project start and in particular for the previous reporting period (30 June to 1 July). The APR/PIR combines both UNDP and SOF (e.g. GEF) reporting requirements. The APR/PIR includes, but is not limited to, reporting on the following:
 - Progress made toward project objective and project outcomes - each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative)
 - Project outputs delivered per project outcome (annual).
 - Lesson learned/best practice.
 - AWP and other expenditure reports
 - Risk and adaptive management
 - ATLAS QPR
 - Portfolio level indicators (i.e. GEF focal area tracking tools) are used by most focal areas on an annual basis as well.

Periodic Monitoring through site visits

219. UNDP CO and the UNDP RCU will conduct visits to project sites based on the agreed schedule in the project's Inception Report/Annual Work Plan to assess first hand project progress. Other members of the PSC may also join these visits. A Field Visit Report/BTOR will be prepared by the CO and UNDP RCU and will be circulated no less than one month after the visit to the project team and PSC members.

Mid-term of project cycle

220. The project will undergo an independent Mid-Term Evaluation at the mid-point of project implementation (insert date). The Mid-Term Evaluation will determine progress being made toward the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term. The organization, terms of reference and timing of the mid-term evaluation will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project

document. The Terms of Reference for this Mid-term evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-EEG. The management response and the evaluation will be uploaded to UNDP corporate systems, in particular the [UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center \(ERC\)](#).

221. The relevant SOF (GEF) Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the mid-term evaluation cycle.

End of Project

222. An independent Final Terminal Evaluation will take place three months prior to the final PSC meeting and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP and SOF (e.g. GEF) guidance. The final evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term evaluation, if any such correction took place). The final evaluation will look at the impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-EEG.

223. The Final Terminal Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the [UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center \(ERC\)](#).

224. The relevant SOF (e.g. GEF) Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the final evaluation.

225. During the last three months, the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will summarize the results achieved (objectives, outcomes, outputs), lessons learned, problems met and areas where results may not have been achieved. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project's results.

Learning and knowledge sharing

226. Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through existing information sharing networks and forums. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in science, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation through lessons learned. The project will identify, analyse, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects. Finally, there will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects with a similar focus.

Communications and visibility requirements

227. Full compliance is required with UNDP's Branding Guidelines. These can be accessed at <http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml>, and specific guidelines on UNDP logo use can be accessed at: <http://intra.undp.org/branding/useOfLogo.html>. Amongst other things, these guidelines describe when and how the UNDP logo needs to be used, as well as how the logos of donors to UNDP projects needs to be used. For the avoidance of any doubt, when logo use is required, the UNDP logo needs to be used alongside the GEF logo. The GEF logo can be accessed at: http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF_logo. The UNDP logo can be accessed at <http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml>.

228. Full compliance is also required with the GEF's Communication and Visibility Guidelines (the "GEF Guidelines"). The GEF Guidelines can be accessed at: http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.40.08_Branding_the_GEF%20final_0.pdf. Amongst other things, the GEF Guidelines describe when and how the GEF logo needs to be used

in project publications, vehicles, supplies and other project equipment. The GEF Guidelines also describe other GEF promotional requirements regarding press releases, press conferences, press visits, visits by Government officials, productions and other promotional items. Where other agencies and project partners have provided support through co-financing, their branding policies and requirements should be similarly applied.

M& E workplan and budget

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
Inception Workshop and Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Manager UNDP CO, UNDP CCA 	Indicative cost: 30,000	Within first two months of project start up
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP CCA RTA/Project Manager will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members. 	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop.	Start, mid and end of project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required.
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on <i>output and implementation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oversight by Project Manager Project team 	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation.	Annually, prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
ARR/PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project manager and team UNDP CO UNDP RTA UNDP EEG 	None	Annually
Periodic status/ progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project manager and team 	None	Quarterly
Mid-term Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project manager and team UNDP CO UNDP RCU External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	Indicative cost: 30,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project manager and team, UNDP CO UNDP RCU External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	Indicative cost: 30,000	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Project Terminal Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project manager and team UNDP CO Local consultant 	0	At least three months before the end of the project
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP CO Project manager and team 	Indicative cost per year: 3,000	Yearly
Visits to field sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP CO UNDP RCU (as appropriate) Government representatives 	For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget	Yearly
TOTAL indicative COST Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		US\$ 93,000 (+/- 5% of total budget)	

7. Legal Context

229. This document together with the CPAP signed by the Government and UNDP which is incorporated by reference constitute together a Project Document as referred to in the SBAA [or other appropriate governing agreement] and all CPAP provisions apply to this document.

230. Consistent with the Article III of the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement, the responsibility for the safety and security of the implementing partner and its personnel and property, and of UNDP's property in the implementing partner's custody, rests with the implementing partner.
231. The implementing partner shall:
- put in place an appropriate security plan and maintain the security plan, taking into account the security situation in the country where the project is being carried;
 - assume all risks and liabilities related to the implementing partner's security, and the full implementation of the security plan.
232. UNDP reserves the right to verify whether such a plan is in place, and to suggest modifications to the plan when necessary. Failure to maintain and implement an appropriate security plan as required hereunder shall be deemed a breach of this agreement.
233. The implementing partner agrees to undertake all reasonable efforts to ensure that none of the UNDP funds received pursuant to the Project Document are used to provide support to individuals or entities associated with terrorism and that the recipients of any amounts provided by UNDP hereunder do not appear on the list maintained by the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999). The list can be accessed via <http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/committees/1267/1267ListEng.htm>. This provision must be included in all sub-contracts or sub-agreements entered into under this Project Document.

8. Annexes (attached separately)

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To mainstream climate risk considerations in the Land Rehabilitation Programme of Lesotho for improved ecosystem resilience and reduced vulnerability of livelihoods to climate shocks.						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
1. Knowledge, skills and institutional capacity to support the land rehabilitation programme to factor in additional risks from climate change, increase resilience and reduce vulnerability.	TA	1. Increased Technical capacity of the MoFLR and relevant departments to apply up-to-date climate science for the management of evolving risks and uncertainty linked to climate change	1.1 A geo-based climatic, agro-ecological and hydrological information system to support better planning for climate change adaptation under the LRP.	LDCF	1,000,000	4,000,000
			1.2 A socio-economics unit in the MFLR.			
			1.3 Assessments of climate-driven vulnerabilities in the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils and cost-benefit analysis of specific adaptation interventions.			
			1.4 Technical guidelines for climate change adaptation interventions identified in Output 1.3.			
	TA	2. Communities empowered with skills, knowledge, partnerships and institutions for managing natural resources to reduce vulnerability to climate change and increase resilience of natural and social capital.	2.1 Training of technical staff of the District Technical Teams, Community Council staff and land managers on restoring and managing ecosystems and agro-ecological landscapes using a climate-smart approach.	LDCF	642,000	2,000,000
			2.2 Training of engineering, planning and monitoring sections of the MFLR on climate science.			
			2.3 Local community members farmers, pastoralists and rural households) from Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils trained in construction and maintenance of climate-smart			

			ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions.			
			2.4 Inter-council land rehabilitation committees operational in Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils			
			2.5 A strategy for maintaining technical capacity in the MFLR and relevant departments.			
		3. Over 50,000 ha of land across the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin rehabilitated through operationalization of the climate-smart Land Rehabilitation Programme	3.1 Climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions in Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils, including: i) protection of critical fens and bogs; ii) adoption of conservation agriculture and agro-forestry practices; and iii) strategic interventions in sensitive areas, including construction of check dams and rehabilitation of old gulleys and rills.	LDCF	5,716,358	15,000,000
			3.2 A long-term strategy for monitoring and evaluating climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions for the MFLR and relevant departments, including an experimental design to evaluate the impact of interventions using grass cover as a proxy for rangeland productivity.			
2. Climate change adaptation mainstreamed into local and national development planning and finance	TA	4. National strategies for rangelands and wetlands management strengthened by the integration of climate change/variability and	4.1 Policy guidelines for incorporating climate science in the review/formulation processes of national sectoral strategies by the Departments of	LDCF	219,908	1,500,000

		ecosystem management.	Rangelands Management and Water Affairs.			
		5. NSDP mainstreamed into local development strategies to support the constituency-wide adoption of the climate-smart Land Rehabilitation Programme.	5.1 Strategy for improved coordination between regional and district development teams to reduce vulnerability to extreme climatic events in the Foothills, Lowlands and Lower Senqu River Basin.	LDCF	419,994	3,600,000
			5.2 Revised local policies across productive sectors – particularly agriculture, infrastructure development, and rural development – include identified best practices for climate-smart interventions.			
			5.3 Policy recommendations for the integration of climate risk considerations into the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils' development plans, as well as the Mohale's Hoek District development plan			
			5.4 Training on climate-resilient construction, climate-smart land use and water resource planning, and climate risk management for the relevant officials. Trained staff will include: structural engineers; urban and rural infrastructure planners; local authorities; district planning units; officers of the Ministry of Development Planning; and teaching staff from technical colleges and vocational training institutes.			
			5.5 Best practices and documentation on climate-smart land			

			management in the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils disseminated through existing national and international platforms.			
Subtotal				7,998,260	26,100,000	
Project management Cost (PMC) ³				399,912	1,500,000	
Total project costs				8,398,172	27,600,000	

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
Government	National Government	Cash	26,000,000
Government	Local councils	Cash	1,000,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	600,000
Total Co-financing			27,600,000

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
UNDP	LDCF	Climate Change	Lesotho	8,398,172	797,828	9,196,000
Total Grant Resources				8,398,172	797,828	9,196,000

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	316,800	275,783	592,583
National/Local Consultants	574,000	890,800	1,464,800

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF⁴

No significant changes in alignment with the project design of the original PIF have been made.

The wording of Outcomes and Outputs has been changed to improve their clarity and highlight specifics unavailable during development of the PIF. In addition, Outputs have been further revised to fit stakeholders' specific needs, following the consultations held during the PPG. However, while the exact wording of outcomes and outputs may have changed, there has been no change in their focus. These consultations were used to refine the outputs in order to achieve the desired developmental outcomes in accordance with the original PIF. These revisions are presented in the table below.

³ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

⁴ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

Project component: Knowledge, skills and institutional capacity support land rehabilitation programme to factor in additional risks from climate change, increase resilience and reduce vulnerability				
Outcome in PIF	Outcome in Project Document	Output in PIF	Output in Project Document	Changes from PIF to Project Document
A geo-based agro-ecological and hydrological information system increases knowledge on the relationships between climate change/variability, ecosystem health and resilient livelihoods, and forms the basis for management of evolving risks and uncertainty linked to climate change	<u><i>Outcome 1: Increased technical capacity of the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation and relevant departments to apply up-to-date climate science for the management of evolving risks and uncertainty linked to climate science.</i></u>	<u><i>Output 1: A geo-based climatic, agro-ecological and hydrological information system supported by a robust and functional GIS unit is operational by end of project year 1 and enables the analysis of climate-driven vulnerabilities and the cost-effective planning of specific adaptation interventions for strengthening social and natural assets. Assessments include: i) integrated map-based assessment of climate-related hazards, vulnerabilities and climate-sensitive natural resources available for the 30 constituencies targeted by the baseline land rehabilitation programme; ii) identification of threats to ecosystem resilience and associated production systems and knowledge based recommendations for mitigating threats incorporated into the land rehabilitation programme in 50 villages (to be selected during PPG); and iii) cost benefit analysis of landscape level mitigation of climate risks undertaken and informs implementation of the climate smart land rehabilitation programme in the 30 constituencies.</i></u>	<u><i>Output 1.1: A geo-based climatic, agro-ecological and hydrological information system to support better planning for climate change adaptation under the Land Rehabilitation Programme.</i></u> <u><i>Output 1.2: A socio-economics unit in the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation.</i></u> <u><i>Output 1.3: Assessments of climate-driven vulnerabilities in the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba Mokhele Community Councils and cost-benefit analysis of specific adaptation interventions.</i></u> <u><i>Output 1.4: Technical guidelines for climate change adaptation interventions.</i></u>	<p>The outcome and outputs have been reworded to be more concise.</p> <p>The outputs have been reorganised per activity type to facilitate the development and implementation of the activities.</p> <p>One action in Output 2 (in the original PIF) has been moved from Outcome 2 to Outcome 1 (Output 1.2 in the Project Document). This was done to group all of the outputs pertaining to strengthening technical capacity of the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation to enable the analysis of climate-driven vulnerabilities and the cost-effective planning of adaptation interventions under one outcome.</p> <p>Output 1 (in the original PIF) referred to covering 30 constituencies and 50 villages. However, these figures are not in accord with the demographic realities on the ground. The project area will only cover three constituencies, encompassing 3 community councils and 9 electoral divisions. Many electoral divisions have more than 50 villages – which vary significantly in household sizes. The number of villages is therefore not considered a functional criteria for delineation of the project area.</p>
Communities empowered with skills, knowledge, partnerships and	<u><i>Outcome 2: Communities empowered with skills, knowledge,</i></u>	<u><i>Output 2: Skills to utilize the information system to reorient the Land Rehabilitation Programme</i></u>	<u><i>Output 2.1: Training of technical staff of the District Technical Teams, Regional Council</i></u>	The outcome and outputs have been reworded to be more concise.

institutions for managing natural resources to reduce vulnerability and increase resilience of natural and social capital (over 20,000 households, with potential for upscaling to cover over 50,000)	<i>partnerships and institutions for managing natural resources to reduce vulnerability to climate change and increase climate-resilience of natural and social capital (over 7,000 households with potential for upscaling to cover over 20,000).</i>	towards ecosystems rehabilitation informed by climate and ecosystems sciences delivered and applied, through: i) training programmes formulated and used in skills development for technical staff of the District Technical Teams, Regional Council staff and land managers in the fields of climate change and land rehabilitation, ecosystems health and relatedness to resilience, productivity and landscapes; ii) relevant departments (particularly engineering, planning and monitoring sections of the Ministries of Forest and Land Rehabilitation) acquire necessary technical skills (staff members) with relevant training on climate science; iii) inter-council land rehabilitation committees established and operationalized to facilitate greater understanding of the role of ecosystem resilience and greater responsibility for environmental management; iv) a strategy for maintaining capacity developed by the project formulated and implementation agreed; and v) a socio-economics unit established and made functional; and supports the integration of social capital and livelihoods needs in the selection, implementation and maintenance of climate smart rehabilitation measures.	<p><i>staff and land managers on restoring and managing ecosystems and agro-ecological landscapes in a climate-smart manner.</i></p> <p><i><u>Output 2.2:</u> Training of engineering, planning and monitoring sections of the Ministry of Forestry and Land Rehabilitation on climate science.</i></p> <p><i><u>Output 2.3:</u> Local community members (farmers, pastoralists and rural households) from the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils trained on the construction and maintenance of climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions.</i></p> <p><i><u>Output 2.4:</u> Inter-council land rehabilitation committees operational in the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba Mokhele community councils.</i></p> <p><i><u>Output 2.5:</u> A strategy for maintaining technical capacity in the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation and relevant departments.</i></p>	<p>The outputs have been reorganised per activity type to facilitate the development and implementation of the activities.</p> <p>Outcome 2 and Outcome 3 have been switched. This was done to group all of the outputs pertaining to the on-the-ground interventions with the implementation of the climate-smart Land Rehabilitation Programme (Outcome 2 in the original PIF). The outputs pertaining to skills development and training programmes have been realigned with the outcome relating to community empowerment through skills, knowledge, partnerships and institutions (Outcome 3 in the original PIF).</p> <p>The PIF targets over 50,000 ha of land under climate-smart Land Rehabilitation Programme spread across 30 constituencies and benefiting over 20,000 households. This is not in accordance with the demographic realities of the project area in the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin. The household densities within the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin do not allow for covering 20,000 households per 50,000 ha, i.e. 0.40 households per hectare. The number of households that will benefit from the project has been revised to approximately 7,000.</p>
Over 50,000 ha under climate-smart Land	<i><u>Outcome 3</u> Over 50,000 ha of land across the</i>	<u>Output 3:</u> Climate smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management practices	<i><u>Output 3.1:</u> Climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and</i>	The outcome and outputs have been reworded to be more concise.

<p>Rehabilitation Programme (spread across 30 constituencies) demonstrates reduction of vulnerability through strengthened integrity and resilience of natural assets (with a potential for upscaling to cover over 200,000 ha)</p>	<p><i>Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin rehabilitated through operationalization of the climate-smart Land Rehabilitation Programme</i></p>	<p>(identified via analytical assessments under Output 1) implemented at the landscape and “farm” level in over 100,000 ha, and begin to increase structural complexity of the natural systems, thereby increasing productivity and resilience, including: i) critical ferns and bogs and other important wetlands in the mountains (which are sources of economically important rivers and support more than 100,000 households in the project areas) protected from overgrazing, and rehabilitated by improving/creating vegetation buffers around them, preferably planted with indigenous grasses and herbaceous vegetation resilient to significant climatic variance; ii) impacts of increased flooding and irregular water flow on soil erosion reduced on the farm level via adoption of conservation agriculture (which includes zero tillage) and establishment of structurally complex patches of vegetation around the farms, preferably made up of keystone species mixed with agro-forestry species that increase goods such as fodder, wood fuel, building poles and increase soil fertility; and iii) at the landscape level, the impact of flooding and droughts reduced by establishing strategic measures in sensitive areas including construction of check dams to slow water flow, rehabilitation of old gulleys and rills (with indigenous grasses, stones, and other measures to be identified through the GIS</p>	<p><i>management interventions in the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba Mokhele community councils, including: i) protection of critical fens and bogs; ii) adoption of conservation agriculture and agro-forestry practices; and iii) strategic interventions in sensitive areas, including construction of check dams, construction of stone lines and rehabilitation of old gulleys and rills.</i></p> <p><i>Output 3.2: A long-term strategy for monitoring and evaluating climate-smart ecosystem restoration and management interventions for the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation and relevant departments, including an experimental design impact evaluation using grass cover as a proxy for rangeland productivity.</i></p>	<p>The geographical scale of the project area has not been reduced. However, the number of constituencies that will be covered has been revised. The notion of covering 30 constituencies and 50 villages is not in accordance with the demographic realities on the ground. The Mohale’s Hoek District has a total of 8 constituencies and the project area will only cover three of these constituencies including three community councils and nine electoral divisions.</p> <p>The outputs have been reorganised per activity type to facilitate the development and implementation of the activities.</p> <p>The outputs have also been amended to more accurately reflect the activities to be undertaken, as well as the revised targets – based upon field studies, GIS analysis and Census data. By way of example, the adaptation interventions will only be implemented in the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin and will not include critical fens and bogs and other important wetlands in the mountains. Output 3.1 has therefore been amended to exclude reference to the households who benefit indirectly therefrom.</p> <p>Additional outputs have been added to promote the development and implementation of ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions.</p>
---	---	--	--	---

		supported analytical work).		
Project component: Climate change adaptation mainstreamed into local and regional development planning and finance				
Outcome in PIF	Outcome in Project Document	Output in PIF	Output in Project Document	Changes from PIF to Project Document
National strategies for rangelands and wetlands management informed by the science of climate change/variability and ecosystems management, and strengthen resilience	<i><u>Outcome 4:</u> National strategies for rangelands and wetlands management strengthened by consideration of climate change/variability and ecosystem management.</i>	<i><u>Output 4:</u> The revised rangelands and wetlands strategies overtly recognize climate risk and the importance of ecosystems based approach to adaptation and resilience; they further include specific budgets for advancing the maintenance of ecosystem functionality as the entry point to addressing climate risks and boosting resilience</i>	<i><u>Output 4.1:</u> Policy guidelines for incorporating climate science in the review/formulation processes of national sectoral strategies by the Departments of Rangelands Management and Water Affairs.</i>	The output has been reworded to be more concise.
Mainstreaming of the provisions of the new National Sustainable Development Plan into regional development strategies takes full cognizance of the role of healthy ecosystems in ensuring resilience and buffering livelihoods and natural capital against climate shocks – and lessons from this process inform constituency-wide adoption of climate smart Land Rehabilitation Programme	<i><u>Outcome 5:</u> NSDP mainstreamed into regional development strategies to support the constituency-wide adoption of the climate-smart Land Rehabilitation Programme.</i>	<i><u>Output 5:</u> Stronger coordination of the regional and district development teams' leads for better integration of proven measures to reduce vulnerability to climate shocks into local policies processes and development strategies. This will lead to: i) additional sectoral strategies, plans and investment projects aimed at implementing the National Sustainable Development Strategy, including specific guidelines, actions and budgets for adaptation measures; ii) design, appraisal and approval processes for council, district and communal development plans integrate climate risk considerations; iii) training programmes on climate-resilient construction, land use and water resources planning based on pilot experience are made available nationally for structural engineers, urban and rural infrastructure</i>	<i><u>Output 5.1:</u> Strategy for improved coordination between regional and district development teams to reduce vulnerability to extreme climatic events in the Foothills, Lowlands and Lower Senqu River Basin</i> <i><u>Output 5.2:</u> Revised local policies across productive sectors – particularly agriculture, infrastructure development and rural development – include identified best practices for climate-smart interventions.</i> <i><u>Output 5.3:</u> Policy recommendations for the integration of climate risk considerations in the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba Mokhele community councils' development plans, as well as the Mohale's Hoek District development plan.</i> <i><u>Output 5.4:</u> Training on climate-resilient</i>	<p>The outcome and outputs have been reworded to be more concise.</p> <p>The outputs have been reorganised per activity type to facilitate the development and implementation of the activities.</p> <p>One of the outputs in Output 5 (in the original PIF) has been moved from Outcome 5 to Outcome 3 (Output 3.2 in the Project Document). This is because Output 3.2 promotes the long-term monitoring of the climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions. The inclusion of the M&E system under Output 3.2 streamlines the development and implementation of ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures.</p> <p>The focus of Output 5.1 has been broadened to allow for the development</p>

		<p>planners, local authorities, district planning units and officers of the Ministry of Economic Development, Finance Commission, and teaching staff from technical colleges and vocational training institutes; staff trained to recognize climate risk problems in new investment projects and apply and/or recommend targeted risk reduction and risk management measures; iv) at least 4 Regional councils formulate regulatory frameworks for guiding environmental management within their councils to minimize/avoid negative impacts on adjoining ecosystems/landscapes; and v) a participatory M&E system established and elaborates indicators for monitoring trends in ecosystems rehabilitation and climate variability (linked to the Dept. of Meteorology and institutions of higher learning and regional and global networks on monitoring ecological/climate change interactions and impacts on ecosystems)</p>	<p><i>construction, climate-smart land use and water resources planning, and climate risk management for relevant officials. Trained staff will include: structural engineers; urban and rural infrastructure planners; local authorities; district planning units; officers of the Ministry of Development Planning; and teaching staff from technical colleges and vocational training institutes.</i></p> <p><i><u>Output 5.5: Best practices and documentation on climate-smart land management in the Khoelenya, Lithipeng and Thaba Mokhele community councils disseminated through existing national and international platforms.</u></i></p>	<p>of coordination strategies, which will facilitate effective development planning – including actions and budgets for adaptation measures – at the regional and local level.</p> <p>Output 5.2 incorporates the revision and development of local policies previously included in Output 5.1 of the PIF.</p> <p>Output 5.3 is focused upon local development plans and the integration of cost-benefit analysis and relevant up-to-date information and evidence-based approaches to inform local development planning. This will include the establishment of regulatory frameworks for the selected Community Councils – which was previously dealt with in Output 5.4 of the PIF.</p> <p>Output 5.4 pertains to training and capacity building, which was previously dealt with in Output 5.3 of the PIF.</p> <p>Output 5.5 deals with the dissemination of information.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. A NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial UNDP Reports, etc

There have been no significant changes in alignment with relevant national strategies and plans since the original PIF. The LDCF-financed project remains aligned with:

- GEF Result-Based Management (RBM) Framework for Adaptation to Climate Change;
- United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC);
- Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA);
- Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD);
- Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG);
- Lesotho's Millennium Development Goals (MDGs);
- Lesotho's National Adaptation Plan of Action (NAPA);
- Lesotho's Second National Communication (SNC);
- Lesotho's Vision 2020;

- Lesotho's National Strategic Development Plan (NSDP);
- Lesotho's Poverty Reduction Strategy; and
- Lesotho's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan.

For additional information on the LDCF-financed project's alignment with national strategies and plans please refer to Section 2 of the Project Document.

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.

There have been no changes in the GEF Focal Areas or eligibility since the original PIF.

The LDCF-financed project is consistent with LDCF Objectives CCA-1 "Reduce vulnerability to the adverse impacts of climate change" and CCA-2 "Increase adaptive capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level".

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage:

No significant changes have been made since the PIF was approved. Further details have been added to the relevant section of the Project Document outlining UNDP's experience and success in assisting the GoL to access funding for climate change adaptation.

For additional information on the GEF Agencies comparative advantage, please refer to Section 2.3 of the Project Document.

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

The problem that the project seeks to address has not changed from what was presented in the PIF. The project seeks to address climate change that is expected to exacerbate land degradation in Lesotho thereby increasing risks to rural communities and their livelihoods. The solution to this problem is to strengthen the resilience of climate-vulnerable communities by: i) enhancing the capacity of government institutions and local communities to mainstream climate change risks into policies, plans and programmes; ii) implementing climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures using a community/household based approach; and iii) establishing a system for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of various approaches to climate change adaptation to inform a process of adaptive management.

The main baseline project upon which the LDCF-financed project will build – the MFLR's Land Reclamation Programme (LRP) – is focused on addressing similar problems of land degradation, but without a specific consideration of predicted climate change effects. This has not changed from the PIF. The LDCF-financed project will contribute towards climate-proofing this baseline project by using GIS to prioritise threatened ecosystems and identify climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions.

For further details on baseline projects please see Section 2.3 of the Project Document.

A5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

The additional cost reasoning has been updated since the original PIF. The revised additional cost reasoning is described below. (*See detailed discussion of the Project Objective, Outcomes and Outputs/activities under section 2.4 of Project Document – Para 61-170*).

The project will increase the effectiveness of the baseline being invested by the government on land rehabilitation and policy implementation (related to rangeland management and rural development), by increasing the resilience of the natural resources and ecosystems to climate-induced disasters; thereby reducing the vulnerability of the people

dependent on these resources to climate variability and change. The LDCF portion of the project will finance the additional costs of maintaining natural assets and related agro-ecological and hydrological services essential to sustaining the productivity of the natural resources in the face of climate change. Community and District Councils will also be assisted to mainstream climate change considerations into local development strategies. Additionally, training communities to rehabilitate and manage ecosystems in a climate-smart manner will increase their resilience to climate shocks as well as improve their livelihoods through greater income-generating opportunities. Without the project, local communities and the ecosystems upon which they depend will be increasingly at risk from the impacts of climate change.

The project will provide practical tools, technologies and capacities for an adaptation programme that promotes ecosystem management by communities. This will be done through practical demonstrations over 50,000 ha to improve the maintenance and enhancement of ecosystem functioning, integrity and resilience. At least 7,000 households in the Molepolole's Mole District will directly benefit from LDCF resources. These benefits will accrue because improved soil quality and ground cover will lead to increased water infiltration and reduced run off, as well as a decrease in soil erosion. These benefits include: i) improved water quality; ii) increased groundwater recharge; iii) reduced surface water runoff during intense rainfall events; and iv) mitigating the impact of extreme weather events and natural disasters. The combined effect of improved soil and vegetation cover will also increase rangeland productivity. In addition, rehabilitation of degraded rangeland and wetland ecosystems would increase the potential for local communities to increase or diversify household income by supporting alternative livelihoods generated by ecosystem goods and services. The development of sustainable alternative livelihoods would reduce the pressure placed on natural resources by traditional livelihood practices such as agriculture, thereby increasing the climate resilience of vulnerable communities in Lesotho. Strengthening the livelihood assets on which communities depend – such as rangelands – safeguards household income as households are less prone to – and in a better position to recover from – climate-induced disasters. In addition, the project will upscale the lessons learned to enable replication elsewhere in Lesotho.

COMPONENT 1. KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS AND INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY SUPPORT LAND REHABILITATION PROGRAMME TO FACTOR IN ADDITIONAL RISKS FROM CLIMATE CHANGE, INCREASE RESILIENCE AND REDUCE VULNERABILITY

Interventions under Component 1 form a package of enabling activities designed to strengthen the GoL's capacity for assessing, analysing and addressing climate change. Enhancing the GoL's capacity will support improved decision-making at the policy-level. Additionally, the project will take a comprehensive multi-sectoral approach to addressing capacity constraints in Lesotho, rather than focusing on a single sector. Furthermore, facilitation of an economy-wide approach to reducing climate vulnerability will promote more sustainable and efficient management of climate risks. The three outcomes under this component are briefly described below

Outcome 1: Increased technical capacity of the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation and relevant departments to apply up-to-date climate science for the management of evolving risks and uncertainty linked to climate change.

The LDCF-financed project under this outcome will: i) improve the GIS capacity of relevant line ministries and institutions, as well as increase the quality of the available GIS and climate science data; ii) study the socio-economic benefits of climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures and use the results of these assessments in the selection of adaptation interventions; iii) identify climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions for the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils; and iv) generate and disseminate technical guidelines for climate change adaptation.

This outcome will strengthen capacities for the generation and timely use of information on ecosystem-specific risks related to climate change. In addition, appropriate methods and approaches will be developed for the LRP to guide ecosystem rehabilitation to improve productivity and resilience under climate change scenarios.

Outcome 2: Communities empowered with skills, knowledge, partnerships and institutions for managing natural resources to reduce vulnerability to climate change and increase resilience of natural and social capital (over 7,000 households with potential for upscaling to cover over 20,000).

The operational capacity of the extension services will be boosted to enable communities to mainstream climate risk considerations into the implementation of baseline projects. Effective advisory services and deeper involvement of extension staff in training and field activities will foster wider acceptance of climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management practices. Technical staff will also engage with the local communities in the design and implementation of climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management practices. In combination with awareness raising campaigns, these actions will ensure the buy-in of local communities and the sustainability of the adaptation interventions beyond the duration of the project.

The project will establish the framework for a regulatory body at the community level, which will be responsible for overseeing environmental planning at a landscape level. Furthermore, community-led committees will be established to draft local bylaws regulating natural resources.

Outcome 3: Over 50,000 ha of land across the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin rehabilitated through operationalization of the climate-smart Land Rehabilitation Programme.

The LDCF-financed project will promote land use practices that reduce the vulnerability of local communities to the negative effects of climate change. Such land use practices will include a range of climate-smart agriculture, agro-forestry, water harvesting and other ecosystem rehabilitation techniques in the Foothills, Southern Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin.

The identified adaptation interventions of the LDCF-financed project will: i) incorporate traditional and innovative adaptation techniques; ii) require locally available or simple inputs; and iii) respond to the anticipated effects of climate change on youth, women and other vulnerable groups. This project will include local communities in selecting and prioritising interventions that are tailored to the local context and in accordance with the Lithipeng and Khoelenya Community Council Adaptation Plans. This approach will promote local community “buy-in” and ownership of the project’s activities. Households and community members in these selected Community Councils will directly benefit from the project through an increased capacity for climate risk management, as well as increased community coordination and ownership. This will have a direct effect on the capacity of communities to prepare for climate change impacts and minimise the damage caused.

The LDCF-financed project will implement a research programme to assess the environmental and socio-economic effects of demonstrated adaptation interventions in Lesotho. The purpose of the research programme will be to measure the effectiveness of adaptation interventions using vegetation cover as a proxy for ecosystem productivity. The results generated will be used to determine the environmental and socio-economic effects of the various treatments. The MFLR will use the evidence generated to inform a replication strategy for other areas at risk of soil erosion.

COMPONENT 2: CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION MAINSTREAMED INTO LOCAL AND NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING AND FINANCE

Component 2 of the project will focus on mainstreaming and integrating climate change adaptation and climate risk considerations into the national and local level policies, strategies and development plans and promote climate-smart interventions by supporting coordination between regional and district development planning teams. It will also provide training and capacity development across the planning systems of the national and local governments and

promote learning and advocacy for policy reform and making. Outcome 4 and 5 contribute to this component as described below.

Outcome 4: National strategies for rangelands and wetlands management strengthened by the integration of climate change/variability and ecosystems management.

Under this Outcome, the LDCF-financed project will strengthen the institutional framework to support effective national and local strategies for natural resource-based livelihoods in Lesotho. Sectoral policies will be reviewed and opportunities for amending such policies to address climate risk considerations will be identified. The review process will be based upon information generated by the analytical studies undertaken in Outcome 1. Furthermore, the revised sectoral policies will be informed by the additional measures identified to strengthen programmes such as the LRP. Thereafter, recommendations will be provided for the integration of climate change and variability into the policies.

Outcome 5: National Strategic Development Plan (NSDP) mainstreamed into local development strategies to support the constituency-wide adoption of the climate-smart Land Rehabilitation Programme.

The LDCF-financed project will support the decentralisation process through the establishment of an institutional framework and capacity development of local authorities. The decentralisation process provides an opportunity to mainstream climate change considerations into land use planning and development decisions at a local level. Mainstreaming mandatory climate change considerations into district and Community Councils' policies, programmes and plans will make developments more resilient to the effects of climate change.

Under this outcome, the capacity of DCOs to integrate climate risk management approaches into existing planning and budgeting processes will be strengthened at district and community council levels. The capacity built within this output will be complementary to the technical skills developed under Outcome 1 and Outcome 2.

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

While the wording of the project risks have been altered and since the original PIF to make them more specific, they remain based on the same underlying principles. Additional risks and appropriate mitigation measures have been identified since the original PIF. These risks are summarised below in the table below.

#	Risk	Impact and probability	Mitigation Measure	Assumption
1	Poor uptake of training on climate- smart land use planning and management results in ineffective implementation of project interventions.	I: 5 P: 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training and knowledge transfer will be undertaken throughout the implementation period of the project. • Knowledge transfer will be undertaken through formal training sessions as well as “learning by doing”. • Pre-and post-training assessments of capacity will be undertaken. • Training sessions and materials will be tailored to the level of technical ability of participants. • Community Council leadership and village chiefs fully participate in training needs assessment and implementation. 	Trainees leave training with improved capacity.

2	Sectoral ministries are unwilling to adopt recommendations on policies	I: 5 P: 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations for policy will be supported by training and awareness raising activities. The Project Steering Committee (PSC) will monitor the progress of the policy revision process – responding to challenges as they arise. Interventions aligned with sectoral ministry's priorities within mandates. Sectoral ministries fully engaged during PPG. 	Recommendations for sector policies, strategies and plans will be accepted and mainstreamed.
3	Communities are unwilling to adopt new climate-smart land use methods.	I: 5 P: 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A stakeholder engagement plan was developed during the PPG phase to support the participation of local communities. Capacity building and training of local communities (See PRODOC chapter 2.9 Stakeholder Involvement Plan). will be undertaken to communicate the benefits of adaptation interventions and involve them in the implementation and M&E. Awareness-raising campaigns will be undertaken to promote adaptation interventions. These campaigns will highlight the importance of LDCF project interventions. 	Communities see climate-smart land use as desirable given development imperatives and lifestyle preferences and support project interventions.
4	Chiefs in target areas unwilling to support project interventions	I: 5 P: 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chiefs are engaged to raise their awareness of the benefits of project interventions. Consultation with chiefs will ensure that their concerns are taken into consideration when planning interventions. Chiefs are also involved in capacity building, training and skills development. 	Chiefs support project interventions and facilitate the roll out within their constituencies.
5	High staff turnover and poor institutional memory result in disruptions or delays in project implementation and coordination.	I: 5 P: 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deputies and alternative representatives within participating institutions will be recommended at inception to support the continuity of staff participation. The PSC will make use of established government structures to capitalise on functioning systems. Community Councils and Chiefs empowered to lobby and advocate for project interventions. 	A strong demand for project interventions from the community councils will counteract the risk, especially in the light of decentralisation policy.
6	The geo-based climatic, agro-ecological and hydrological information system is not sustained beyond the lifetime of the project.	I: 3 P: 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong data management systems established during the lifetime of the project, under the guidance of the PMU. Responsibility for maintaining the system is appropriately allocated within government. Project activities build on strong commitments and baseline investments on GIS in the participating departments 	<p>Information established during the project will support climate-smart land use planning and management into the future.</p> <p>The EESU remains committed to its national mandate.</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project activities coordinated by the EESU of BOS 	
7	Ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions are not cost effective.	I: 5 P: 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of project interventions undertaken before implementation to assess cost-effectiveness. Interventions based on climate risk assessment & mapping. 	Cost-effective interventions will be identified.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

Because of delays between PIF submission and the PPG completion, numerous aligned projects identified in the PIF are in the final year of their implementation or have terminated. Consequently, new initiatives have been identified and the LDCF-financed project has been designed in full alignment with the portfolio of GEF projects that are currently in implementation phase. The project is aligned with the following GEF-financed initiatives:

- Development of Cornerstone Public Policies and Institutional Capacities to Accelerate Sustainable Energy for All Progress (GEF);
- Enabling Activities to Review and Update the National Implementation Plan for the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (GEF);
- Alignment of Lesotho's National Action Plan with UNCCD (GEF);
- Strengthening Capacity for Climate Change Adaptation through Support to Integrated Watershed Management Programme in Lesotho (LDCF);
- Adaptation of Small-scale Agriculture (LDCF);
- Improvement of Early Warning System to Reduce Impacts of Climate Change and Capacity Building to integrate Climate Change into Development Plans (LDCF); and
- Support to the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Lesotho (GEF).

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

Stakeholders at both national and local levels will be engaged during implementation of the LDCF-financed project. This process commenced during the PPG phase with the inception workshop (detailed in Annex 2) and continued throughout the project's design. During the validation mission, the plan for stakeholder engagement during project implementation was discussed and agreed upon during bilateral consultations, one-on-one meetings with relevant stakeholders as well as during the validation workshop (detailed in Annex 2).

Outcome	Output	Stakeholders	Key Responsibilities
Outcome 1. <i>Increased technical capacity of the MFLR and relevant departments to apply up-to-date climate science for the management of evolving risks and uncertainty linked to climate change.</i>	Output 1.1. A geo-based climatic, agro-ecological and hydrological information system to support better planning for climate change adaptation under the LRP.	MFLR GIS Unit, MAFS GIS Unit, DWA GIS Unit, BOS EESU and new project funded GIS unit at LMS.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participate in training sessions on GIS and climate change. (MFLR GIS Unit, MAFS GIS Unit, DWA GIS Unit, LMS GIS Unit). Collect and analyse data. (MFLR GIS Unit, MAFS GIS Unit, DWA GIS Unit, LMS GIS Unit). Host and coordinate national geo-based climatic, agro-ecological and hydrological database (BOS EESU).
	Output 1.2. A socio-economics unit in the MFLR.	MFLR Planning Unit.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Host socio-economic unit. Participate in training sessions on social capital and livelihoods. Undertake cost-benefit analysis of climate change adaptation and mitigation interventions.
	Output 1.3. Assessments of climate-driven vulnerabilities in the	MFLR, MAFS GIS Unit, DWA GIS Unit, LMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undertake strategic environmental assessments – using GIS data generated in Output 1.1 and socio-

	Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils and cost-benefit analysis of specific adaptation interventions.	GIS unit, BOS EESU, Community Councils.	<p>economic data collected in Output 1.2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undertake integrated map-based assessments of climate-related hazards, vulnerabilities and climate sensitive natural resources. • Propose context-appropriate ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions.
	Output 1.4. Technical guidelines for climate change adaptation interventions identified in Output 1.3.	MFLR.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement technical guidelines for climate change adaptation interventions. • Disseminate technical guidelines to relevant stakeholders.
Outcome 2. Communities empowered with skills, knowledge, partnerships and institutions for managing natural resources to reduce vulnerability to climate change and increase resilience of natural and social capital (over 7,000 households with potential for upscaling to cover over 20,000).	Output 2.1. Training of technical staff of the District Technical Teams, Community Council staff and land managers on restoring and managing ecosystems and agro-ecological landscapes using a climate-smart approach.	MFLR, Mohale's Hoek District Council, Community Councils, Chiefs, local land managers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct a comprehensive needs assessment for climate change adaptation training (MFLR). • Update and extend portfolio of training modules based on needs assessment (MFLR). • Develop and disseminate user-friendly training material on climate change adaptation and monitoring to relevant stakeholders (MFLR). • Participate in training sessions on climate change adaptation, including restoring and managing ecosystems and agro-ecological landscapes.
	Output 2.2. Training of engineering, planning and monitoring sections of the MFLR on climate science.	MFLR Engineering Unit, MFLR Planning Unit, MFLR Monitoring Unit.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess current awareness on climate science in MFLR and update training material accordingly. • Participate in training sessions on integrating climate science into their activities.
	Output 2.3. Local community members (farmers, pastoralists and rural households) from Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils trained in construction and maintenance of climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions.	MFLR, NGOs (e.g. CARE, World Vision, Rural Self-Help Development Association RSDA), CBOs, Community Councils, local communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and implement training for local communities on climate change adaptation as well as ecosystem rehabilitation and management (MFLR, NGOs). • Participate in training sessions on climate change adaptation as well as ecosystem rehabilitation and management (local communities). • Develop and participate in training NGOs and/or CBOs on appropriate climate change adaptation interventions as well as monitoring and evaluation (MFLR, NGOs). • Host local community discussion forums to share lessons learned on climate change adaptation experiences (Community Councils, local communities).
	Output 2.4. Inter-council land rehabilitation committees operational in Lithipeng,	MoLGCA, Mohale's Hoek District Council, inter-council land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish inter-council land rehabilitation committees. • Support operation of inter-council land rehabilitation committees.

	Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils.	rehabilitation committees, Community Councils.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose recommendations for Community bylaws for the management of natural resources (inter-council land rehabilitation committees). Approve and implement bylaws proposed by inter-council land rehabilitation committees (MoLGCA and MFLR).
	Output 2.5. A strategy for maintaining technical capacity in the MFLR and relevant departments.	MFLR.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop and implement a strategy for maintaining the technical capacity of relevant MFLR departments. Develop and disseminate user-friendly literature on climate change adaptation and monitoring to relevant stakeholders.
Outcome 3. Over 50,000 ha of land across the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin rehabilitated through operationalization of the climate-smart Land Rehabilitation Programme.	Output 3.1. Climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions in Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils, including: i) protection of critical fens and bogs; ii) adoption of conservation agriculture and agro-forestry practices; and iii) strategic interventions in sensitive areas, including construction of check dams and rehabilitation of old gulleys and rills.	MFLR, Community Councils, NGOs (e.g. CARE, World Vision, RSDA), local communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement interventions – developed under Output 1.4 – in sites selected under Outputs 1.1 and 1.3. Develop and disseminate information on climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management approaches (MFLR). Develop and implement strategies for community ownership of interventions beyond project termination to relevant stakeholders.
	Output 3.2. A long-term strategy for monitoring and evaluating climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions for the MFLR and relevant departments, including an experimental design to evaluate the impact of interventions using grass cover as a proxy for rangeland productivity.	MFLR, Community Councils, local communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undertake baseline assessments of soil erosion, grass cover and existing interventions to control soil erosion. Identify treatment and control sites, and implement experimental design treatments. Establish monitoring points at intervention and control sites as well as establish systems to collect data on the long-term impacts of climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions. Collect long-term data on the impacts of climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions. Analyse data from pilot interventions and experimental design; collate the results; and disseminate to schools, media,

			public institutions and relevant stakeholders (MFLR).
Outcome 4. National strategies for rangelands and wetlands management strengthened by the integration of climate change/variability and ecosystem management.	Output 4.1. Policy guidelines for incorporating climate science in the review/formulation processes of national sectoral strategies by the Departments of Rangelands Management and Water Affairs.	MFLR (DRM), MEMWA (DWA).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review existing rangeland and wetland management strategies and identify opportunities for strengthening policy support for climate change adaptation. Integrate climate change adaptation into the ongoing revision of the national wetland and rangeland management strategies. Conduct capacity assessments of DRM and DWA as well as other relevant stakeholders to identify capacity gaps for the implementation of policies. Develop and disseminate policy briefs and recommendations for integrating climate change adaptation into relevant sector policies, plans and strategies.
Outcome 5. NSDP mainstreamed into local development strategies to support the constituency-wide adoption of the climate-smart Land Rehabilitation Programme.	Output 5.1. Strategy for improved coordination between regional and district development teams to reduce vulnerability to extreme climatic events in the Foothills, Lowlands and Lower Senqu River Basin.	MFLR, MAFS, MoLGCA, Ministry of Public Works and Transport (MoPWT), MoDP, MoEMWA, Ministry of Social Development (MoSD), MTEC.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review management arrangements and recommendations to improve coordination of decision-making and project management Expand MFLR and MAFS inter-disciplinary teams to include specialists from other relevant departments (MFLR, MAFS, MoPWT, MoDP, MoEMWA, MoSD, MTEC).
	Output 5.2. Revised local policies across productive sectors – particularly agriculture, infrastructure development, and rural development – include identified best practices for climate-smart interventions.	MFLR, MAFS, MoLGCA, MoPWT, MoEMWA, MTEC.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review local policies for productive sectors. Develop guidelines to support the integration of climate-risk analysis and ecosystem management into the design and approval process of local development programmes, plans and activities. Prepare recommendations for the integration of climate-smart interventions into local policies.
	Output 5.3. Policy recommendations for the integration of climate risk considerations into the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils' development plans, as well as the Mohale's	MFLR, MAFS, MoLGCA, Mohale's Hoek District Council, Community Councils, NGOs (e.g. CARE, World Vision, RSDA).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish a discussion forum to facilitate dialogue on climate change adaptation between district and community council stakeholders (MFLR, MAFS, Mohale's Hoek District Council, Community Councils, NGOs). Review District and Community Council development plans (MoLGCA, Mohale's Hoek District Council, Community Councils).

	Hoek District development plan.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare recommendations to include climate risk considerations into District and Community Council development plans (MFLR, MoLGCA, Mohale's Hoek District Council, Community Councils).
	Output 5.4. Training on climate-resilient construction, climate-smart land use and water resource planning, and climate risk management for the relevant officials. Trained staff will include: structural engineers; urban and rural infrastructure planners; local authorities; district planning units; officers of the Ministry of Development Planning (MoDP); and teaching staff from technical colleges and vocational training institutes.	MFLR, MAFS, MoPWT, MoDP, Ministry of Education and Training (MoET), MoTICM, technical colleges and vocational training institutes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and implement training programmes for staff from a wide range of stakeholders. • Integrate the abovementioned training into regular technical and vocational college curricula (MoET, technical colleges and vocational training institutes).
	Output 5.5. Best practices and documentation on climate-smart land management in the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils disseminated through existing national and international platforms.	MFLR, MAFS, local communities, NGOs (e.g. CARE, World Vision, RSDA), SLM, UNDP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish farmers Field Schools (MAFS, MFLR, NGOs, local communities). • Coordinate exchange visits to project sites. (MFLR, MAFS, NGOs, local communities). • Best practices and Project Documents disseminated nationally through the Lesotho Sustainable Land Management platform (SLM). • Best practices and Project Documents disseminated globally through Adaptation Learning Mechanism (ALM), wikiADAPT, Global Adaptation Network (GAN) and African Adaptation Knowledge Network (AAKN) (UNDP).

Matrix of stakeholder participation

Stakeholder	Capabilities/current role for promoting climate change adaptation	Role in project
Natural resource users e.g. youth groups and farmers, particularly women and the elderly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive indigenous technical knowledge. • Familiarity with concepts of group action and committee operations. • Commitment to climate change adaptation because of livelihood interests in a sustainable environment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leading agents of LRP through user groups or associations. • Primary beneficiaries of "cash for work" programme and implementers of the climate-smart initiatives.

District Councils	Coordinate the functions and activities of Community Councils	Local level governance. Coordination of technical teams.
Community Councils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal authority for natural resources management. • Little capacity to exert this authority at field level. • Committed to fulfilling their natural resource management responsibilities, but currently uncertain how to go about this. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locus of legal authority for LRP. • Supervise government field staff – who are administratively answerable to the Community Councils. • Supervise and guide resource user groups acting on their behalf. • Provide modest levels of resourcing to these groups for their daily operations. • Key participants in coordinated management to ensure rehabilitation measures are implemented and impacts are monitored.
Chiefs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traditional natural resource management authorities. • Some have extensive technical knowledge. • Two chiefs are elected by their peers as members of each Community Council and can play a formal role in Council's natural resource management decision making. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some chiefs can contribute as Community Council members. • All chiefs can contribute as leading and knowledgeable members of their communities.
MFLR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through its Forestry, Soil and Water Conservation, and Range Management Divisions, the MFLR can provide technical knowledge and practical/programmatic experience. • Domestic budget will be used for co-financing with GEF contribution. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leading technical agency. • Chair of Steering Committee. • Source of co-finance. • Provide guidance and technical support to communities and stakeholders. • Should actively participate in knowledge management and networking activities.
MAFS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasingly active in promoting on-farm soil and water conservation through soil fertility and soil structure management and conservation agriculture techniques. • Responsible for agricultural extension services for both croplands and livestock services • Responsible for promotion and advocacy of irrigation systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be an active member of project Steering Committee. • Provide guidance and technical support to communities and stakeholders. • Should actively participate in knowledge management and networking activities.
MoLGCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsible for guiding the decentralisation process and the establishment of the new local government system in Lesotho. • Consequently, responsible for assisting Community Councils' with their natural resource management role. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be an active member of project Steering Committee. Should actively participate in knowledge management and networking activities. • Should advise and facilitate Community Council's development of natural resource management bylaws, which must be approved by the Minister of Local Government. • Provide guidance and technical support to Community Councils.
Department of Environment nee National Environment Secretariat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy coordination role, with particular reference to Lesotho's global obligations and commitments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF Focal Point: key liaison role. • Member of Project Steering Committee.

UNDP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive experience of sustainable rural development strategies and challenges in Lesotho. • Experience of GEF project delivery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key agency for channeling and supervision of GEF resources and providing advice on GEF procedures. • Key member of project Steering Committee.
Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical expertise in agriculture and natural resources including vast technical and sociological experience conservation agriculture and other climate change adaptation initiatives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinator of conservation agriculture network. • Potential collaborator in networking and knowledge management, with particular reference to on-farm conservation agriculture.
NGOs and CSOs e.g. CARE; World Vision; RSDA; Serumula Development Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong technical and institutional expertise in LRP and related fields. • Detailed understanding of local development needs, opportunities and constraints. • Currently engaged in various natural resource management related activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members of Project Steering Committee. • Potential collaborators in LRP model development, training and knowledge management/ networking activities. • Should actively participate in policy reviews.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

National and Local Benefits

The LDCF-financed project will address the problems of land degradation, poverty and vulnerability of the Basotho to climate change in the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin. Community and District Councils will also be assisted to mainstream climate change considerations into local development strategies. These interventions will directly contribute to the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) 7: “ensure environmental sustainability” – Target 7A: “integrate the principle of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources.” Because local communities depend on natural resources for their livelihoods, improved environmental management will reduce poverty and increase food security, thereby contributing to attaining MDG 1: “eradicate extreme poverty and hunger” as well as other MDGs that are closely linked to the natural resource base. Additionally, training communities to rehabilitate and manage ecosystems in a climate-smart manner will increase their resilience to climate shocks as well as improve their livelihoods through greater income-generating opportunities. The project will therefore contribute to reducing poverty in the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils of the Mohale’s Hoek District.

Without the project, local communities and the ecosystems upon which they depend will be increasingly at risk from the impacts of climate change. As a result, progress towards poverty reduction and socio-economic development is likely to be hampered. The project will provide practical tools, technologies and capacities for an adaptation programme that promotes ecosystem management by communities. Households will be trained to implement climate-smart rehabilitation. This will be done through practical demonstrations over 50,000 ha to improve the maintenance and enhancement of ecosystem functioning, integrity and resilience. At least 7,000 households in the Mohale’s Hoek District will directly benefit from LDCF resources. These benefits will accrue because improved soil quality and ground cover will lead to increased water infiltration and reduced run off, as well as a decrease in soil erosion. The combined effect of improved soil and vegetation cover will also increase rangeland productivity. Strengthening the livelihood assets on which communities depend – such as rangelands – safeguards household income as households are less prone to – and in a better position to recover from – climate-induced disasters. In addition, the project will upscale the lessons learned to enable replication elsewhere in Lesotho.⁵

⁵ Scaling up of the project initiatives over 200,000 ha will upscale the benefits to potentially cover 50,000 households throughout the country.
GEF5 CEO Endorsement Template-February 2013.doc

The immediate benefits of the project will be that government institutions, NGOs and vulnerable communities have increased adaptive capacity as they: i) are more aware of the linkages between climate resilience and ecosystem management; and ii) acquire the necessary skills to apply adaptive approaches. This increased capacity will also support long-term benefits by promoting adaptation planning beyond the life-span of the project.

Gender and youth considerations

Youth considerations.

In Lesotho, the youth (people between the ages of 15 and 35) unemployment rate is 34%⁶. Youth currently make up a large portion of the LRP workforce, and will continue to do so under the LDCF-financed project. To encourage youth participation, the project will adopt a consultative approach using recreational activities as a means to engage the youth in training and awareness-raising initiatives (see section 2.4).

Gender Considerations.

The GEF recognises that climate change can affect men and women in different ways, and adaptation efforts tend to be most effective when the gender perspectives are reflected in the climate change risk management solutions⁷. Gender is a complex issue in Lesotho, as the Bill of Rights of the Constitution prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex, but exempts customary law from the non-discriminatory principle⁸. Significant attempts have subsequently been made to redress the situation including the enactment of gender responsive laws such as the Capacity of Married Persons Act (2006). Consequently, there is increasing recognition for women as natural resource managers, evident in their greater leadership representation in structured community organisations⁹. The LDCF-funded project will build on and seek to alleviate gender disparities likely to be imposed by climate change regimes on natural resource based livelihoods.

In alignment with the rights-based approach to development put forward by Lesotho's Gender and Development Policy, the LDCF-financed project will identify opportunities to increase youth and female participation in the project's activities and decision-making processes. These will include:

- Inclusion of youth and gender-disaggregated indicators and targets in the result framework of the project, specifically for participation at government and community training workshops, demonstration activities and management committees.
- Targeting of gender- and youth-differentiated vulnerabilities into project interventions so that the most climate vulnerable groups within a community receive support from the LDCF-financed project.
- Participation of stakeholders in the MoGYS throughout project planning and implementation to ensure that youth and gender considerations are appropriately mainstreamed into project activities.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

The activities of the LDCF-financed project have been designed to be cost-effective. In order to reduce costs and to avoid duplication, the LDCF-financed project will pursue an active partnership strategy with other ongoing initiatives, including projects such as those funded through the GEF SGP and collaborative synergy with NGOs on the ground. Through this collaboration, the LDCF-financed project will build on the lessons learned and best practices from past and current projects and ensure that cost-effectiveness is included as a selection criteria for identification of appropriate adaptation practices and implementation protocols.

Interventions under Component 1 form a package of enabling activities designed to strengthen the GoL's capacity for assessing, analysing and addressing climate change. Enhancing the GoL's capacity will support improved decision-making at the policy-level. Additionally, the project will take a comprehensive multi-sectoral approach to

⁶ http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/ourwork/povertyreduction/projects_and_initiatives/projects_lesotho/ (Accessed on 4 September 2014)

⁷ GEF programming strategy on adaptation to climate change for the Least Developed Countries Fund and the Special Climate Change Fund (2014)

⁸ African Development Bank (2005) Kingdom of Lesotho: Multi-sector country Gender Profile

⁹ Shackelton, S and Campbell, B (2000) Empowering Communities to Manage Natural Resources: Case Studies from Southern Africa
GEF5 CEO Endorsement Template-February 2013.doc

addressing capacity constraints in Lesotho, rather than focusing on a single sector. Furthermore, facilitation of an economy-wide approach to reducing climate vulnerability will promote more sustainable and efficient management of climate risks.

The LDCF-financed project will enhance and make use of existing national and sub-national structures where possible. For example, the BOS' EESU will coordinate data collection and analyses undertaken by ministerial GIS units as well as host the geo-based agro-ecological and hydrological database established under Output 1.1. The project will also utilise the MFLR's planning unit as the nucleus of the socio-economic unit. Increasing the capacity of existing agencies will reduce project costs, strengthen institutional buy-in and increase the potential for project approaches and newly capacitated staff to be integrated into departments, ministries and institutions beyond project termination. This will contribute to an enabling environment for integrating climate change adaptation into long-term planning.

The LDCF-financed project focuses on building adaptive capacity and the use of both hard and soft adaptation measures that are locally appropriate. The use of exclusively hard infrastructure – such as check dams, gabions and stone lines – was rejected for various reasons. Firstly, hard adaptation measures are considerably more expensive than softer measures like ecosystem management. Therefore, the exclusive implementation of hard interventions would result in fewer interventions being implemented and consequently fewer beneficiaries. Secondly, hard interventions may have unintended negative consequences such as transferring local risks up- or down-stream. Finally, hard interventions often have a focus on preventing damage from climate change and disaster events rather than reducing the risk of these occurring. Instead, a mix of hard and soft climate-smart ecosystem-based rehabilitation and management adaptation interventions were proposed. These interventions will be thoroughly assessed and costed by the socio-economic unit established under Output 1.2. Examples of these soft climate-smart ecosystem-based rehabilitation and management adaptation interventions include: conservation agriculture, agro-forestry, inter-cropping, water harvesting and drip irrigation. The use of both hard and soft adaptation interventions, is expected to prove less costly and provide protection to more beneficiaries than the exclusive implementation of hard infrastructure.

Costs were determined for small-scale, on-the-ground adaptation measures identified through consultations undertaken with community members as well as other national and sub-national stakeholders. Using a community-based approach to adaptation – while ensuring that development plans are informed by science and local knowledge – empowers vulnerable communities to plan for and adapt to the impacts of climate change. Interventions proposed in the project were selected based on available knowledge of proven or promising adaptation technologies. Furthermore, project activities will be informed by the expertise of relevant GoL institutions – such as the MFLR and MAFS – to ensure their suitability to the local context. For example, the MFLR and MAFS will provide guidance on the most appropriate trees to plant in the 'greening the village' and 'greening the gullies' activities as well as supervision and skills development for management of drip irrigation sites.

In addition, the effectiveness of these activities in reducing vulnerability to climate change will be tested and measured – through socio-economic and cost-benefit analyses – during the course of the project. The most successful activities will be prioritised for up-scaling to neighbouring communities. Furthermore, details regarding their implementation will be widely disseminated at workshops and training events undertaken by this project.

The project aims to reach approximately 7,000 households. These households will directly benefit from initiatives that focus on reducing climate vulnerability through community livelihood enhancement. Crop insurance was identified as a potential solution to compensate farmers for losses incurred through climate-induced natural disasters. However, such insurance mechanisms are reliant on inter alia: i) comprehensive climate monitoring systems that are explicitly linked to crop yields; ii) the ability of farmers to pay insurance premiums; and iii) the willingness and ability of government to subsidise insurance premiums. The implementation of such an insurance scheme was deemed unfeasible for Lesotho for a number of reasons. Firstly, there is insufficient capacity for climate monitoring that is directly linked to crop yields to inform if/when insurance pay-outs should occur. Secondly, the majority of farmers in Lesotho practice rainfed subsistence agriculture which leads to low levels of income. As such, they would be unable to service insurance premiums and would consequently be unable to participate in insurance schemes. Finally, the GoL is not able to subsidise insurance premiums to the extent required to implement

such a scheme. Based on this analysis, the LDCF-financed project will instead focus on diversifying and strengthening agricultural livelihoods to increase the income earned by subsistence farmers. The project will for example explore the possibility of value chains with low investment and high return such as fruit and honey production and processing. This will allow farmers to increase their savings and/or further invest in productive assets, thereby strengthening their capacity to recover from climate shocks.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
Inception Workshop and Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Manager UNDP CO, UNDP CCA 	Indicative cost: 30,000	Within first two months of project start up
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP CCA RTA/Project Manager will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members. 	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop.	Start, mid and end of project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required.
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on <i>output and implementation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oversight by Project Manager Project team 	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation.	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
ARR/PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project manager and team UNDP CO UNDP RTA UNDP EEG 	None	Annually
Periodic status/ progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project manager and team 	None	Quarterly
Mid-term Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project manager and team UNDP CO UNDP RCU External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	Indicative cost: 30,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project manager and team, UNDP CO UNDP RCU External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	Indicative cost : 30,000	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Project Terminal Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project manager and team UNDP CO local consultant 	0	At least three months before the end of the project
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP CO Project manager and team 	Indicative cost per year: 3,000	Yearly
Visits to field sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP CO UNDP RCU (as appropriate) Government representatives 	For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget	Yearly
TOTAL indicative COST Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		US\$ 93,000 (+/- 5% of total budget)	


PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

- A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):** (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Mr. Stanley M. Damane	Director of Department of Environment and GEF Operational Focal Point	MINISTRY OF TOURISM, ENVIRONMENT AND CULTURE	10/AUGUST/2012

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu, Executive Director, UNDP-GEF		Nov 26, 2014	Phemo K. Kgomotso, Regional Technical Specialist, Ecosystems and Biodiversity, Africa, UNDP-GEF	+2519 250 3309	phemo.kgomotso@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 achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD: <i>Outcome 2:</i> By 2017 Lesotho adopts environmental management practices that promote a low-carbon, climate-resilient economy and society, sustainably manages natural resources and reduces vulnerability to disasters.					
Country Programme Outcome indicators: Number of national/sectoral policies and strategies that promote low-carbon, climate resilient economy and society; number of national/sectoral policies that promote conservation of natural resources; and number of local communities that implement disaster risk reduction measures.					
Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one): Promote climate change adaptation					
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Programme: <i>CCA-1: Reducing Vulnerability:</i> Reduce vulnerability to the adverse impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level. <i>CCA-2: Increasing Adaptive Capacity:</i> Increase adaptive capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level.					
Applicable LDCF Expected Outcomes: <i>Outcome 1.2:</i> Reduced vulnerability in development sectors. <i>Outcome 2.3:</i> Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes at local level.					
Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: <i>Indicator 1.2.15:</i> Number of people benefitting from climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management practices through implementation of hard and soft measures to reduce vulnerability. <i>Indicator 2.3.1:</i> Targeted population groups participating in adaptation and risk reduction awareness activities.					
Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Source of verification	Risks and assumptions
Project Objective: To mainstream climate risk considerations in the Land Rehabilitation Programme of Lesotho for improved ecosystem resilience and reduced vulnerability of livelihoods to climate shocks.	The use of climate-driven vulnerabilities and cost-effective planning to inform the implementation of the Land Rehabilitation Programme.	Climate change risks are not integrated into the Land Rehabilitation Programme. Target sites are chosen on an <i>ad hoc</i> basis. Rehabilitation and management measures are not tailored to specific ecosystems.	Climate-driven vulnerabilities and cost-effective planning are used to inform site prioritisation of target sites and the implementation of appropriate climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures.	Climate driven vulnerability assessments and cost-benefit analysis Project implementation report Review of Land Rehabilitation Programme practices	
Outcome 1: Increased technical capacity of the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation and relevant departments to apply up-to-date climate science for the management of evolving risks and uncertainty linked to climate change.	Capacities of the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation and relevant departments to identify, prioritise, implement, monitor and evaluate adaptation measures.	Baseline estimated at a score of 3. Baseline to be verified during year 1 of project implementation.	Capacity increased to a score of 7. Target to be verified during year 1 of project implementation.	To capture evidence of the capacity of institutions to identify, prioritise, implement, monitor and evaluate adaptation measures, a scoring methodology that considers the following five criteria, expressed as questions: (a) Does the institution have access to and does it make use of climate information in decision-making? (b) Are climate change risks as well as appropriate adaptation strategies and	Assumptions The geo-based, climatic, agro-ecological and hydrological information system established during the project will support climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures. Trainees leave training with improved capacity. Risks The geo-based agro-ecological, climatic and hydrological

				<p>measures integrated into relevant institutional policies, processes and procedures?</p> <p>(c) Does the institution have adequate resources to implement such policies, processes and procedures?</p> <p>(d) Are there clear roles and responsibilities within the institution, and effective partnerships outside the institution to address adaptation?</p> <p>(e) Is the institution equipped to monitor, evaluate and learn from its adaptation actions?</p> <p>Each question is answered with an assessment and score for the extent to which the associated criterion has not been met: not at all (=0), partially (=1) or to a large extent/completely (=2). An overall score is calculated, with a maximum score of 10 given five criteria.</p>	<p>information system is not sustained beyond the lifetime of the project.</p> <p>Poor uptake of training on climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures</p>
Output 1.1	A geo-based climatic, agro-ecological and hydrological information system formulated, tested in pilot area and ready for upscaling to the rest of the districts in Lesotho.	Lack of a coordinated information system that compiles GIS information on climatic, agro-ecological and hydrological variables.	By the end of the first year, a geo-based climatic, agro-ecological and hydrological information system developed.	Maps and vulnerability assessments generated utilising the geo-based climatic, agro-ecological and hydrological information system.	
Output 1.2	A socio-economics unit is established within the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation.	No dedicated unit considering social capital issues in the selection of intervention methods.	By the end of the first year, a socio-economics unit is established.	Socio-economics unit Project implementation report Assessments Cost benefit-analysis	
Output 1.3	Number of climate-driven vulnerability assessments and cost-benefit analyses of specific adaptation interventions undertaken for each of the selected Community Councils.	No rigorous assessments of climate-driven vulnerability or cost benefit analyses of climate change adaptation interventions undertaken at the level of Community Councils.	By the end of the first year, at least 1 climate-driven vulnerability assessment and 1 cost-benefit analysis of specific adaptation interventions undertaken for each of the Community Councils identified.	Project implementation report	
Output 1.4	Number of technical guidelines on climate	No guidelines on climate change adaptation	By the end of the first year, at least 1 technical guideline	Technical guidelines Project implementation report	

	change adaptation interventions identified for the selected Community Councils.	interventions have been developed for the selected Community Councils.	on climate change adaptation interventions produced for the selected Community Councils.		
Outcome 2: Communities empowered with skills, knowledge, partnerships and institutions for managing natural resources to reduce vulnerability to climate change and increase resilience of natural and social capital (over 7,000 households with potential for upscaling to cover over 20,000).	% change in climate change vulnerability index in targeted populations. % change in targeted population's awareness of predicted adverse impacts of climate change.	Baseline climate change vulnerability index scores will be determined during year one of project implementation. Baseline climate change awareness (CCA) index scores are low. CCA index scores will be determined during year one of project implementation.	At least 10% reduction in climate change vulnerability index scores. Target to be verified during year one of project implementation. At least 10% increase in CCA index scores. Target to be verified during year one of project implementation.	Methodologies for both climate change awareness and vulnerability indices will be developed during year one of project implementation.	Assumptions Communities see climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures as desirable given development imperatives as well as lifestyle preferences, and support project interventions. Chiefs support project interventions and facilitate roll out within their constituencies. Risks Communities are unwilling to adopt new climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures. Chiefs in target areas unwilling to support project interventions. High staff turnover and poor institutional memory result in disruptions or delays in project implementation and coordination.
Output 2.1	Number of technical staff trained in climate change adaptation, including restoring and managing ecosystems and agro-ecological landscapes.	Technical staff of the District Technical Teams, Regional Council staff and land managers have received limited training on climate change adaptation.	Within the first year of the project, at least 50 technical staff of the District Technical Teams, District and Community Council staff and land managers trained in climate change adaptation, including restoring and managing ecosystems and agro-ecological landscapes. Trainees must include representatives from the Mohale's Hoek District and the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils.	Field visits Surveys Project implementation report	
Output 2.2	Number of training sessions conducted and participants within the engineering, planning and monitoring sections of the MFLR trained in climate science.	Engineering, planning and monitoring sections of the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation have received limited training on climate science.	By project end-point 10 staff within the engineering, planning and monitoring sections of the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation have attended workshops on climate science.	Training course reports, attendance lists and completed evaluation forms Project implementation reports	
Output 2.3	Number of households participating in training programmes on implementation of climate-smart ecosystem	Local communities and households have limited capacity to plan, implement and maintain climate-smart	By project end-point at least 7,000 households trained in the implementation and maintenance of climate-smart ecosystem	Training course reports, attendance lists and completed evaluation forms	

	rehabilitation and management measures.	ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures.	rehabilitation and management measures.		
Output 2.4	An inter-council land rehabilitation committee established and operational.	No inter-council land rehabilitation committees are in operation.	By project mid-point at least 1 inter-council land rehabilitation committees established. By project end-point, a minimum of 8 inter-council land rehabilitation committee meetings held.	Council records Project implementation report	
Output 2.5	Finalised strategy for maintaining technical capacity of relevant departments and agencies.	There is no strategy for maintaining the technical capacity of relevant departments and agencies.	By project mid-point, a strategy for maintaining technical capacity is developed. By project end-point, the strategy for maintaining technical capacity is implemented.	Finalised Strategy	
Outcome 3: Over 50,000 ha of land across the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin rehabilitated through operationalization of the climate-smart Land Rehabilitation Programme.	1. The number of ha of land successfully protected, better managed and rehabilitated under the climate-smart Land Rehabilitation Programme.	Baseline and target to be established during implementation.	By project end-point, at least 50,000 ha of land in the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin under climate-smart LRP.	Field visits and physical assessments Data collection at project sites Project implementation reports	Assumptions Cost-effective climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures will be identified. Risks Climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures are not cost-effective.
Output 3.1	Number of households across three Community Councils adopting climate-smart livelihood strategies.	The number of households adopting climate-smart livelihood strategies will be determined during implementation.	At least 7,000 households engaging in climate change adaptation activities, including climate-smart farming or agro-forestry practices.	M&E Strategy Field visits and physical assessments Data collection at project sites Project implementation report	
	Appropriate climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions identified, including inter alia conservation, agro-forestry and water harvesting for the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba Mokhele Community Councils.	Climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions are not currently implemented in the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils.	By project end-point at least 50% of conventional management systems are replaced by climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions implemented in the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils.	Field visits and physical assessments Data collection at project sites	
Output 3.2	Number of functioning long-term monitoring field sites established at intervention sites for	Monitoring is limited to recording of outputs from quarterly and annual reports – because the LRP has no	By project end-point, at least 3 long-term monitoring sites – including a control, experiment and	M&E Strategy Field visits and physical assessments Data collection at project sites	

	measuring the effects of climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions on relevant ecosystem services.	Monitoring and Evaluation Unit.	benchmark – established within each of the agro-ecological zones – the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin.	Project implementation report	
Outcome 4: National strategies for rangelands and wetlands management strengthened by the integration of climate change/variability and ecosystems management.	Number of briefs on suggested policy revisions to the rangeland and wetland management strategies developed by the LDCF-financed project to address climate change and ecosystem management.	National strategies do not adequately include climate risk considerations.	By project end-point, at least two policy briefs developed that include recommendations for the incorporation of climate risk considerations into each of the national rangeland and wetland management strategies.	Review of recommendations for national strategies Revised/updated national strategies with specific sections on climate change adaptation policy Project implementation report	Assumptions Recommendations for policies, strategies and plans will be accepted and mainstreamed. Risks Policies, strategies and plans are not accepted by decision-makers or local communities and cannot be enforced
Outcome 5: NSDP mainstreamed into local development strategies to support the constituency-wide adoption of the climate-smart Land Rehabilitation Programme	Climate change adaptation (as provided for in the NSDP) integrated into local development strategies. (adapted from AMAT 1.1.1)	Development strategies do not adequately include climate change (as provided for in the NSDP).	By project end-point, climate change adaptation is integrated into local policy processes and development strategies. (A score of 2= integrated to a large extent/completely)	The extent to which climate change adaptation (as provided for in the NSDP) is integrated into local development strategies will be scored as follows: not at all (=0), partially (=1) or to a large extent/completely (=2).	Assumptions Recommendations for sectoral policies, strategies and plans will be accepted and mainstreamed. Risks Sectoral ministries are unwilling to adopt recommendations on policies.
Output 5.1	Appropriate coordination strategy – tailored for inter-ministerial and departmental coordination at all levels – is clearly defined.	No strategy in place to ensure coordination between national and district development teams	By project mid-point, a coordination strategy is clearly defined. By project end-point, the coordination strategy is implemented.	Coordination strategy Project implementation report	
Output 5.2	Local policies across productive sectors – agriculture, infrastructure and rural development – revised to include best practices and budgets for climate-smart interventions. (adapted from AMAT 1.1.1.2)	Policies do not adequately refer to climate risk considerations.	By project end-point, at least one policy brief developed for each productive sector – agriculture, infrastructure and rural development – to include identified best practices and budgets for climate-smart interventions	Policy briefs Budgets Project implementation report	
Output 5.3	Number of policy briefs for design, appraisal and approval processes for council, district and communal development plans for Mphahle's Hoek District and in each of the Community Councils.	There is no programmatic approach to mainstreaming climate risk considerations into development plans.	By project mid-point, at least one policy brief to be developed for the integration of climate risk considerations into the Mphahle's Hoek District Plan. By project end-point, at least one policy brief	Policy briefs Project implementation report	

			developed for each productive sector – agriculture, infrastructure and rural development – to include identified best practices and budgets for climate-smart interventions. By project mid-point, at least one policy brief to be developed for the integration of climate risk considerations into the Mohale's Hoek District Plan.		
Output 5.4	Number of people trained by the LDCF-financed project on climate-resilient construction; land use and water resources planning; climate risk problems; and risk reduction and management measures.	Limited training has been conducted on climate-resilient construction; land use and water resources planning; climate risk problems; and risk reduction and management measures.	By project end-point, at least 1000 people trained. Trainees must include representatives from local authorities; district planning units; structural engineers; urban and rural infrastructure planners; officers of the Ministry of Development Planning, Ministry of Finance; and teaching staff from technical colleges and vocational training institutes.	Climate change adaptation modules for training courses	
Output 5.5	Best practices identified and guidelines developed for climate-smart land management in the Khoelenya, Lithipeng and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils.	No guidelines for best practices and climate-smart land management.	By project end-point, guidelines developed for best practices and climate-smart land management in the Khoelenya, Lithipeng and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils.	Developed guidelines	

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).

GEF SEC Comments			
Question	Comment	Response	Reference
(5) Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Not clear. Recommended action: Please demonstrate that UNDP has the relevant experience and capacity required to implement the investments and cash-for-work activities proposed under Component 1.	UNDP has a successful track record of implementing the Small Grants Program in Lesotho since 2007 and has a fully-fledged Country Program with a portfolio of 16 projects implemented by 16 local NGOs/CBOs at a total grant amount of USD 5000,000. In addition, UNDP will collaborate with credible NGOs/CBOs who will implement the cash for work program on the ground; UNDP will provide administrative and financial management support to the selected local groups.	Para 59, page 19
(13) Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDC/SCCF/ funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	With respect to component 1, the PIF proposes a wide array of pilot investments aiming to enhance the land rehabilitation programme. The cost effectiveness of this approach, vis-à-vis a focus on fewer priority adaptation measures should be discussed. Recommended action: Please consider focusing Output 3 on fewer priority investments, or justify the proposed approach.	The scope of the project has been reduced from covering 2 pilot sites in each of the 80 constituencies where the baseline land rehabilitation programme is under implementation to covering just 30 villages in total; reducing the potential area from 200,000ha to about 100,00 ha. The PIF targets over 50,000 ha of land under climate-smart Land Rehabilitation Programme spread across the 30 constituencies and benefiting over 20,000 households. During the PPG phase, these figures were reduced further because the notion of covering 30 constituencies and 50 villages is not in accord with the demographic realities on the ground. The project will cover over 50,000 ha of land within three constituencies benefiting approximately 7,000 households. The household densities do not allow for covering 20,000 households per 50,000 ha.	Para 50-52, page 17 Annexure 9
(15) Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Upon addressing the recommendations under section 13, please provide a clear description of the adaptation benefits.	The project will increase the effectiveness of the baseline being invested by the government on land rehabilitation and policy implementation (related to rangeland management and rural development), by increasing the resilience of the natural resources and ecosystems to climate-induced disasters; thereby reducing the vulnerability of the people dependent on these resources to climate variability and change. The LDCF portion of the project will finance the additional costs of maintaining natural assets and related agro-ecological and hydrological services essential to sustaining the productivity of the natural resources in the face of climate change.	Para 47-49, page 16 Para 173-180, page 43-44 Para 185-189, page 45-46
Germany comments			
Question	Comment	Response	
N/A	The proposed project activities focus mainly on the central level. In our view, the role of the District Coordination Offices should be more strongly reflected in the proposal. We recommend reviewing the	The project will support the decentralisation of functions through the establishment of an institutional framework and capacity development of local authorities. The capacity of DCOs to integrate climate risks into existing planning and budgeting processes will be strengthened at district and local levels through the following activities:	

	<p>outputs with a view to identifying further entry points at local and district level.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity 2.4.1: Develop an organisational strategy for the establishment of inter-council land rehabilitation committees. • Activity 2.4.4: Facilitate the establishment of a policy advocacy programme on environmental issues. • Activity 5.1.1: Review institutional arrangements and prepare recommendations to improve coordination of decision-making processes and project management by DCOs, as well as the extension officers from inter alia the MFLR and MAFS. • Activity 5.1.2: Develop innovative institutional mechanisms to increase collaboration through improved coordination of DCOs. • Activity 5.2.2: Develop guidelines to support the integration of climate risks and ecosystem management into the design and approval processes of local development programmes, plans and activities. • Activity 5.3.1: Create a discussion forum to facilitate dialogue on climate change adaptation between district and community council stakeholders. <p>The management arrangements provide for the establishment of a District Project Steering Committee and a District Project Implementation Committee. Both of these committees will include representatives from relevant line ministries, district officials, Community Council representatives, the PMU and NGOs. The DCOs will also be actively involved in the management of the project as representatives on the Technical Advisory Committee.</p>	<p>Para 90-92, page 26</p> <p>Para 103-106, page 28-29</p> <p>Para 150-161, page 35-39</p>
N/A	<p>In addition to the relevant on-going initiatives mentioned in the PIF, we would like to draw attention to the EU program “Deepening Decentralization and Non-State Actors Support” which may offer synergies to improve local provision of environmental services (e.g. water, firewood, erosion control and maintenance of soil fertility through land use which considers climate change impacts).</p>	<p>The project will pursue an active partnership strategy with other ongoing initiatives, for example the EU Program, and collaborative synergies with NGOs on the ground. Through this collaboration the project will build on the lessons learned and best practices from past and current projects.</p>	
USA comments			
Question	Comment	Response	
N/A	<p>Clarify how it will ensure the sustainability of GIS training in-country and how</p>	<p>The project will develop a strategy to build technical capacity and GIS skills within the various GIS units through the following activities:</p>	

	technicians might transfer their knowledge further (e.g. through peer-training approaches) as these skills are in high demand in the region. The retention of people with new GIS capacity could be one indicator of the long-term sustainability GIS trainings and success of the project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity 1.1.5: Undertake a capacity assessment to identify gaps in staffing and skills of the GIS units. • Activity 1.1.6: Develop a strategy to build technical capacity to enable comprehensive analysis of climate data through both on-the-job training and hiring of additional qualified staff. • Activity 1.1.7: Train the various GIS units, relevant line ministries and departments as well as institutions on climate science. 	Para 67-74, page 21-23
	Clarify how much, and what type of capacity in GIS will be required to complete the project as currently proposed. Will enough skilled staff be available in time for the project to be completed?	Training sessions on GIS for technical staff from the MFLR, BOS, LMS, MAFS and MEMWA will be provided to approximately 14 individuals over a two year period. The MoLGCA subscribes to a training institution in Nairobi, Kenya. This institution gives specialised courses in GIS and Remote Sensing for up to six months.	Para 67-74, pages 21-23
N/A	Involve other relevant government ministries in program design. The proposal appropriately places emphasis on the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation. In addition, we suggest that UNDP consult and work with other government stakeholders, particularly the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Development Planning (as the project focuses on strategic planning for climate change) and the Ministry of Agriculture.	<p>The MFLR is the lead government agency in implementing the LDCF-financed project. However, they will work in close collaboration with various ministries – who are all represented on the National Project Steering Committee, including <i>inter alia</i>: MFLR; Chief Economic Planner, Mohale's Hoek DCO; MAFS: Planning; and MLGCA: Land Use Planning.</p> <p>In addition, the District Project Steering Committee will include the District Economic Planner. The District Project Implementation Committee will also include representatives from the Community Council Physical Planners.</p>	Para 197-202, pages 69-70
N/A	Clarify how it will communicate results, lessons learned and best practices identified throughout the project to the various stakeholders both during and after the project	<p>The project will disseminate information and lessons learned through the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity 1.4.2: Disseminate technical guidelines to relevant line ministries departments, institutions and other. • Activity 2.1.6: Develop and disseminate easily comprehensible, user-friendly literature on climate change adaptation and monitoring for NGOs, CBOs and land managers. • Activity 2.3.4: Host local community discussion forums to share lessons learned on climate change adaptation experiences. • Activity 2.3.5: Use local media – including radio – to target specific audiences with appropriate ecosystem management information. • Activity 5.2.4: Update the relevant line ministries on a quarterly basis regarding progress in promoting and integrating climate change into sectoral policies. 	<p>Para 85, page 24</p> <p>Para 93-96, pages 26-27</p> <p>Para 99-102, pages 27-28</p> <p>Para 156-159, page 38</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity 5.5.1: Publish guideline documents in local languages. • Activity 5.5.2: Conduct a public awareness campaign using local media to inform local populations on the effects of climate change and appropriate adaptation measures. • Activity 5.5.3: Adopt experiential learning methods by facilitating the establishment of Farmer Field Schools. • Activity 5.5.4: Coordinate field visits and study tours to publicize project activities' and lessons learnt from implementation experience. • Activity 5.5.5: Collate and synthesise lessons learned and best practices from project results. • Activity 5.5.6: Best practices and lessons learned under Activity 5.5.5 to be disseminated nationally through the Lesotho SLM Platform. • Activity 5.5.7: Best practices and documentation to be shared globally via the UNDP's Adaptation Learning Mechanism and wikiADAPT, as well as the Global Adaptation Network and the Africa Adaptation Knowledge Network. 	Para 165-170, pages 39-40
N/A	Outline how it will engage users, including women, farmers and herders, in the development and implementation of the program. Paragraph 37 of page 12 indicates that the stakeholder engagement process will consists of a "strategic environmental assessment, including vulnerability and resilience analysis to identify threats to ecosystem resilience and the associate production systems." It is unclear as to how a strategic environmental assessment is an effective stakeholder engagement mechanism, or how it will affect changes in traditional practices that threaten the provision of agro-ecological and hydrological services. As a result, we request UNDP to demonstrate how the project intends to utilise effective and locally appropriate stakeholder engagement methods.	<p>The SEA is merely one of the aspects of the proposed project which will include stakeholder engagement. In these circumstances, stakeholders will be consulted during the vulnerability analysis through, for example surveys detailing the perceived vulnerability and understanding of climate change by the local communities. In addition, there will be several other means of engaging with stakeholders throughout the project duration.</p> <p>By way of example, the project will implement training and capacity building that will include adaptive management practices to prepare communities to assume responsibility for management of the project's interventions through the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity 2.3.4: Host local community discussion forums to share lessons learned on climate change adaptation experiences. • Activity 2.3.5: Use local media – including radio – to target specific audiences with appropriate ecosystem management information. • Activity 5.5.1: Publish guideline documents in local languages. • Activity 5.5.3: Adopt experiential learning methods by facilitating the establishment of Farmer Field Schools. • Activity 5.5.4: Coordinate field visits and study tours to publicize project activities' and lessons learnt from implementation experience. These field visits will include school and youth groups who will be 	<p>Para 99-102, pages 27-28</p> <p>Para 165-170, pages 39-40</p>

		encouraged to participate in various activities and competitions.	
--	--	---	--

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS¹⁰

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF:			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Total	0	0	0

*GEF funds were not used for the PPG.

¹⁰ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.