



GEF-6 REQUEST FOR PROJECT ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Climate-Smart Agriculture for Climate-Resilient Livelihoods (CSARL)			
Country(ies):	Swaziland	GEF Project ID: ¹	9133
GEF Agency(ies):	IFAD	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Agriculture (MOA), Swaziland Water and Agriculture Development Enterprise (SWADE), Swaziland Environment Authority, Swaziland Meteorological Service	Submission Date:	20 April 2016
GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi-focal Areas	Project Duration (Months)	72 Months
Integrated Approach Pilot	IAP-Cities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Commodities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Food Security <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Corporate Program: SGP <input type="checkbox"/>	
Name of Parent Program	Fostering Sustainability and Resilience for Food Security in Sub-Saharan Africa	Agency Fee (\$)	648,991

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK AND OTHER PROGRAM STRATEGIES²

Focal Area Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co- financing
LD-1 Program 1 (select) (select)	1.1: Improved agricultural, rangeland and pastoral management 1.2: Functionality and cover of agro-ecosystems maintained	GEFTF	500,000	3,000,000
LD-1 Program 2 (select) (select)	1.3: Increased investments in SLM	GEFTF	416,944	3,000,000
LD-3 Program 4 (select) (select)	3.1: Support mechanisms for SLM in wider landscapes established 3.2: Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities based on gender sensitive needs 3.3: Increased investments in integrated landscape management	GEFTF	781,365	5,400,000
LD-4 Program 5 (select) (select)	4.1: SLM mainstreamed in development investments and value chains across multiple scales 4.2: Innovative mechanisms for multi-stakeholder planning and investments in SLM at scale	GEFTF	916,943	6,000,000
BD-4 Program 9 (select) (select)	9.1 Increased area of production landscapes and seascapes that integrate conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into management.	GEFTF	450,115	3,000,000
CCM-2 Program 3	Promote conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks in forest, and other land-use, and support climate smart agriculture	GEFTF	540,137	3,600,000
IAP-Food Security	Increased sustainability and resilience of food production systems and value chains to enhance food security in Sub- Saharan Africa	GEFTF	3,605,505	24,000,000
Total project costs			7,211,009	48,000,000

¹ Project ID number remains the same as the assigned PIF number.

² When completing Table A, refer to the excerpts on [GEF 6 Results Frameworks for GETF, LDCF and SCCF](#).

--	--	--	--

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

Project Objective: Smallholder households (disaggregated by wealth, gender and age) in the Project Chiefdoms sustainably enhance food and nutrition security and incomes from through diversified climate resilient agricultural production and market-linkages						
Project Components/ Programs	Financing Type ³	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
					GEF Project Financing	Confirmed Co- financing
Chiefdom Development Planning capacity	TA	Chiefdom Development Planning process institutionalised in three of the four Regions	1.1 Improved institutional framework for development planning at Chiefdom-level 1.2 Chiefdom Development Plans formulated 1.3 Chiefdom human-, water- and land resources allocated to planned development activities	GEFTF	827,500	4,630,671
Sustainable Land and Water Management (SLWM) practices at multiple scales	TA	Sustainable land management applied at multiple scales across 37 Chiefdomships in three regions	2.1 SLWM at or above Chiefdom level 2.2 SLWM of communal lands 2.3 SLWM at farm and household level	GEFTF	5,591,505	35,193,106
National capacity to monitor and refine sustainable land management policies and programmes for achieving convention targets	TA	National capacity to design, implement, monitor and refine SLWM policies and programmes to meet Swaziland's convention targets; and to share lessons nationally and regionally.	3.1 Regular surveillance of land degradation and ecosystem health processes interventions 3.2 Improved institutional framework for Chiefdom Development Planning 3.3 A dynamic body of knowledge on sustainable land management jointly developed and used by research, policy- and development agencies	GEFTF	749,504	2,222,723
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
Subtotal					7,168,509	42,046,500
Project Management Cost (PMC) ⁴				GEFTF	42,500	5,953,500

³ Financing type can be either investment or technical assistance.

Total project costs		7,211,009	48,000,000
----------------------------	--	-----------	------------

C. CONFIRMED SOURCES OF CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY NAME AND BY TYPE

Please include evidence for co-financing for the project with this form.

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Cofinancing	Amount (\$)
GEF Agency	IFAD	Grants	500,000
Recipient Government	Government of Swaziland through its loan from IFAD (SMLP)	Loans	9,600,000
Recipient Government	Government of Swaziland – Departmental Budgets (SMLP)	In-kind	7,200,000
Beneficiaries	Farmers and communities (SMLP)	In-kind	800,000
Recipient Government	GOS Programmes Attachment 9.3	Loans	17,050,400
Private Sector	NAMBOARD	Guarantees	2,297,000
Recipient Government	MTAD - 11 Tindkundla	Grants	10,552,600
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
Total Co-financing			48,000,000

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES) AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country Name/Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)	Agency Fee ^{a)} (b) ²	Total (c)=a+b
IFAD	GEF TF	Country	Land Degradation	IAP-Food Security	2,619,841	235,786	2,855,625
IFAD	GEF TF	Country	Biodiversity	IAP-Food Security	450,114	40,510	490,625
IFAD	GEF TF	Country	Climate Change	IAP-Food Security	540,137	48,612	588,750
IFAD	GEF TF	IAP-Food Security incentive	IAP Set Aside	IAP-Food Security	3,600,917	324,083	3,925,00
(select)	(select)		(select)	(select as applicable)			0
(select)	(select)		(select)	(select as applicable)			0
(select)	(select)		(select)	(select as applicable)			0
(select)	(select)		(select)	(select as applicable)			0
(select)	(select)		(select)	(select as applicable)			0
(select)	(select)		(select)	(select as applicable)			0
Total Grant Resources					7,211,009	648,991	7,860,000

a) Refer to the Fee Policy for GEF Partner Agencies

⁴ For GEF Project Financing up to \$2 million, PMC could be up to 10% of the subtotal; above \$2 million, PMC could be up to 5% of the subtotal. PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project financing amount in Table D below.

E. PROJECT'S TARGET CONTRIBUTIONS TO GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS⁵

Provide the expected project targets as appropriate.

Corporate Results	Replenishment Targets	Project Targets
1. Maintain globally significant biodiversity and the ecosystem goods and services that it provides to society	Improved management of landscapes and seascapes covering 300 million hectares	92500 hectares
2. Sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture, rangelands, and forest landscapes)	120 million hectares under sustainable land management	31630 hectares
3. Promotion of collective management of transboundary water systems and implementation of the full range of policy, legal, and institutional reforms and investments contributing to sustainable use and maintenance of ecosystem services	Water-food-ecosystems security and conjunctive management of surface and groundwater in at least 10 freshwater basins;	Number of freshwater basins
	20% of globally over-exploited fisheries (by volume) moved to more sustainable levels	Percent of fisheries, by volume
4. Support to transformational shifts towards a low-emission and resilient development path	750 million tons of CO _{2e} mitigated (include both direct and indirect)	1302528 metric tons
5. Increase in phase-out, disposal and reduction of releases of POPs, ODS, mercury and other chemicals of global concern	Disposal of 80,000 tons of POPs (PCB, obsolete pesticides)	metric tons
	Reduction of 1000 tons of Mercury	metric tons
	Phase-out of 303.44 tons of ODP (HCFC)	ODP tons
6. Enhance capacity of countries to implement MEAs (multilateral environmental agreements) and mainstream into national and sub-national policy, planning financial and legal frameworks	Development and sectoral planning frameworks integrate measurable targets drawn from the MEAs in at least 10 countries	Number of Countries:
	Functional environmental information systems are established to support decision-making in at least 10 countries	Number of Countries: 1

F. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? (Select)

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF Trust Fund) in Annex D.

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF⁶

⁵ Update the applicable indicators provided at PIF stage. Progress in programming against these targets for the projects per the Corporate Results Framework in the [GEF-6 Programming Directions](#), will be aggregated and reported during mid-term and at the conclusion of the replenishment period.

⁶ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF, no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

A.1. *Project Description*. Elaborate on: 1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed; 2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects, 3) the proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area⁷ strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project, 4) [incremental/additional cost reasoning](#) and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, and [co-financing](#); 5) [global environmental benefits](#) (GEFTF) and/or [adaptation benefits](#) (LDCF/SCCF); and 6) innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up.

I. Global environmental issues, root causes and barriers (See Appendix 1 in PDR)

1. Poverty and food insecurity are endemic in Swaziland, and especially affect smallholder farmers in Chiefdoms on Swazi Nation Land (SNL; i.e. communal rural areas). Among the complex causes of poverty and food deficiency, two reasons stand out. The first – predominantly addressed by the IFAD financed Smallholder Market-Led Project (SMLP) that will serve as the baseline – is the poor integration of the smallholder agricultural sector into local and national markets for agricultural products. The second reason – which will be addressed by CSARL – is the fragile natural resource base, which is vulnerable to climate change and ongoing degradation.

2. Swaziland Nation Land is communally utilised, under the jurisdiction of the Chiefdoms, and this generally provides little incentive for farmers to invest in sustainable land and water management. Many livestock areas are overgrazed, and forest areas under threat. Rural households remain trapped in poverty and are becoming ever more vulnerable with the increasing impacts of land degradation and climate change (Intended Nationally Determined Contribution, INDC. Swaziland Government, Ministry Of Tourism And Environmental Affairs, 2015).

3. Land degradation has been recognized as a threat in Swaziland for at least a century, and the problem continues despite various development efforts (e.g. large-scale application of contour grass strips in the 1950s). The main drivers of degradation are increasing human population, soil nutrient mining within farmlands, growing livestock populations on communally grazed rangelands, land tenure arrangements and deforestation. To this list can be added the more recently acknowledged impacts of climate change. Land degradation undermines the resource base, leads to loss of biodiversity in the soil, as well as above ground, and degrades the environment leading to reduction in ecosystem services that are fundamental to improved production; thereby contributing to impoverished rural livelihoods. Land degradation furthermore leads to an increased emission of greenhouse gases through the loss of carbon from the system (Absalom M Manyatsi, 2014. Greenhouse Gas Inventory For Land Use, Land Use Change And Forestry Sector In Swaziland Report. Ministry Of Tourism And Environmental Affairs, July 2014).

II. Baseline scenario and baseline project (see PDR Appendix 2 and 3 for more detailed descriptions)

4. Seventy-eight per cent of Swaziland's population derives its livelihood from agriculture; and over 70 per cent of the population depends upon subsistence rainfed agriculture on communal Swazi Nation Land (SNL). Agricultural productivity is very low, and susceptible to erratic and unreliable rainfall. Cattle provide financial security to many households on SNL and as a consequence most lands are overstocked, enhancing vulnerability to drought and degradation. Smallholder livelihoods on SNL are precarious: the poverty incidence in rural areas is around 70 per cent and about half of the poor cannot meet their minimum daily nutritional requirements (Central Statistical Office, Poverty Profile Report 2009/10).

5. In this context, the Government of Swaziland and IFAD prepared the Smallholder Market-Led Project (SMLP) to reduce poverty, food insecurity and nutrition of poor rural dwellers – especially women and youth – through investments supporting increased agricultural production and productivity, and market-led commercialisation of

⁷ For biodiversity projects, in addition to explaining the project's consistency with the biodiversity focal area strategy, objectives and programs, please also describe which [Aichi Target\(s\)](#) the project will directly contribute to achieving..

smallholder agriculture. SMLP is designed to run for six years and is expected to become effective in early 2016, following a start-up phase in late 2015. During its design, co-funding by the GEF was solicited in order to address concerns regarding climate change, biodiversity and land degradation - and the synergies to be derived through the combination - which would negatively affect the sustainability of Project outcomes. The GEF Integrated Approach Programme (IAP) on Fostering Sustainability and Resilience for Food Security in Sub-Saharan Africa is ideally suited to support 'Climate-Smart Agriculture for Resilient Livelihoods' (CSARL) within SMLP.

6. This approach that sees the integration of intensified agriculture production with environmental concerns is not new in Swaziland: it has been tested through the GEF-funded Lower Usuthu Sustainable Land Management Project (LUSLM). LUSLM provided a testing ground for sustainable land and water management, with a clear emphasis on the homestead and the farm. Sustainable management of natural resources at a larger scale was, however, underfunded, and the project could do little to reverse rill and gully erosion, or to capture runoff for irrigated crop production. While Chiefdom Development Plans provide an important inroad to land use planning, the relatively modest funding meant that little could be achieved in terms of natural resource zoning, protection and management.

7. The SMLP has been formulated in response to the above needs, and combines many elements of the LUSLM project, with attention to development of value chains supported by investments in irrigation and erosion control. Similar projects combining agricultural production, Chiefdom development planning, investments in natural resource management and support to marketing) are funded by the European Union under its EDF XI grant, including the High Value Crop and Horticulture Project (HVCHP), the second phase of LUSIP and future nationwide investment in small earth dams (ongoing Potential for Dams-Study); and it receives support from an Indian commercial loan as well.

8. While SMLP addresses the weak linkage between existing market demands and smallholder production; CSARL addresses the long-term sustainability of the environment underpinning agricultural production. Together, they help make market opportunities a driver for investment in sustainable, climate resilient agricultural production.

9. Development hypothesis. CSARL will support enhanced resilience of smallholder farmers' agro-ecological production systems to climate change and associated hazards and shocks through: the better management of land and other natural resources; investment in the people who depend on the land; and through building capacity of the local, sub-national and national agencies that support smallholder households in their endeavours. Doing so creates conditions under which smallholder farms can sustainably improve their production for: food security; improved nutrition, and enhanced incomes. Improved linkage and interaction of smallholder farms with commodity markets creates conditions for agricultural intensification, rather than extensification, and for actions and investments that help safeguard and enhance the climate resilience of the natural environment upon which crop and livestock production depends.

10. By investing in sustainable land and water management as a basis for climate resilient market-led smallholder agriculture, GEF-IAP is responsive to the policies articulated by the Swaziland Government; and capitalises on GEF's earlier contributions by simultaneously expanding to other areas and investing in relevant national capacities. IFAD, both as the agency administering the GEF-IAP-funded CSARL and as the leading co-funding agency for SMLP, is through its close involvement with smallholder agriculture in Swaziland – and in the wider region – well-placed to support the Government of Swaziland in its policies to transform smallholder agriculture.

III. GEF FAs, expected components and outcomes (See PDR Appendix 4 for full details)

11. SMLP/CSARL aims to contribute to the national goal of reduced rural poverty (SNAIP, 2014) from a sustainably managed and resilient environment (Attachment 1 summarises CSARL's contributions to Aichi Targets, NBSAP, 2015, NAP-UNCCD 2015). SMLP/CSARL's Project Development Objective, to which CSARL's contribution is aligned, is that smallholder households in the Project Chiefdoms sustainably enhance food and nutrition security and incomes through diversified climate resilient agricultural production and market-linkages. By doing so the projects will contribute to the following GEF FAs: LD-1, Program 1, Program 2; LD-3, Program 4; LD-4, Program 5; BD-4, Program 9; CCM-2, Program 3, and IAP-Food Security..

12. SMLP/CSARL will target the three main outcomes, which are clustered into three Project Components:

Component 1: Chiefdom Development Planning capacity

Outcome 1: Chiefdom Development Planning process institutionalised in three of the four Regions;

Component 2: Sustainable land management applied at multiple scales across 37 Chiefdomships in three regions

Outcome 2: Sustainable land management applied at multiple scales in three regions;

Component 3: National capacity to monitor and refine sustainable land management policies and programmes for achieving convention targets

Outcome 3: National capacity to design, implement, monitor and refine SLWM policies and programmes to meet Swaziland's convention targets; and to share lessons nationally and regionally.

13. The first outcome coincides fully with the concept note description, albeit that more emphasis is given to national outreach by establishing planning processes in all four Regions of Swaziland. The second outcome has been specified to describe the outcome of scaling-up integrated natural resource management and sustainable land and water management practices, by emphasising the application within the four Regions. Furthermore, the design applies the term 'sustainable land and water management', which is well-known in Swaziland, as the central concept encompassing integrated management of natural resources at different scales. For the third outcome also, the description has been focussed more on the outcome (capacity) rather than on the process leading there (knowledge management). In doing so, the original focus on capacity for monitoring and assessment of GEBs (reflecting the UN conventions on biodiversity, climate change and land degradation) has been widened to national capacity to pursue policies and programmes in the field of sustainable land and water management.

IV. Additional cost reasoning and contributions from the baseline

14. The Project scales-out sustainable land and water management from 10 Chiefdoms in the LUSLM to 37 under SMLP/CSARL through climate-smart interventions – including local resource management and community-led planning; enhanced productivity of crops and smallstock; and linkage of climate-smart production to viable markets – in order to enhance incomes and nutrition of more than 90,000 people. The envisioned commercialisation of smallholder agriculture under SMLP is expected to provide an incentive for investment in the sustainability and resilience of the natural environment. This is because, as agricultural production improves, farmers are more willing to raise investment in their natural resource base to make it yield more, and to be increasingly resilient to environmental (and economic) shocks. Commercialisation requires higher production and this can only be achieved and maintained by better land management – including soil and water conservation measures, improvements in organic matter status through mulching, crop rotation and reduced tillage (i.e. conservation agriculture), and the introduction of agroforestry into the system.

15. By investing in sustainable land and water management as a basis for climate resilient market-led smallholder agriculture, GEF-IAP is responsive to the policies articulated by the Swaziland Government; and capitalises on GEF's earlier contributions by simultaneously expanding to other areas and investing in relevant national capacities. While SMLP addresses the weak linkage between existing market demands and smallholder production, CSARL addresses the long-term sustainability of the environment underpinning agricultural production. Together, they help make market opportunities a driver for investment in sustainable, climate resilient agricultural production.

16. Therefore, SMLP/CSARL aims to reach-out nationwide (scaling-out) by, on the one hand showing a brisk implementation pace in the Chiefdoms it engages in, and by on the other hand triggering a process that continues post-project, eventually spreading out to an approximate population of 700,000 dependent on smallholder agriculture. The latter is pursued by capacity development for implementation, review and refinement of policies, programmes and projects aimed at sustainable land and water management on SNL. This would enable stakeholders in Swaziland to pursue further commercialisation of smallholder agriculture and a reversal of current land degradation trends.

V. GEBs

17. The project contributions to Global Environmental Benefits (GEB) targets are described in detailed in the GEB Framework (PDR Attachment 6.2). A summary of these is provided here:

- Reduction of the extent of land degradation (e.g. rehabilitation of 4,625 ha of severely degraded rangelands and grasslands)
- Rehabilitation or restoration of ecosystem services in 37 Chiefdoms. The project area includes 32,500 ha of land with a high biodiversity value that requires some of level of protection (NBSAP, 2015) through Chiefs Letters of Consent
- Restoration of vegetative cover in degraded catchments
- Protection of existing vegetative cover through conservation
- Conservation of carbon stocks and enhancement of carbon sequestration on agricultural land
- Protection of plant diversity in rangelands and grasslands through control of alien invasive plant species

VI. Innovativeness, sustainability and potential scaling-up

Innovativeness.

18. The blending of GEF resources with the loan Project, through its value chain activities, will link smallholder farmers to supply markets, and ensure that market information is made available to them. To support this process and thus facilitating the smallholder farmers to attain markets for their produce, the project will establish Innovation Platforms, in which representatives of wholesalers, buyers, extension services, financiers and growers will work together to identify improvements and innovations that help enhance the benefits from the selected value chains.

19. SMLP/CSARL will also provide an ‘innovation fund’ for a series of applied field research topics. Funds have been earmarked for up to 25 studies which will be undertaken by, inter alia, Government, UNISWA, and NGOs. Amongst some current ideas for research topics are: a) socio-economic impacts of household livelihood investments – including rainwater harvesting and homegardening; b) livelihood and agrobiodiversity benefits of beekeeping; c) effects of protection, improved rangeland management and conservation agriculture on soil health; and d) rotational grazing of common lands through ‘social fencing’.

Sustainability.

20. The programme design assumes that its target group of smallholder farmer households, with special considerations for the position of women and youth, will continue to benefit from the Project intervention beyond the Project period, and beyond the economic lifetime of the infrastructure introduced by the Project. The mechanisms built into the project design that promote this long-term sustainability are:

21. Knowledge management – a key component of CSARL is to build national capacity to promote, implement and refine policies, programmes and projects aimed at sustainable land and water management. The Project is not responsible for development of such policies, programmes and projects, but its capacity building component is intended to support national stakeholders to develop the knowledge they need to further pursue the national policies on smallholder agriculture and sustainable land and water management. Investments will be made in capacity building, and in setting-up a national system for assessment of land use, through a Land Degradation Surveillance Framework.

22. Market linkages – The Project promotes cooperation and entrepreneurship among smallholder farmers on the one hand, and commodity-wise cooperation along the value chain on the other. This mechanism should result in a continuing orientation of smallholder producer groups and individual producers on market opportunities, and a lasting commitment among the value chain partners to enhance the value creation for key commodities produced by smallholder farmers. Continuity may, however, be affected by major shifts in global and national markets.

23. Groups and alliances – The Project relies on well-organised groups to accelerate the dissemination of activities and results. Once established, any agency can link its services to this mechanism, while alliances between service providers at Inkhundla level would continue to promote inter-agency cooperation. The Chiefdom will continue to play a role in establishing beneficiary groups, beyond the Project, while the Inkhundla level could – if supported by determined policy – develop into a level of service coordination for the development of Chiefdoms.

24. Consultative planning – by far the most important mechanism, set-up to extend beyond the Project duration, is the process of Chiefdom Development Planning. The Ministry of Tinkhundla and Administrative Development will provide continuity to this approach, provided adequate resources continue to be allocated to replication of Chiefdom development planning, spatially and in time. The CDP process includes – and benefits from – geographical organised information on the Chiefdom area. Chiefdoms are also in a position to regulate land use in their areas, and to set aside land and water resources for specific activities, under conditions of sustainable use.

Scaling-up.

25. The Project will introduce sustainable land and water management for market-led agriculture in 37 of Swaziland's 385 Chiefdoms. While this more than triples the coverage of the precursor LUSLM project, it amounts to not more than approximately 10% of the SNL area; and only a mere 5% of the total national land resources. Within the Project area, smallholder farming will be transformed by a combination of local community-led planning of natural resource management; investment in sustainable land and water management at all levels of land use; and development of viable linkages to national agricultural commodity markets. Additional investment in the national capacity for land assessment, Chiefdom development planning and sustainable land and water management contributes to Swaziland's capacity to scale-up the approach to other rainfed areas on SNL.

26. The inclusion of CSARL in SMLP helps scaling-up of sustainable land and water management (SLWM) approaches by boosting investment in sustainable land and water management at levels ranging from climate resilient homesteads to Chiefdom NRM. Moreover, by spreading its investments, CSARL replicates the approaches that proved successful in the Lower Usuthu area to Swaziland's other Regions, and CSARL builds national capacity; for i) Chiefdom-level resource planning; for ii) sustainable land and water management; and for iii) land degradation monitoring and assessment. By doing so, the Project works on two dimension of scale: it addresses the horizontal spread of tested approaches to new areas by engaging with more Chiefdoms, and it contributes to further integration (vertical spread) of the overall approach – especially Chiefdom Development Planning – within the country's development programme.

27. Furthermore, the GEF-funded LUSLM Terminal Evaluation (2015) points out that even during this project, there was demand for scaling-up of successful approaches to other largely rainfall-dependent Chiefdoms. This is strongly driven by the policies of Swaziland, and by the alignment of donor support to those policies. CSARL is designed to address the barriers to upscaling e.g. limited capacity in the national government – both in terms of human and financial resources and limited responsiveness of national resource allocation and service delivery to demands articulated locally. Higher levels of investment in SLWM at multiple scales – from the homesteads to whole landscapes – are expected to facilitate the ability of the resource base to sustainably support enhanced levels of production, and to be simultaneously resilient to climate shocks.

A.2. Child Project? If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

28. The GEF financing will support the establishment of multi-stakeholder and cross-sectoral approaches to foster supportive policies and investment in SLWM approaches in production systems. The framework will be extended at community level through Chiefdom Development Plans to promote sustainability and resilience for food security. CSARL will build on the existing baseline and achievements in targeted agroecologies around the country and ensuring that resource planning and agricultural production are underpinned by interventions that maintain ecosystems goods and services of the agro-ecological systems. CSARL will contribute to environmentally systematic planning at Chiefdom

level and national scaling-up through value chains that link farmers to markets, with emphasis on specific agricultural commodities. A selection of commodities has been made, based on their potential as both food and cash crops, in order that both better food security and higher incomes are simultaneously supported.

29. The Project is designed to provide a sound ecological base for production through scaling-out of CSA, soil and water conservation measures, rooftop rainwater harvesting, homegardening, indigenous poultry and goats, beekeeping and fruit orchards - creating 'climate resilient households' - and at farm level, conservation agriculture, agroforestry and small-scale irrigation. The SLWM activities are expected to build climate resilience into the production system, while contributing to climate change mitigation through sequestration of carbon in soils and vegetation. At a broader scale the Project will help communities address management of rangelands, eroded areas and forests. By doing so, this child project will contribute to safeguarding natural capital to enhance environmental sustainability, achieve food security and improve resilience of the production systems.

30. The monitoring and assessment approach CSARL will target national capacity development for Monitoring and Assessment (M&A) of land degradation, climate resilience, maintenance of ecosystems functions within relevant government agencies, research and academic institutes. For instance, the Project will build on a Land Degradation Ecosystem Health Surveillance Framework, including appropriate tools for measurement of GEBs. This approach will enable collating information to meet Swaziland's reporting obligations under the UNFCCC, CCD, CBD Conventions as a signatory of these, and demonstrate impacts towards the GEB targets set under the GEF IAP regional program.

A.3. Stakeholders. Elaborate on how the key stakeholders engagement, particularly with regard to [civil society organizations](#) and [indigenous peoples](#), is incorporated in the preparation and implementation of the project.

31. The Project, along with implementation partners such as the RDAs, local NGOs and the Inkhundla, are potential investors in activities planned by the Chiefdoms, as supported by the commitment to cofinancing this project. CSARL will help coordinate the formation of Chiefdom Development Plans (CDPs) within the Inkhundla (a parliamentary constituency, usually comprising three or more Chiefdoms), which has the potential to form a pivot between local and national planning processes, and to facilitate responsible allocation of government, NGO and donor resources. In addition, identification of development options at Chiefdom level will be primarily done by the CDC members, and the involvement of Rural Development Area (RDA) and NGO representatives in order to make the plans more responsive to community needs and aspirations, and assist in the articulation of interventions.

A.4. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. Elaborate on how gender equality and women's empowerment issues are mainstreamed into the project implementation and monitoring, taking into account the differences, needs, roles and priorities of women and men.

32. Women form a majority in the Project area, and many households are female-headed, due to male out-migration for income and due to the effects of the AIDS pandemic. Forty per cent of the households are female headed or female-managed. By tradition, men are involved in cattle rearing; generally leaving crop production and rearing of smallstock to women. The Project's choice to concentrate on food crops and small livestock is based on the realisation that this provides an implicit focus on women, and helps address priority nutrition needs. One risk is that once the potential for incomes presents itself, men may opt-in for market-led production activities, however, the Project includes measures to safeguard the participation of women. A Gender and Youth Action Plan will be developed for the Project, and will be reviewed annually.

33. In addition, the Chiefdom socio-economic baseline studies, amongst others, record the female-headed households and regular monitoring will demonstrate their level of participation in development activities. The Community Development Committee is the forum to discuss disparities in gender participation, as well as for identifying remedial measures. Where groups are formed, be it the CDC, groups for soil and water infrastructure or youth enterprises, the Project will promote female participation in the leadership of these groups. Discussions with respect to gender

differentiation will be initiated, using story-telling as an entry point. Lastly, the staff composition of the PIU will include women in professional roles.

A.5 Risk. Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.(table format acceptable):

34. The following sections describe the main assumptions and the risks associated with their failure. A description of the steps taken to prevent, minimise or mitigate these risks is also provided.

35. Commitment to shared knowledge management. Component 3 will only be successful if knowledge management at national level involves actors other than the lead ministry and the implementing agency. If government agencies, knowledge institutions, concerned parastatals and non-governmental agencies are not willing to share in, and contribute to, knowledge management on the three convention targets, the main mechanism for replication of the Project's lessons would fail. The risk would also take a more immediate effect. Relevant actors would neither benefit from nor contribute to the development of the Land Degradation Surveillance Framework; and national courses on SLWM and Chiefdom development planning would be very hard to realise. The national set-up for achieving the targets of the UN conventions on desertification, biodiversity and climate change provides the main framework for the preclusion of the above risk. The three national focal points for the conventions have contributed to Project design, and the monitoring and assessment required to gauge achievement of the targets is supported by the Project design.

36. Social, environmental and climate risks. The interventions grouped under Component 2 (sustainable land and water management at all levels) are measures designed to mitigate climate risk: these fall broadly under 'climate-smart agriculture' where resilience is achieved by increasing soil organic matter and underground biodiversity, improving soil cover with residues, and better surface cover with growing crops through fertility enhancement and water conservation. However in certain circumstances with specific interventions there are associated risks. The erosion control works and the small earth dams for irrigation have an especially high risk profile, which includes infrastructure failure risks and risks of loss of cultivated lands, homesteads and properties. Careful development, following sound assessment procedures, is required to ensure prevention or mitigation of such risks. The formulation of CSARL has been taken as an opportunity to review the existing social, environmental and climate assessment procedures for the combined SMLP/CSARL, and to define the way forward for investment in sustainable land and water management and in soil and water conservation infrastructure. The PDR's Appendix 12 includes the up-to-date review note, which, inter alia, concludes that the Project has moderate social, environmental and climate risks, while the existing country framework provides adequate safeguards for careful development.

37. The Ministry of Tinkhundla Administration and Development (MTAD) leadership. Implementation of Component 1 (Chiefdom Development Planning) will benefit from strong backing by the Ministry of Tinkhundla & Administrative Development; and the knowledge management on Chiefdom Development Planning addressed by Component 3 presupposes that MTAD will assume ownership of the guidelines prepared by the Project. If MTAD failed to provide the prerequisite leadership, the position of the CDCs in local resource planning would be less sustainable and replication of the approach both in time and in areal coverage would be compromised. The Project design has benefitted from the existing relationship between MTAD and the LUSLM team, and from their awareness of the CDP process. MTAD has been consulted at all levels during Project design and it is included as a member of the Project Steering Committee. The Project design has been adjusted to include full Tinkhundla (clusters of Inkundla) in response to MTAD's explicit desire and in alignment to MTAD's policy to coordinate development at the Inkhundla level. Capacity building investments

include officials of MTAD, resources are available to make modest investments in Inkhundla facilities, and resources are available for publications and reproduction.

38. Affordable mechanisation and repair services. Intensified agricultural production requires availability of appropriate farm mechanisation services, and specialised maintenance services may be required to repair ferro-cement tanks as well as the pipes and fittings of irrigation systems. Presently, very few such services are available – and specific requirements for conservation agriculture are poorly addressed – and if this void is not filled, some of the Project achievements will gradually slip. The Project’s choice for simple improvements to existing farm practices, and for basic designs when it comes to infrastructure go some way in preventing a too-large dependence on mechanisation and infrastructure services. Moreover, the Project has set aside resources to promote young entrepreneurs to cater for the demands for mechanisation and infrastructure. In doing so, the Project builds on the LUSLM experience in setting-up youth and women’s groups for the construction of ferro-cement tanks. Moreover, the competitive cost of ferro-cement tanks – compared to the plastic tanks commercially available – allows households to save resources that can later be used for repairs.

39. Adequate sources of financing agriculture. Adoption of new agricultural practices requires smallholders to invest. Yet most smallholders are short of financial resources. Formal development- and micro-credit services are in their infancy. Such institutions as exist generally cater to urban demands and charge considerable fees and interest on their services. Whatever margin may exist for market-led smallholder production may be negated by high interest on credit or by the unavailability of affordable services. If availability of adequate finance is a hurdle for investment, then the pace of project implementation will be much slower than projected; furthermore some smallholders will not be able to invest at all. The magnitude of the risk is reasonable. The required transitions are not high in cost, whereas alternative sources for financing upscaled production or market supply are emerging: a framework and umbrella organisation for Savings and Credit Cooperatives (SACCO) exists, and informal community-based savings and credit groups are available. Within the Project design, two aspects help close the financing gap: the Project finances starter packs for climate resilient homesteads and climate-smart agriculture (conditional upon adequate levels of land preparation and relevant training where required etc) and by virtue of improving the interaction with market partners, there is a possibility of pre-financing investments and adjusting these through subsequent transactions.

40. Willingness to align services to CDPs. If local development agencies, such as the RDAs and NGOs working locally, are unwilling to align their services to the views and priorities expressed through the CDP process, the present mismatch between external support and local ambition will continue. Moreover, CDCs will be discouraged to invest time and effort into crafting development plans. Presently, CDCs have been established in nearly all Chiefdoms, but they play a varying and generally modest role in development planning. The Project attempts to contain this risk at multiple levels: at national level it works with MTAD to develop national guidance material for Chiefdom Development Planning. CSARL exclusively supports Chiefdom Development Planning in all Chiefdoms in an Inkhundla, thereby bringing the Inkhundla and the Regional Administrations in, and using their position to ensure alignment of development programmes to Chiefdom planning. Finally, the Project will use its resources to involve agencies that are locally available in the process of plan formulation, thereby enhancing the likelihood that these agencies align their activities to the ensuing plans.

41. Continuity in leadership support. CDCs and CDPs are new concepts, and in some areas Inner Councils have perceived the CDC as a competing force. While such misunderstandings can be easily redressed, the risk is that after the withdrawal of the Project, a change in Chiefdom leadership may lead to a changing attitude vis-à-vis the CDC and the CDP. Absence of continuity would endanger the long-term institution of community-led resource planning. Similarly,

replication by other Chiefdoms of the approach demonstrated in the 37 Project Chiefdoms would be endangered by poor understanding of the process and its accomplishments. The Project design includes orientation of the traditional leadership, including exchange visits to areas successfully applying the CDP-approach. The involvement of MTAD, with its branches at Regional and Inkhundla-level, provides a further guarantee of continuity. Finally, but not unimportantly, the communication and public relations approach employed by the LUSLM project, provides a good example of building positive attitudes towards the changes pursued by the Project.

42. Absence of economic shocks. Economic shocks, whether caused by changed fiscal policies, mass import of cheap commodities or weather extremes may change the business case for market-led sustainable agriculture, as presented in the economic and financial analyses. The sensitivity analyses confirm the robustness of the Project design to output price variations.

A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination. Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

43. The Ministry of Agriculture will be the lead Ministry for the SMLP/CSARL. It shall delegate day-to-day implementation to the parastatal, Swaziland Water and Agriculture Development Enterprise (SWADE), which has long experience in management and implementation of similar projects. SWADE's capacity to co-ordinate the implementation will be strengthened through short-term technical assistance (TA) that will focus on financial management and monitoring. The TA will ensure timely and smooth start-up of the project. SWADE will establish a dedicated Project Implementation Unit, which will perform under oversight established by the Ministry of Agriculture. MoA's oversight comprises a Project Steering Committee and two Technical Committees. Further details can be found in the PDR's Appendix 5. The intention of GoS to combine the Project Steering Committee with comparable committees of similar projects is welcomed.

44. To ensure that existing market demands lead the development of sustainable agricultural practices, relevant Market Partners will be involved through Memoranda of Understanding. Market Partners that have already been identified include the National Agricultural Marketing Board (NAMBOARD) for legumes, vegetables, goat meat; and Eswatini Kitchen for honey, vegetables and fruits. The Project will include investments that help these Market Partners to link their demands for secure supply to smallholder producers; and the Market Partners will extend their services to these producers. NAMBOARD is mandated with marketing for smallholder agriculture. It will be engaged in the Project as the key business development service, responsible for developing market linkages and value chains for a range of products. As such, it will chair the technical committee on market-led agriculture; and provide coordination to the stakeholders engaged in the third Project Component.

45. The Rural Development Areas of the Ministry of Agriculture will be involved in all Chiefdom-based Project activities. Their contribution to the Project success consists of conveyance of market information, of technical advisory services for agricultural production and processing, and of equipment and materials for production and infrastructure. Investments will be made to support the role of the RDAs. The involvement of the RDAs is furthermore important, as through the RDAs oversight by the lead Ministry can take place on issues critical to the Project's success, such as targeting and sustainability of land and water use.

46. In order to plan and target Project activities for sustainable land and water management and for market-led agricultural production, the Project will support Chiefdom-led development planning. The Chiefdoms, and the Community Development Committees formed therein, are responsible to determine how their land and water resources

can best be utilised for development activities. They also take the lead in initiating groups of households that engage in, and benefit from, these development activities. To this end, the Project will support preparation of Chiefdom Development Plans, and will ensure involvement of the Chiefdoms in strategic decisions with respect to infrastructure and market-led smallholder production activities.

47. Producers engaged in crop and smallstock production on designated lands and in the homesteads will be encouraged to form groups for achieving results beyond the capability of individual households, such as recovery of degraded land, capture and utilisation of rainwater runoff, dissemination of climate-smart agriculture techniques, staggered delivery of stable market volumes, and collective negotiation with service providers. Groups will be set-up in order to accelerate achievement of Project investments. Groups are generally informal, but where a degree of formalisation is required, group registration can be low key, through submission of constitution to the Chiefdom.

Additional Information not well elaborated at PIF Stage:

A.7 Benefits. Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?

48. SMLP/CSARL is expected to generate substantial net incremental benefits for farmers and households in 37 Chiefdoms (see PDR Appendix 10). Benefits would accrue to farmers, women and youth directly involved in crop and livestock activities. The farmers will be assisted to increase their farm productivity through better planning of development activities; investments in soil and water management; and technical support for sustainable land and water management at multiple levels, including the homestead and the farm.

49. Higher productivity of smallholder farming, required to enhance rural incomes and food security will be achieved by smallholder agriculture making better use of i) sustainably managed land and water resources, and ii) existing agricultural commodity markets. Whereas the original SMLP project design strives to improve the linkage to markets, the inclusion of CSARL will promote sustainable land and water management at multiple levels, to ensure resilient agricultural production systems based on healthy ecosystems. While the GEF-IAP financed measures stimulate sustainable land and water management (SLWM) activities with an initial 'push', it will be the 'pull' of the market that leads to long-term sustainable land and water management – given continued technical support and guidance to farmers. Thus the market-led approach and the initial GEF-IAP support make a perfect match.

A.8 Knowledge Management. Elaborate on the knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives (e.g. participate in trainings, conferences, stakeholder exchanges, virtual networks, project twinning) and plans for the project to assess and document in a user-friendly form (e.g. lessons learned briefs, engaging websites, guidebooks based on experience) and share these experiences and expertise (e.g. participate in community of practices, organize seminars, trainings and conferences) with relevant stakeholders.

50. One problem with upscaling SLWM – and understanding of biodiversity conservation and climate change action – is inadequate knowledge management. This is simultaneously a question of capacity and institutional memory of what has been tested before. SMLP/CSARL will invest in developing capacity to design, analyse and refine SLWM practices and economic empowerment interventions at household, and community, levels. It will do so through engaging academia and research institutions in action research, by promoting professional capacity building through Regional training, and by supporting documentation of lessons learned.

51. The Project will invest in developing solid environmental and socioeconomic assessment during the first year of implementation to capture an accurate and reliable description of the environmental, climate vulnerability and food security status in the Chiefdoms (see cost implications in M&E Work Plan and Budget in Attachment 6.1). These baselines and follow-up surveys will ensure that ecosystem services, such as agrobiodiversity (enhanced varietal diversity and improved soil health), and carbon stocks in vegetation, are established, quantified and monitored during project duration. The regional cross-cutting project will provide training and capacity building in the application of the Monitoring and Assessment (M&A) tools to ensure consistent quality, reporting and dissemination of the new knowledge generated. PIU and key Departments will be trained in the utilisation of the main outputs from the application of these tools.

52. CSARL will target national capacity development on land degradation M&A, natural resources planning & management, and SLWM practices within sector agencies, including government, research and academic institutes, development agencies and the private sector, to enable these to define, implement and refine SLWM policies and programmes. The main body of information for M&A of GEBs will be generated by selected decision-support tools (e.g. Multi-purpose Poverty Assessment Tool, (MPAT), Land Degradation Surveillance Framework (LDSF), Ex-ante Carbon Assessment Tool (ExACT) and the Diversity Assessment Tool for Agro-biodiversity and Resilience (DATAR)). These will be operated through collaboration with international development and research centres (e.g. ICRAF, Bioversity International), and national institutions (e.g. Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Tourism and Environmental Affairs and the National University of Swaziland), which can make use of the tools and contribute to their application.

53. CSARL will also focus its support on the identification, quantification and assessment of the potential economic value of various management interventions (conservation areas, enclosures, conservation agriculture, beekeeping and indigenous poultry production) on agrobiodiversity in a subset of CDPs, to help develop sustainable management guidelines, especially in the harvesting of plants important to Swazi culture. This approach will meet the needs of local communities, especially women, who often depend on agricultural biodiversity for their livelihoods through its contribution to food security and nutrition, medicines, fodder, and building materials as well as through ecosystem qualities such as below-ground biodiversity.

54. In addition, SMLP/CSARL provides for the development of up to 20 detailed factsheets/ brochures on SLWM. These will form the basis of a consolidated 'SLWM Guidelines for Swaziland'. Training of professionals also features prominently. The first route is through short courses conducted in-house. The second is by sending select professionals to attend Master's courses in universities within the Southern Africa Region. Thirdly study tours, both within Swaziland - and outside to countries with comparative competence in areas where Swaziland needs direction. Fourthly, there will be conferences where project staff and academics will gather with delegates, to share experience and build up their knowledge base. Finally, SMLP/CSARL will continue involving the University's School of Journalism and Mass Communication in raising awareness, and in training students in agricultural development.

B. DESCRIPTION OF THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH:

B.1 Consistency with National Priorities. Describe the consistency of the project with national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions such as NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, etc.:

55. The Government of the Kingdom of Swaziland has adopted an integrated approach toward enhanced resilience in addressing the challenges posed by land degradation, biodiversity loss and climate change. The integrated approach is intended to enhance synergies in the implementation of the three Rio Conventions, namely: (1) UNFCCC and the Intended Nationally Determined Contributions to the Convention (INDC), (2) CBD and (3) CCD. The GoS has ratified all three Rio Conventions (UNCCD, CBD and UNFCCC) and is in the process of submitting the following reports:

- Aligned National Action Programme of Swaziland for the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification

- Swaziland's Second National Biodiversity Strategy And Action Plan
- Intended Nationally Determined Contribution, INDC
- Climate Vulnerability Assessment of The Water Sector And Infrastructure In Swaziland
- Greenhouse Gas Inventory For Land Use, Land Use Change And Forestry Sector In Swaziland

56. Each of these assessments makes specific references to lessons learned from the GEF LUSLM Project. CSARL and its associated loan project, SMLP, builds on many of these pilots, and has the goal of upscaling interventions for sustainability and resilience, resulting in maintenance of ecosystems functions and services: biodiversity and habitats will be better preserved. This would also ensure improved climate regulation, reduced vulnerability to environmental shocks and carbon sequestration, which are relevant actions for the three Rio Conventions. (A table summarising the alignment between CSARL and targets of the three Rio targets in Swaziland can be found in Attachment 1). The CSARL's objectives are in line with the Government's agenda for ensuring agricultural growth, poverty reduction and food security at national and household levels as guided by the following development policies and strategies: National Development Strategy (Vision 2022), Poverty Reduction Strategy and Action Programme 2006 (PRSAP), National Food Security Policy (2005), National Programme for Food Security (Sectoral Development Plan for Agriculture) as well as the Swaziland National Agricultural Investment Plan 2014 (SNAIP). The project also supports the Swaziland Environmental Action Plan (SEAP).

57. Furthermore, the Project will contribute to the guiding principles of the Swaziland National Climate Change Policy (Scientifically sound and appropriate information; Integrated approach, the Principle of Subsidiarity; Inter- and Intra-generational Equity; Public Participation; The Precautionary Principle; Capacity Building; International Cooperation; Strategic Partnerships) which is developing a sustainable, climate resilient and inclusive low-carbon green growth society.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN: A detailed M&E budget, including activities, responsible parties, timeframe and source of funding is presented Appendix 6 of the PDR, and is summarised in the table below.

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	GEF-IAP Cross Cutting Child Project	GEF funding requested	Co-financing (IFAD and GoS)	Total Budget (USD)	Time frame
Inception Workshop	<input type="checkbox"/> Project Coordinator <input type="checkbox"/> IFAD		5 000	15 000	20 000	Within first two months of project start up
MPAT baseline and terminal survey	<input type="checkbox"/> Project Team <input type="checkbox"/> IFAD <input type="checkbox"/> Relevant GoS Department	Mostly budgeted under SMLP	30 000	30 000	60 000	Start and end of project
LDSF baseline and terminal survey	as above	budgeted under SMLP and CSARL Component 3				Start and end of project
C accounting	as above		20 000	10 000	30 000	Start, mid and end of project
Agro-biodiversity survey	as above		40 000	20 000	60 000	Start, mid and end of project
Soil health surveys	As above	Budgeted under CSARL component 3	20 000	10 000	30 000	Every two years

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	GEF-IAP Cross Cutting Child Project	GEF funding requested	Co-financing (IFAD and GoS)	Total Budget (USD)	Time frame
Capacity needs assessments for multi-scale M&A of environmental sustainability of ecosystems and livelihoods	<input type="checkbox"/> IFAD <input type="checkbox"/> Relevant GoS Department	Technical backstopping	3 000	2000	5 000	Year 1
Training on and capacity building in the application of the M&A tools	as above	Technical backstopping	5 000	5000	10 000	On ad-hoc basis
Travel to GEF-IAP Regional implementation workshops	<input type="checkbox"/> Project Team		7 000	8000	15 000	Every two years
Annual Performance Review (for six years)	<input type="checkbox"/> Project Team <input type="checkbox"/> Project Steering Committee		10 000	20 000	30 000	Annually
Project supervision missions 12 missions)	<input type="checkbox"/> Project Team <input type="checkbox"/> IFAD		140 000	40 000	180 000	Every six months
Mid-term review (MTR)	<input type="checkbox"/> Project Team <input type="checkbox"/> Independent Evaluator <input type="checkbox"/> IFAD <input type="checkbox"/> GEF		5 000	30 000	35 000	At the midpoint of project implementation
Terminal evaluation (TE)	<input type="checkbox"/> Project Team <input type="checkbox"/> Independent Evaluator <input type="checkbox"/> IFAD <input type="checkbox"/> GEF		10 000	25 000	35 000	At least one month before the end of the project. Report to be submitted no more than 12 months after project completion
Project completion workshop	<input type="checkbox"/> Project Team <input type="checkbox"/> IFAD		10 000	25 000	35 000	At the end of the project period to review and publicise project experience
Project publications	<input type="checkbox"/> Project Team <input type="checkbox"/> Project Stakeholders		30 000	20 000	50 000	To be determined by Project Team and IFAD
Dissemination of project information	<input type="checkbox"/> Project team		15 000	10 000	25 000	continuous
Equipment and material	<input type="checkbox"/> Project team		20000	30 000	50 000	Within six months following project start-up

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	GEF-IAP Cross Cutting Child Project	GEF funding requested	Co-financing (IFAD and GoS)	Total Budget (USD)	Time frame
TOTAL INDICATIVE COST (excluding contribution from the GEF-IAP Cross Cutting Project)			370 000	300 000	670 000	

PART III: CERTIFICATION BY GEF PARTNER AGENCY(IES)

A. GEF Agency(ies) certification

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies⁸ and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO endorsement under GEF-6.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (MM/dd/yyyy)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Perin Saint Ange, Associate Vice-President, Programme Management Department, IFAD			Stephen Twomlow Environment and Climate Division IFAD	+39 06 5459 2681	s.twomolow@ifad.org

⁸ GEF policies encompass all managed trust funds, namely: GEFTF, LDCF, and SCCF

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).

The Logical Framework can be found on pages 19-24 of the PDR.

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- see separate attachment).

Revision Log Following IFAD Quality Enhancement Process of PDR – 26/11/2015

#	source	Suggestion	Revisions
1.	Rob Delve, 9/11	If you look at the main sections in the revised PDR (para 62-67) apart from 2 different additions nothing has changed. Putting the changes in only Appendix 4 is not that helpful, as the main PDR still does not read well, or reflect these changes for Component 2 and this needs to be addressed.	Text on roofwater tanks and fertiliser use added. See references below.
2.	Rob Delve, 9/11	The crop models still have very high levels of fertiliser use, with no reference in the main PDR to how these will be afforded by farmers, no reference to the size of the water tank related to the household needs in the PDR – putting these references in the 2014 PIM or the EFA section or elsewhere is not that helpful, as it all needs to be in the main PDR sections. I also don't think adding that farmers will be encouraged to look for financing to make investments in inputs to make the returns the EFA shows is enough.... As least this risky investment should be linked to crop insurance etc.	Reference to fertiliser levels in para 74
3.	Rob Delve, 9/11	Nor do I agree we give starter packs to people for free with no co-pay – but if that is the way project wants to go, that's a team decision.	The co-pay is now stipulated at various locations in the text in the form of prior field preparation etc.
4.	Mawira Chitima 10/11	How many CDPs will be financed under CSARL? The SMLP logframe has 25 CDPs, but the CSARL PDR has increasing number of CDPs from 17 to 35.	See footnotes 2 and 13
5.	Mawira Chitima 10/11	CDP planning: I suggest that since we have 3 Tinkundlas fully covered with CDPs the programme should move to develop an Inkundla Development Plan (IDP). The IDP will also be used as an input into regional development planning process. This is an important step as natural resources are commonly shared beyond the chiefdom (especially rangelands, forests and access to water). The IDP will also help in the allocation of resources at the Inkundla level. The IDP will be a key output under CSARL.	IDPs are already made by the Inkhundla's but are not based in a systematic planning process. In three Tinkhundla, the compiled plan will now be based on the CDPs. Summary #8 and main #33
6.	Mawira Chitima	The SMLP targets “99 ha new irrigated command area out of a potential 110 are developed” but it is not clear how much area will now be targeted with additional funding from CSARL on the two	Para 68 added.

#	source	Suggestion	Revisions
	10/11	schemes. Or area to be rehabilitated on the 18 schemes. The criteria for selection of irrigation schemes and other land and water conservation investments needs to be clear as there may be a need to select across Chiefdoms, unless the funding will be adequate for identified investments under the CDPs.	
7.	Mawira Chitima 10/11	Since the CSARL will be rehabilitating 18 schemes, the design can benefit from an analysis of the schemes as they exist at present. An inclusion of a long list of possible schemes, with state of functionality included and the main causes for need to rehabilitate can help in determining the nature of intervention required. This analysis should include the availability of water resources, condition of the watershed area, agronomic conditions and organisational capacity. During the validation mission, it will be helpful to get this information.	Para 68 added.
8.	Chapeyama 24/11	The enhancement of the SMLP outputs by linkage to CSARL introduces aspects of sustainable natural resources management, sustainable production systems and resilience to climate change. Market linkages are also identified as a further incentive for communities to engage in project activities. However, transition from subsistence (communal) farming to commercial farming has been a very difficult process over most of Southern Africa. The proposed intervention suggests that this can be achieved through the institutionalisation of CA and SLWM resulting in rural communities producing excess for sale through proposed value chain improvement. The analysis in the intervention could be made more robust by discussing conditions under which commercial agriculture develops and thrives. Providing answers to the following questions could assist with the analysis: Why have communal farmers failed to access agricultural markets? Is there demand for products from communal farmers? Experience with indigenous chicken farming under LUSLM could be instructive.	See para 88 (added)
9.	Chapeyama 24/11	A discussion of land tenure arrangements in Swaziland would assist with this analysis especially highlighting the "tragedy of the commons" which impedes agricultural development on Swazi National Land. Why would communal farmers want to invest in land management SLM on land that technically does not belong to them? Experiences from LUSLM with respect to livestock ownership could be investigated further (paragraphs 4 and 6). Although national agricultural policy pronouncements indicate a desire for a paradigm shift towards commercial agriculture on SNL, what are the chances of this succeeding under communal	Para 8 added

#	source	Suggestion	Revisions
		land ownership?	
10.	Chapeyama 24/11	Interventions such as LUSIP and LUSLM which have demonstrated the potential for increased productivity at the household and farm level on SNL have largely been funded through external sources. Although the experiences from these programmes are now being up-scaled to cover more regions, what are the chances that these will be sustainable over the long term given national capacity and financial limitations for investing in these initiatives? Have the results from LUSLM been institutionalised in the pilot areas the programme has been implemented in for these to be used as the basis for scaling-up? Does this expansion to other areas not amount to spreading the piloting to cover a larger area of the country? Finally, is donor funding assured or even desirable over the long term?	Addressed in para 16 and 160 – with minor edits.
11.	Chapeyama 24/11	All policy reforms or attempts at reform have not addressed the absolute authority of His Majesty the King over land resources. Is this an impediment to investment in agricultural growth and development?	Not responded to
12.	Chapeyama 24/11	The analysis could also establish the necessary minimum community needs for food and other services before intimating that the project will create opportunities for participating communities to enter the market through the sale of the expected surplus produce.	Included in the farm models as a matter of routine – not specifically emphasised.
13.	Chapeyama 24/11	The project design proposes roof water harvesting as one of the measures to be introduced to promote household level sustainability. This needs further analysis as the amount of water that is harvested through this approach usually does not last very long. This needs to be integrated into other water management initiatives as a resource augmentation measure instead.	See para 71 (new) – it also responds partially to the comment under #1
14.	QE 26/11	Institutional linkages: Issue: Breaking through the silos in government structures. Throughout the project design, there has been a strong commitment from all stakeholders including the Ministries of Agriculture, and Tinkhundla and Administrative Development (MTAD), and the Swaziland Environmental Authority. All parties are members of the project steering committee and are eagerly awaiting the start of the project. The project is also meeting the global reporting needs of the three	Agreed. Text on Swaziland's contribution to the climate change convention is adapted

#	source	Suggestion	Revisions
		Rio conventions through component 3.	
15.	QE 26/11	Capacity building: Issue: Integration of the Chiefdom Development Plans (CDP) into the Inkundla planning process. This issue was raised by MTAD during the design and influenced the selection of the additional Chiefdomships to ensure aggregation of plans could take place at the Inkundla level. In turn, this will influence the flow of regional development funds from central government to the Chiefdomships.	As reflected
16.	QE 26/11	Land tenure: Issue: Under the current Swazi national land system, communal ownership may hinder individual investment in sustainable land and water management. This is being addressed by the use of the CDP and the introduction of the Chiefs' Letters to designate land usage within the Chiefdomship.	Para 8 added
17.	QE 26/11	Market access: Issue: transition from communal subsistence to commercial farming in a sustainable manner. To ensure market access, the project has developed strong linkages with TechnoServe (as a service provider which also hosts the Swazi Honey Producers' Association) and National Agricultural Marketing Board of Swaziland (NAMBOARD). In addition, the project will use matching grants to stimulate smallholder entry into the markets through starter packs etc and will encourage linkages with IFAD-supported Rural Finance Project.	As reflected
18.	QE 26/11	Roofwater harvesting: Issue: There was a lack of clarify about the benefits that will accrue from the roofwater harvesting in terms of duration and volume of water availability.	Explained, para 71
19.	QE 26/11	Land: give more visibility in the PDR to the CDP and the role of the Chief's letters and provide continued support to the draft National Land Policy.	See new para 8, and edits in para 63
20.	QE 26/11	IFAD's Complaints Procedure: Text to be included in the PDR under paragraph 85 Social, Environmental and Climate Assessment Procedures: IFAD has developed a Complaints Procedure for "Alleged Non-Compliance with its Social and Environmental Policies and Mandatory Aspects of Its Social Environmental and Climate Assessment Procedures". Parties adversely or potentially adversely affected by IFAD-funded projects and programmes may bring issues to the Fund's attention using SECAPcomplaints@ifad.org. The IFAD website provides a clear summary of the steps involved and guidance on how to	Text added as para 94

#	source	Suggestion	Revisions
		report issues.	
21.	QE 26/11	Quantitative data: Under component 3, ensure attention is paid to collecting and analyzing quantitative data that will clearly demonstrate the impacts of the project on food security, household income and assets, and global environmental benefits.	Addressed in PIM, but para 76 has been added for emphasis
22	Steve's checklist 30/11	Incorporation of all changes into the PDR, completion of the CEO endorsement request and Tracking tools with the aim to submit to GEF by mid January at the latest	done
23	Steve's checklist 30/11	Confirmation of where the LDSDF network will be hosted and any management arrangements we need to make clear in the project documentation	Still open, to be addressed during start-up
25	Caroline, Enrico	Comments on app 9 and 10 and related text sections	EFA revised, text edits to match figures in text with latest tables.
26	Steve	Standard text on GEF-IAP	Inserted as para 31 and 32
27	Thomas 15/12	Text edits by Thomas and remarks by Oussama	See mail 16/12

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁹

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

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: \$ 137,615				
Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GEF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)			
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent to Date	Amount Committed	Amount Uncommitted
Communications and M&E Expert	7 000.00	6 641.86	-	358.14
Financial Review Local	2 065.00	2 010.79	-	54.21
PPG Admin Assistant	3 500.00	-	3 343.73	156.27
NRM and GEF specialist	31 400.00	29 263.83	-	2 136.17
PPG Coordinator	33 000.00	27 520.20	5 471.55	8.25
Economic Analysis & Budgets	8 600.00	7 802.23	749.80	47.97
Procurement Specialist	2 050.00	1 663.20	22.04	364.76
Workshops, Transport and Coordination with communities and Govt	50 000.00	37 500.00	12 500.00	-
Total	137 615.00	112 402.11	22 087.12	3 125.77

⁹ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue to 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. Agencies should also report closing of PPG to Trustee in its Quarterly Report.

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF Trust Funds or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

Attachment 1 - CSARL Contributions to the Three Rio Conventions

The Government of the Kingdom of Swaziland has adopted an integrated approach toward enhanced resilience in addressing the challenges posed by Land Degradation, Biodiversity Loss and Climate Change. The integrated approach is intended to enhance synergies in the implementation of the three Rio Conventions, namely: (1) the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, (UNFCCC), (2) the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and (3) the Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD). The GoS has ratified all three Rio Conventions (UNCCD, CBD and UNFCCC) and is in the process of drafting or has submitted the following reports

- Aligned National Action Programme (Nap) Of Swaziland For The United Nations Convention To Combat Desertification¹⁰
- Swaziland's Second National Biodiversity Strategy And Action Plan¹¹
- Swaziland's Second National Communication To The United Nations Framework Convention On Climate Change¹²
- Climate Vulnerability Assessment Of The Water Sector And Infrastructure In Swaziland¹³
- Greenhouse Gas Inventory For Land Use, Land Use Change And Forestry Sector In Swaziland¹⁴

Each of these assessments makes specific references to lessons learned from the GEF LUSLM Project. CSARL and its associated loan project SMLP build on many of these pilots, and has the goal of up-scaling interventions for sustainability and resilience, resulting in maintenance of ecosystems functions and services, biodiversity and habitats would be better preserved. This would also ensure improved climate regulation, reduced vulnerability to environmental shocks and carbon sequestration, which are relevant actions for the three Rio Conventions. Table 1 summarises the alignment between CSARL and targets of the three Rio targets in Swaziland.

CSARL will target national capacity development on land degradation monitoring & assessment, natural resources planning & management, and SLM practices within sector agencies, including government, research and academic institutes, development agencies and the private sector, to enable these to define, implement and refine SLM policies and programmes.

¹⁰ Aligned National Action Programme (Nap) Of Swaziland For The United Nations Convention To Combat Desertification – July 2015 Draft. Swaziland Environmental Authority

¹¹ T.A.M. Mahlaba And A. Monadjem In Association With D. F. Dlamini, 2015. Preparation Of Swaziland's Second National Biodiversity Strategy And Action Plan. Draft National Biodiversity Strategy And Action Plan The Swaziland Environment Authority Ministry Of Tourism And Environmental Affairs (SEA, 2015)

¹² Swaziland's Second National Communication To The United Nations Framework Convention On Climate Change. Swaziland Government, Ministry Of Tourism And Environmental Affairs. 2012

¹³ Vulnerability Assessment Report. Climate Vulnerability Assessment Of The Water Sector And Infrastructure In Swaziland. Ministry Of Natural Resources And Energy – Department Of Water Affairs. January 2014

¹⁴ Absalom M Manyatsi, 2014. Greenhouse Gas Inventory For Land Use, Land Use Change And Forestry Sector In Swaziland Report. Ministry Of Tourism And Environmental Affairs, July 2014

Table 1 CSARL Outcomes mapped against the National targets/objectives of the UNCCD, CBD and UNFCCC in Swaziland, July 2015

CSARL Components and Outputs	Objectives of the Aligned National Action Programme (NAP) of Swaziland for the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification – July 2015 Draft	Swaziland's Second National Biodiversity Strategy And Action Plan – 2022 AichiTargets	Adaptation Measures Identified in the Swaziland Second National Communication to the UNFCCC	Action Programme Climate Vulnerability of Swazilands water sector	Land Use Change Assessment Planned Improvements
Outcome 1:Chiefdom Development Planning process institutionalised in each of the four Regions Outputs: 1.1 Improved institutional framework for development planning at Chiefdom-level 1.2 Chiefdom Development Plans formulated 1.3 Chiefdom human-, water- and land resources allocated to planned development activities	Programme three: Resource Mobilization and Sustainable financing and enabling access to technology Programme four: Mainstreaming, streamlining DLDD and integration and Coordination of policies and legislation	Target 4: Government of Swaziland, municipalities, businesses, local communities and stakeholders at all levels have developed and are implementing plans for sustainable production and consumption and have kept the impacts of use of natural resources well within safe ecological limits. Target 5: The rate of loss, degradation and fragmentation of Swaziland's natural habitats is at least halved, and where feasible brought close to zero. Target 7: all areas under agriculture, aquaculture, forestry and industry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of Swaziland's biodiversity Target 9. invasive species that are alien to Swaziland, and their pathways, are identified and prioritized; priority species are controlled or eradicated, and measures are put in place to manage pathways to prevent their introduction and establishment.	Introduction of sustainable land resource planning and management based Implementation of integrated water resources management Natural forests and woodlands sustainable forest management	Ensure the participation of vulnerable groups like Women and children in developing and implementation resilient strategies	
Outcome 2: Sustainable land management applied at multiple scales in all four regions Outputs: 2.1 SLM at (or above) Chiefdom level 2.2 SLM at Chiefdom level 2.3 SLM at farm and household level	Programme one: Sustainable and Transformational Livelihoods, Poverty Alleviation and Alternative Livelihoods <u>Indigenous Chickens, Agroforestry and Nurseries, Mushrooms, Bee-keeping, Flexi-Biogas Systems and Home gardens, Infield Water Harvesting technologies, Goat Production, Non Timber Forest Products (NTFPs), Livestock production (beef) and Livestock production</u>		Shifting planting periods involving research for planting dates and other management factors. Drought resistant crops through diversifying cropping pattern and focussing on drought tolerant crops, through selection, testing and introducing crops such as cassava, pigeon pea, sisal, herp, sorghum, oil seeds such as cotton, sunflower and groundnuts and leguminous crops.	Diversification of Agriculture to drought resistant varieties	

	<p>(dairy).</p> <p>Programme two: Sustainable Land Management and Sustainable Ecosystem Management <u>Sustainable Watershed Management – Groundwater, Invasive Alien Species Control, Community Based Land and Rangeland Rehabilitation, Sustainable Use of Wetlands and Spring Protection, SFM: Restoration and rehabilitation of natural forests and woodlands and development of forest environment, Community</u></p>		<p>Conducting research on drought tolerant food crops in collaboration with the University of Swaziland Partnerships with regional seed companies and research institutions have helped fast-track research efforts.</p> <p>Irrigation support through developing small dams primarily for livestock and domestic water with supplementary irrigation for horticulture</p> <p>Rain water harvesting</p> <p>Adaptation options for biodiversity</p> <p>Alien invasive plant species comprehensive program</p>		
<p>Outcome 3:</p> <p>National capacity to design, implement, monitor and refine sustainable land management policies and programmes at multiple scales.</p> <p>Outputs:</p> <p>3.1 Systematic surveillance of land degradation processes and interventions</p> <p>3.2 Improved institutional framework for Chiefdom Development Planning</p> <p>3.3 Research, policy- and development agencies jointly engaged in M&E of SLM activities in the Project area</p>	<p>Programme two: Sustainable Land Management and Sustainable Ecosystem Management - National assessment and mapping of DLDD.</p> <p>Programme four: Mainstreaming, streamlining DLDD and integration and Coordination of policies and legislation</p> <p>Programme five: Public Awareness and knowledge management (UNCCD operational obj 1 & 3)</p> <p>Programme six: Building Capacities of institutions and people on DLDD</p>	<p>Target 10: pressures on Swaziland's vulnerable and most valuable ecosystems are identified and prioritized; priority pressures are controlled or eradicated.</p> <p>Target 11: at least 20 per cent of Swaziland's land area, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, protected landscapes and multiple resource use areas are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of protected areas.</p> <p>Target 14: Swaziland's ecosystems that provide essential services are restored and safeguarded taking into account the needs of women and children, local communities and those of the poor and vulnerable.</p> <p>Target 15: ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been</p>	<p>Regional suitability production through introducing sustainable land resource planning and management based on updated AEZ and crop suitability models,</p>	<p>Inclusion of climate change as a subject in the national curriculum</p> <p>Gazette the draft Land policy</p> <p>Establishment of information management hardware/software and sharing protocols</p>	<p>Development of digital land use database for all the years using remote sensing and field validation.</p> <p>Digital soil maps should be produced, indicating distribution of different soil types such as organic soils (and peat soils) and mineral soils.</p> <p>Experiments should be carried to determine the carbon content under local conditions for different land cover and land use categories.</p>

		<p>enhanced in Swaziland, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15 per cent of degraded ecosystems, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification.</p> <p>Target 19: knowledge, the science base and technologies relating to biodiversity, its values, functioning, status and trends, and the consequences of its loss, are improved, widely shared and transferred, and applied in Swaziland.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--