

# Climate Change Adaptation in Forest and Agricultural Mosaic Landscapes

В	asic Information
	GEF ID 10186
	<b>Countries</b> Zambia
	<b>Project Title</b> Climate Change Adaptation in Forest and Agricultural Mosaic Landscapes
	<b>GEF Agency(ies)</b> FAO
	Agency ID FAO: 643688
	<b>GEF Focal Area(s)</b> Climate Change
	Program Manager Dustin Schinn

## PIF

art I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 23, 2019:

Yes. Project aligns well with CCA-1 and CCA-2.

**Agency Response** 

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 23, 2019:

The project and its components are designed in a clear and sound way, and the quality of the proposal is commendable. However, please clarify/address a few remaining issues/questions as follows:

(i) Under Output 1.1.2, please clarify what "community structures" for forest landscape management will be strengthened; which structures are those and how do they belo address climate change adaptation?

https://gefportal.worldbank.org/App/#/gefsecreview/pmreview/view/446f33ba-2955-e911-a827-000d3a365662/view

are mose and now do mey neip address climate change adaptation:

(ii) Under Output 2.1.3, please investigate whether there are other countries or other areas in Zambia where the proposed NTFP production and development of small-scale forest enterprises has been successful, to inform this LDCF project. The use of NTFPs for livelihoods is a feasible approach and seems reasonable in the circumstances of Zambian forests, however, it would be beneficial to explore in how far existing approaches can be replicated/scaled up, and in how far these forest enterprises could be connected to markets.

(iii) Under Component 3 on "Enhancing diversified livelihood strategies for climate resilience", the project is expected to benefit 144,000 people. However, it seems unclear how the proposed activities under this component will actually reach beneficiaries on the ground. For example, "participatory selection of suitable climate-resilient species" (Output 3.1.2) or "Development of inclusive value chains for selected crops" (Output 3.1.3) are relatively vague and could consist of technical assistance, training and guideline preparation, while the project needs to have a clear formulation of expected benefits for the vulnerable people on the ground.

(iv) Output 4.2.1 currently comprises regional and global knowledge management and link with the Drylands Sustainable Impact Program. This is very relevant. Please also include coordination from the ground up with the Drylands Impact Program in the section on "coordination."

DS, April 28, 2019:

Comments cleared.

#### **Agency Response**

Thank you for the feedback and below is our response:

(i) **Output 1.1. 2**: Community structures include community forestry management committees, Forest user group leaders, local traditional leadership and local government ward development committees, which are important for local climate change adaptation and mitigation plan implementation and need to be strengthened and provided with tools and skills on adaptation measures including: integrated land use planning, participatory climate risk assessments, SFM and agroforestry.

(ii) **Output 2.1.3:** Yes, there are already a number of NTFPs with very high market potential already being produced on a small scale in Zambia. These include honey, dry and fresh mushrooms as well as tamarind and baobab products. These will be scaled-up through the application of business incubation skills among other enterprise development tools to go to a larger scale.

(iii) **Component 3**: How the component will reach beneficiaries on the ground has been further elaborated in the description of component 3 (Part II, 3) and in the project framework as follows:

3.1.2 Community level participatory selection of suitable climate-resilient species using traditional knowledge, farmer field schools, field days (with focus on neglected and underutilized crops, here) conducted with FFPOs and guidelines for sustainable management and promotion developed and implemented (to reach out to about 144,000 beneficiaries).

3.1.3 Support provided to producer groups and their associations in the development of inclusive value chains for selected crops (e.g. establishment of community based seed banks and certification system, links to markets etc).

This support goes beyond preparation of trainings and guidelines.

(iv) **Output 4.2.1**: Point taken. There will indeed be coordination with the DSL IP on the ground. Reflected in the revised wording:

4.2.1 Participation in regional and global knowledge management events (organized by the DSL IP) and on-the ground south-south exchanges and visits with the DSL IP child projects

### **Co-financing**

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 23, 2019:

Please clarify why all co-financing is listed as "recurrent expenditures". The Agency may wish to explore if there is an opportunity to leverage investments to multiply this project's impact.

DS, April 28, 2019:

Cleared.

#### Agency Response

Yes, there is an opportunity to leverage investments to multiply the project's impact. The \$12 million from the EU Development Fund for sustainable intensification of smallholder farmer systems, whose priorities are very much in line with the proposed LDCF project actions, and national public funds for community level investments (\$4 million from the Ministries of Finance and National Planning) are not recurrent expenditures – they fall under investments mobilized. This has now been corrected in the PIF.

Further efforts will be made during project design to mobilize more investments.

**GEF Resource Availability** 

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 23, 2019:

In the consultation with the government of Zambia on April 23, 2019, the government confirmed that this project reflects their priority and should be prioritized over other submissions. The project is eligible for LDCF financing and fits within the cumulative ceiling and the percountry cap of up to \$10 million for the period of 2018-2022. The project, once cleared, will be compared to other projects based on the factors for project prioritization approved by the LDCF/SCCF Council in June 2018.

### Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

## Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

**Project Preparation Grant** 

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 23, 2019:

Yes.

Agency Response

**Core indicators** 

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 23, 2019:

Please provide expected indicators for climate change adaptation, which consists of 4 core indicators and associated meta-data. Please provide this information in the Excel template as circulated to Agencies, and upload as an attachment to GEF Portal.

DS, April 28, 2019:

Excel file received. Please however include the number of individual beneficiaries in the relevant cell in that Excel file, instead of the number of households. So the number should be 144,000.

DS, May 1, 2019:

Comment cleared.

### Agency Response

This has been done – indicators worksheet attached.

Correction made in the attached Excel file.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 23, 2019:

Please adjust the Rio Markers for the project in GEF Portal, to reflect that the project has climate change adaptation as its principal objective (Rio Marker CCA = 2).

DS, April 28, 2019:

Cleared.

## Agency Response

Rio Markers have been adjusted in the portal.

art II - Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 23, 2019:

Yes.

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 23, 2019:

As mentioned above, please explore whether other investment baselines could be leveraged. If not, please provide justification.

DS, April 28, 2019:

Cleared.

### Agency Response

This has been addressed – additional investment baseline identified and reflected in the revised PIF.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 23, 2019:

Yes.

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion DS, April 23, 2019: Yes.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 23, 2019:

Yes.

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 23, 2019:

Yes.

**Agency Response** 

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 23, 2019:

Please describe in more detail what the "scale-up of sustainable charcoal technologies" would comprise. Does this include efficient charcoal production, or also sustainable forest management?

DS, April 28, 2019:

Cleared.

### **Agency Response**

A detailed description of what the scale-up of sustainable charcoal technologies would comprise has been inserted in the revised PIF. Here the idea is to ensure that charcoal is produced in an efficient way from well management forest landscapes. So efficient production and sustainable forest management go hand-in-hand, also bearing in mind that sustainable harvest systems are part of sustainable/efficient production. Under the Forest and Farm Facility, production technologies such as improved ventilated earth kilns and retort kilns have been successfully tested and these are the kind of technologies that will be promoted.

## Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

#### DS, April 23, 2019:

Yes, however, please explain whether the project intends to overlap with areas in Zambia that already benefit from UNEP or UNDP projects with LDCF support.

#### DS, April 28, 2019:

Cleared. There is no geographical overlap and the lessons and best practices from the other LDCF-financed initiatives will be incorporated.

Agency Response There are two LDCF supported UNDP (Promoting climate resilient community-based regeneration of indigenous forests in Zambia's Central Province) and UNEP (Building the resilience of local communities in Zambia through the introduction of Ecosystem based Adaptation (EbA) into priority ecosystems, including wetlands and forests) projects that are relevant. Although there is no geographical overlap with these projects, the UNDP project is particularly important because of its main interventions – piloting agro-forestry and natural regeneration techniques, charcoal production technologies and fire management. Therefore, in scaling-up innovations and technologies in forestry value chains including charcoal and NTFPs under component 2, the proposed project must take into account best practices and lessons from the UNDP-led project (this to be ensured in project design).

### Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 23, 2019:

Please consider whether the Zambia Ministry of Agriculture should be given a role as a stakeholder as well, especially in light of the project addressing agro-forestry issues. Currently, only the Ministry of Lands, Natural Resources and Environmental Protection is listed as a stakeholder.

DS, April 28, 2019:

Cleared.

#### Agency Response

Yes, the Ministry of Agriculture will be a key partner in the project and their role is now reflected in the stakeholder list.

### Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Gabriella/DS, April 29, 2019:

Partly unclear: Please provide further description on the relevant gender context for the project, specifically as it relates to the components. Please include some indication what a "gender responsive approach" will entail in the sort of activities that are envisaged as part of the project.

DS, May 1, 2019:

Cleared.

#### Agency Response

Further description provided in the revised PIF:

In Zambia, ownership and control of assets and resources (natural resources inclusive) is predominantly in the hands of men. Traditionally, the majority of women do not own nor inherit land. The control over use of income and participation in making decisions in the use of income has equally been recorded to be low, more especially among rural households.

As much as women tend to take a significant role in the production of commodities, men tend to take over at the time of marketing the produced commodities. Attempts have been made to engage women on these related aspects but generally, they do not naturally come out

especially when discussions are held in public domains where men are present. Furthermore, women and youth farmers are generally the

most financially excluded group especially in terms of formal services.

Given the above gender context, the project will take a gender responsive approach at all levels of the project components; namely promoting innovations and technologies in forestry value chains; and the component of enhancing diversifies livelihood strategies for climate resilience. The overall goal will be to promote gender equity and equality in access to and control of natural assets, technologies, services, decision-making processes, products and income from forest landscapes in order to enhance food security, wellbeing and resilience of rural households, especially women and girls.

The first level effort will be to fully understand the roles of the various actors in the sector and their contributions to specific products and services, and then design interventions that will be appropriate to their knowledge and skills, resources, time availability, interest and ingenuity.

Based on consultations conducted in the preparation of the PIF, some of the specific targeted gender responsive activities identified include:

• Incorporate behavior change messages into farmer training materials and advice to promote women's decision-making over key aspects of production related to crop production and management of forestry and non-forestry resources;

• Use of success stories from a number of different contexts about how shared decision-making and equitable divisions of labor between men and women improves economic security and overall income;

• Promote agricultural and forestry related activities viewed as women friendly such as production of indigenous vegetables, which are on demand by the market;

• Encourage the involvement of women in all training programs, and where necessary, conduct women specific training programs;

- Increase the household's access to time and labor saving inputs, technologies and/or services, whilst increasing production;
- Encourage investment in mechanizing activities that females are primarily involved in;

• Encourage women participation in product marketing to promote women's decision-making and accountability to on-farm proceeds and returns on labour.

A percentage of the budget will be allocated to women's empowerment and support to women's or female-led Forest and Farm Producer Organizations (FFPOs). In addition, the promotion of gender equitable financial and technical support will be ensured, including through community-based savings and lending initiatives and through the dissemination of labour-saving and gender-sensitive technologies and practices.

<!-- /\* Style Definitions \*/ p.MsoNormal, li.MsoNormal, div.MsoNormal {mso-style-unhide:no; mso-style-qformat:yes; mso-style-parent:""; margin:0cm; margin-bottom:.0001pt; mso-pagination:widow-orphan; font-size:12.0pt; font-family:"Times New Roman"; mso-fareast-fontfamily:"Times New Roman"; mso-ansi-language:EN-US; mso-fareast-language:EN-US;} p.MsoFootnoteText, li.MsoFootnoteText,

div MecEcotroteText /mec-etvle-name:"Ecotroteteket\ Canava 0\ Ecot\: Canava 0\ Roston 10\ f\ ET\ ECOTNOTES\ fr\ single https://gefportal.worldbank.org/App/#/gefsecreview/pmreview/view/446f33ba-2955-e911-a827-000d3a365662/view

uiv.ivisui uutinute tekt titisu-style-tiattie. Tuunutetekst (juetteva 🤊 (ji uitt), uetteva 🤊 (juustuit tu (ji (ji ti (ji tuutu) tus (jitt),sittyje

Char2\,Char Char21\,Char Char211\,footnote text\,ft\,ADB\,Footnote"; mso-style-priority:99; mso-style-unhide:no; mso-style-gformat:yes; mso-style-link:"Fodnotetekst Tegn\,Geneva 9 Tegn\,Font\: Geneva 9 Tegn\,Boston 10 Tegn\,f Tegn\,FT Tegn\,FOOTNOTES Tegn\,fn Tegn\,Char Char2 Tegn\,ft Tegn"; margin:0cm; margin-bottom:.0001pt; mso-pagination:widow-orphan; font-size:10.0pt; font-family:"Times New Roman"; mso-fareast-font-family:"Times New Roman"; mso-ansi-language:EN-US; mso-fareast-language:EN-US;} span.MsoFootnoteReference {mso-style-name:"Fodnotehenvisning\,16 Point\,Superscript 6 Point\,BVI fnr Carattere Char Char Char Car\,BVI fnr Car"; mso-style-priority:99; mso-style-unhide:no; mso-style-qformat:yes; mso-style-locked:yes; mso-style-parent:""; mso-style-{mso-style-name:"Fodnotetekst Tegn\,Geneva 9 Tegn\,Font\: Geneva 9 Tegn\,Boston 10 Tegn\,f Tegn\,FT Tegn\,FOOTNOTES Tegn\,fn Tegn\,Char Char2 Tegn\,ft Tegn"; mso-style-priority:99; mso-style-unhide:no; mso-style-locked:yes; mso-style-link:"Fodnotetekst\,Geneva 9\,Font\: Geneva 9\,Boston 10\,f\,FT\,FOOTNOTES\,fn\,single space\,Footnote Text Char1\,Footnote Text Char Char\,Char Char\,Char Char\,Char Char Char Char\,Char Char Char Char Char Char\,Char Char2\,Char Char21\,Char Char211\,footnote text\,ft\,ADB\,Footnote";} p.BVIfnrCarattereCharCharCharCarattereCharCharCharCharCharCharCharCharCharCarattereChar,

Containers/UBF8T346G9.Office/msoclip1/01/clip\_header.htm") ecs;} @page WordSection1 {size:612.0pt 792.0pt; margin:3.0cm 2.0cm 3.0cm 2.0cm; mso-header-margin:35.4pt; mso-footer-margin:35.4pt; mso-paper-source:0;} div.WordSection1 {page:WordSection1;} /\* List Definitions \*/ @list l0 {mso-list-id:1285695297; mso-list-type:hybrid; mso-list-template-ids:-1866954252 67698689 67698691 67698693

67698689 67698691 67698693 67698699 67698691 67698693;} @list l0:level1 {mso-level-number-format:bullet; mso-level-text:::]; mso-level-tab-stop:none; mso-level-number-position:left; text-indent:-18.0pt; font-family:Symbol;} @list l0:level2 {mso-level-number-format:bullet; mso-level-text::]; mso-level-text::]; mso-level-text::]; mso-level-text::]; mso-level-text::]; mso-level-number-position:left; text-indent:-18.0pt; font-family:"Courier New";} @list l0:level3 {mso-level-number-format:bullet; mso-level-text::]; mso-level-text:]; mso-level-text:]; mso-level-text:]; mso-level-te

### **Private Sector Engagement**

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 23, 2019:

Cleared.

Agency Response

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures

that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 23, 2019:

Cleared.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 23, 2019:

Please see comment above to coordinate with the Drylands Impact Program.

DS, April 28, 2019:

Cleared.

Agency Response Well noted and this is reflected in the PIF.

**Consistency with National Priorities** 

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 23, 2019:

Cleared.

Agency Response

**Knowledge Management** 

Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 23, 2019:

Cleared.

Agency Response

art III - Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been

### checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 23, 2019:

Yes.

Agency Response

**EFSEC DECISION** 

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, May 1, 2019:

All comments cleared. Program Manager recommends PIF for technical clearance and PPG. Zambia had two projects in the technically cleared pipeline of the LDCF at the end of the GEF-6 period. During the GEF Secretariat consultations with the Zambia GEF OFP to discuss the new GEF Adaptation Programming Strategy and Operational Improvements, the OFP prioritized this FAO project over the UNDP project.

Forests are a critical resource in Zambia and cover about 70% of the country, providing the foundation for livelihoods for a large proportion of the population through both timber and non-timber forest products (NTFPs), including among other things the selling of charcoal and firewood which are important contributors to household incomes. It is estimated that 65% of Zambia's population resides in rural areas and are thus directly or indirectly dependent on the forests. This heavy reliance on natural resources and forests in particular coupled with weak management systems due to inadequate tenure systems are at present the one of the main causes behind Zambia's high deforestation rate, estimated at 250,000-300,000 hectares per year.

This project requests US\$ 7,905,572 from the LDCF (incl. Agency Fee and PPG), to increase the resilience of productive landscapes and rural communities through innovations and technology transfer for climate change adaptation. The project is structured around four principal components, including: (1) Improved community managed forests and agricultural landscapes resilient to climate change;

(2) Promoting innovations and technologies in forestry value chains including for charcoal and Non-Timber Forest Products (NTFPs);

(3) Diversified livelihood strategies based on the sustainable management and use of agro-biodiversity; and (4) project M&E.

https://gefportal.worldbank.org/App/#/gefsecreview/pmreview/view/446f33ba-2955-e911-a827-000d3a365662/view

Drawing on indicative co-financing of US\$ 29.5 million from the government and development partners, this project is expected to yield significant adaptation benefits, including: 144,000 direct beneficiaries (50% female); 400,000 hectares of land under climate-resilient management; 50 policies/plans that will mainstream climate resilience; and 1,600 people trained (50% female). Through its M&E component, the project will also link with the Drylands Impact Program, by supporting participation in regional and global knowledge management events and on-the ground south-south exchanges with the Drylands IP child projects. The project is gender-responsive and fully embedded in the national policy agenda.

## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**/iew Dates** 

|                                  | PIF Review | Agency Response |
|----------------------------------|------------|-----------------|
| First Review                     | 4/23/2019  | 4/26/2019       |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 4/28/2019  | 4/30/2019       |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 5/1/2019   |                 |
| Additional Review (as necessary) |            |                 |
| Additional Review (as necessary) |            |                 |