



---

## Ecosystem conservation and community livelihood enhancement in North Western Zambia

### Basic Information

**GEF ID**

10192

**Countries**

Zambia

**Project Title**

Ecosystem conservation and community livelihood enhancement in North Western Zambia

**GEF Agency(ies)**

UNEP

**Agency ID**

UNEP: 01694

**GEF Focal Area(s)**

Multi Focal Area

**Program Manager**

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

## PIF

### Part 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

The project is developed under BD-1-1 (BD mainstreaming), LD-1-1 (SLM), and LD 1-2 (SFM).

It is fine at PIF level. Confirm during the PPG, as SLM 1.3 (Forest Landscape Restoration) could be triggered.

April 30, 2019 - Please, note that in the PIF template, you wrote LD 2.2 instead of LD 1.2 (LD 2.2 does not exist).

May 1st, 2019 - Addressed

##### Agency Response

Noted. The possible alignment with SLM 1.3 will be reviewed and confirmed during the PPG phase.

May 1, 2019 – Thank you, the PIF has been corrected to reflect LD 1.2.

#### 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?

**Project, Program Objectives and the Core Indicators:****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Not fully.

- The formulation of outputs is a source of concerns (1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.2, 2.4, 3.2, and 3.3). We take note of the proposed framework of outcomes, outputs, with associated indicators which are very useful to understand the ambition of the project. However, please ensure that the formulation of outputs well reflect the results of activities; they must be concrete, and if possible quantified. Please, refer to the OECD glossary, if needed.
- Please confirm the part between Technical Assistance and Investment. For the time being 100% of the project is considered as TA. We are not sure it is coherent with the component 2, outputs 2.3 and 2.4 (ANR programme implemented, adoption of techniques), and the proposed indicators of 5,000 ha of forests restored and 100,000 ha of lands under improved management.
- The question is also applicable for the component 1: Are you planning to obtain 20,000 ha under SLM, and 80,000 ha under improved management for BD. Without investment? only with plans and training? Please, clarify.
- Component 1: Can the 10 Community Forest Management Areas or Participatory Forest Management Areas, 10 sustainable forest management plans registered; 2 District Integrated Development Plans mainstream SFM and 6 Community Forest Management Areas or Participatory Forest Management Areas receiving income and disbursing funds to participating communities, be delivered with the soft interventions proposed for component 1 (i.e. assessment, outreach program, declarations and promotions) and without Investment? What is the budget for implementation of these deliverables beyond the creation and who is going to provide the funding?
- Component 2: There is a disconnect between Component 1 and 2 because the outcomes of Component 2 do not reflect the propositions of Component 1. Is the “promotion of conservation and sustainable use of natural resources in community-managed forests” going to take place in the 10 Community Forest Management Areas or Participatory Forest Management Areas? Can this be achieved with the training and equipment of 50 community forest guards + one community-based enterprise + 5,000 ha of degraded forests under restoration + households adopting more efficient energy and heating systems?
- Component 3: Is it feasible to “enhance the sustainability and productivity of agricultural practices in community-managed forests” by simply providing technical assistance via agricultural extension officers, technical and financial assistance provided to incentivize the adoption of sustainable agricultural practices and assisting participating farmers in improving their productivity and net income? This sounds like an aspirational statement that a set of deliverables that can be produced within time and budget. Please provide details as on how this is going to take place.

April 30, 2019

Addressed.

## Agency Response

- The *Indicative Project Description Summary* of the PIF has been reformulated to better reflect the suite of concrete activities envisaged under each output.
  
- Both the PIF template and the portal unfortunately only allow one to select Technical Assistance or Investments. The project comprises a blend of Technical Assistance and Investment (as indicated in the comment), but UN Environment selected the most important of the two in its submission. Component 1 is considered as TA in its entirety. Components 2 and 3 have both Technical Assistance and Investment elements. Substantive Investment activities for the project include: establishment of a regional nursery (Output 2.3); installation of composting and mulching facilities (Output 3.2); and installation of small crop processing plants and storage facilities (Output 3.3).
  
- The target for Component 1 is '*at least 10 CFMAs/ PFMAs declared, covering >80,000ha of dryland forest landscapes*' and **not** '80,000 ha under improved management for BD'. The overall target for the full project is 80,000 ha of land under improved forest management (as well as 5,000 ha of forest area under rehabilitation) and 20,000 ha of land under improved agricultural management. The project's contribution to the GEF 7 core indicators will be realized at the project-wide scale (and not at the component level) and this will include both Technical Assistance and Investment. An additional target, '*More sustainable crop and livestock agricultural practices adopted in at least 20,000 ha*', has been included in the PIF to clarify the distinction between the areas being managed for sustainable forestry (i.e. the project-supported CFMAs and PFMAs) and those managed for sustainable agriculture (areas adjacent to, and surrounding, the project-supported CFMAs and PFMAs).
  
- Based on the recent success of the Government of Finland funded pilot project '*Decentralised Forest and other Natural Resources Management Program*' (DFNRMP), we are confident that the suite of outputs and activities proposed under component 1 will be sufficient to achieve the outcome targets for Component 1 using the 'soft interventions' being proposed. Component 1 only addresses the establishment and planning of these new CFMAs/ CFMAs, while Component 2 is strongly focused on strengthening the operational and financial sustainability of the CFMAs/PFMAs. We do however agree that the target of '*at least 6 CFMA/ PFMAs are receiving income and disbursing funds to participating communities*' is not achievable under Component 1. This target has now been moved to Component 2 in the PIF. The project time frame of five years is too short to guarantee their operational and financial sustainability beyond the term of this project. To mitigate this, the project envisages incrementally building the capacities of the FD and the individual CFMGs/PFMCs to implement the resourcing framework (financial planning for, and financial management of, the area to strengthen their financial sustainability) contained in the overarching forest management plan prepared for each CFMA/PFMA.
  
- Component 2 flows directly from Component 1. The outputs and activities under Component 2 are entirely focused on operationalising elements of the forest management plans prepared for each newly declared PFMA/CFMA. We apologise that this was not clear. The text in the PIF has been revised to better reflect the linkage between Components 1 and 2. The resource limitations however dictate that GEF funding is not sufficient to implement all the elements of the forest management plans. The selected areas of support are thus only catalytic and are intended to demonstrate the potential value to communities of taking direct control over the sustainable management of their natural resources through community forest modalities. The conceptual model for community forest management is premised on the

their natural resources through community forest modalities. The conceptual model for community forest management is premised on the

notion that by devolving the control of forests and forest resources to communities, and then supporting households within these communities to sustainably increase their productivity and incomes through net revenues from the sale of their crops and forest-based products, this will provide sufficient incentive for those communities to continue to invest in the long-term stewardship of these forests well beyond the term of the project. This is what this project seeks to test over the longer-term. It is anticipated (and legally required) that the FD will continue to support the functioning of the CFMAs/PFMAs beyond the term of the project. The project will also assist the CFMGs, PFMC's and FD to motivate for additional complementary financial and operational support from other sources.

- As mentioned above, the outputs and activities under Component 3 comprise a blend of Technical Assistance and Investment. We agree that the component description is aspirational (as are Components 1 and 2). The specificities ('details') of the proposed project support to small household farmers are currently contained in the suite of proposed outputs and activities under the component. The intense poverty levels, and limited agricultural support services, in the project area suggests that even small investments are likely to yield significantly beneficial returns. We will however further develop the details of proposed project support under this component during the PPG phase.

## 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**

Cofinancing is brought up by the government, TNC, UNEP, and the Trident Foundation with a mix of in-kind and grant cofinancing.

At CEO endorsement, please detail further the role of the cofinancing in the project.

#### **Agency Response**

We will detail further the role of the co-financing in the project at CEO Endorsement.

May, 6 2019 – Many thanks. Changed the classification between "recurrent expenditures" and "investment mobilized" in co-financing table C in line with Co-Financing guidelines. Where 'investment mobilized' has been indicated, it refers to Co-Financing that excludes recurrent expenditures, as defined in the guidelines.

## 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

The proposed GEF financing in the table D mentions resources from BD and LD allocations + fees.

Addressed.

The total project grant + PPG + fees = \$6,010,000 (tables D+E) reflects the amount mentioned in the letter of endorsement.

### Agency Response

Noted.

May, 6 2019 – Many thanks. Corrected the break-down by Focal area between tables A and D to match.

## The STAR allocation?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

- \$1,945,797 (grant + fees) is within the BD STAR allocation (\$5.08 million).

- \$3,899,953 (grant + fees) exceeds the LD allocation of \$2.41 million.

A marginal adjustment up to \$2 million is however possible.

The letter endorsement mentions the transfer of \$1.6 million from CCM to LD.

Addressed.

**Agency Response**

Noted.

**The focal area allocation?**

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

The requested resources are available from BD and LD resources, including the transfer of \$1.6 million from CCM to LD.

**Agency Response**

Noted.

**The LDCF under the principle of equitable access**

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

NA

**Agency Response**

N/A

**The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?**

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

NA

**Agency Response**

N/A

**Focal area set-aside?**

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

NA

**Agency Response**

N/A

**Impact Program Incentive?**

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

NA

**Agency Response**

N/A

**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**

A PPG of \$150,000 is requested, within the acceptable range for projects between 3 and 6 million.

Addressed.

**Agency Response**

Noted.

**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**

The proposed core indicators are 3.2 (5,000 ha of forest and forest land restored), 4.1 (80,000 ha of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity, out of protected area), 4.3 (20,000 ha of areas under SLM in production systems), and 11 (1,000 direct beneficiaries, including 500 female and 500 male beneficiaries).

Please, confirm these values at CEO endorsement.

Addressed.

April 30, 2019

Information in the PIF, the review, and in the portal is not coherent. In the core indicators, 100,000 ha are assigned to the indicator 4.1 (improved management for BD), while in the review you wrote "the target is not 80,000 ha under improved management for BD, but the target is 80,000 ha of land under improved forest management, and 5,000 ha of forest under rehabilitation, and 20,000 ha of land under improved agricultural management". However, in the portal, you did not use the indicator 4.3 for SLM or the indicator 4.4 (High Conservation Value Forests), but assigned 100,000 ha under the indicator 4.1 (improved management for BD). Please, confirm, and make the information coherent. It is important to justify the use of LD and BD resources.

### **Agency Response**

These values will be confirmed at CEO endorsement.

May 1, 2019: The 80,000 ha of forests has been assigned to indicator 4.4 and the 20,000 ha of improved, more sustainable land use practices assigned to indicator 4.3. A document has been uploaded to justify the targeted sites (80,000 ha) in Northwestern Province to qualify as HCVPs as required in the portal. The information is now coherent between the PIF and the portal. Information has also been added to section "5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from baseline, GEFTF and co-financing; and 6) global environmental benefits (GEFTF) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)" to clarify both BD and LD benefits (see revised PIF, p.15).

### **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**

Yes.

Addressed.

**Agency Response**

Noted.

May, 6 2019 – Many thanks. Filled out taxonomy section.

**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**

Addressed

**Agency Response**

Noted.

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

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

Addressed.

**Agency Response**

Noted.

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

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

Addressed.

**Agency Response**

Noted.

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

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

Addressed.

**Agency Response**

Noted.

**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**

Addressed.

**Agency Response**

Noted.

**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**

The justification for the use of BD \$1.9 million is not fully convincing: Please elaborate on what BD benefits (global important biodiversity) that will be derived from these investments that are more in line with an SLM and SFM project than one focusing on biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. What do these 100,000 ha have in store for BD conservation and what are the specific investments to deliver them?

Confirm the targets at CEO endorsement.

April 30, 2019

We take note of the response made, and the revised text in the PIF (p15, incremental reasoning). However, reflect the changes in the core indicators (4.1 improved management for BD, 4.3 SLM, 4.4 HVCF, and 3.2 area for forest and forest land restored).

May 1st, 2019 - Addressed.

**Agency Response**

As requested, the PIF has been revised to further elaborate on the BD benefits that will be derived from the investment.

The targets will be confirmed at CEO Endorsement.

May 1, 2019: The section on incremental reasoning has been further elaborated regarding LD benefits and changes appropriately reflected

in the core indicator worksheet and GEF portal.

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

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

There is a potential for innovation and scaling up in this SFM approach focusing on land rights, rights holders, users, and benefits.

Devolving forest management and control of forest resources to local communities can be a strong incentive for sustainability.

Addressed.

Please, reinforce these elements at CEO endorsement.

### Agency Response

Agreed. These elements will be reinforced at CEO endorsement.

## Project/Program Map and Coordinates

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

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

A general map is available.

More detailed maps and geo-references of targeted landscapes will be welcome during PPG, when specific forest landscapes would have been selected by communities.

**Agency Response** More detailed geo-referenced maps will be prepared during the PPG phase

## 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

Addressed. (p30 and annex E).

### Agency Response

Noted.

## 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

Gender issues are not very detailed in the text, but gender issues are included in the result framework (outcome 2, indicator 2.a, outcome 3).

p.30: A gender responsive rapid social assessment is proposed to analyze the role of women and men in production, access to resources and services, decision making mechanisms. Resources will be assigned to the project to specifically promote gender equality and women economic empowerment, including in project implementation (staff, committee, etc).

Cleared.

to be confirmed at CEO endorsement.

### Agency Response

Noted.

## Private Sector Engagement

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

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The case is made for private sector engagement. However, we suggest to remove the names of the private groups for the time being: The PIF mentions future collaborations with large copper, gold, cobalt mining rights and concessions holders, forestry and mining companies, hunting companies, and agriculture producers: A background check is expected for these companies. Please, confirm the absence of reputation risks. We suggest a conservative approach. Please extend the background check beyond Zambia, as some of these companies may have a global or regional action.

- At CEO endorsement, please provide details about the connection between the private sector and community-based farmer networks, agriculture enterprises, and nature-based enterprises.

### Agency Response

Agreed. The names of private groups have now been removed from the PIF.

At CEO endorsement, details about the connection between the private sector and community-based farmer networks, agriculture enterprises, and nature-based enterprises will be provided. A background check will be undertaken for any identified companies.

## 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**

Addressed.

**Agency Response**

Noted.

## 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**

Addressed.

**Agency Response**

Noted.

### 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

Addressed.

#### Agency Response

Noted.

### 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

The result framework includes a knowledge based approach (output 1.1, 1.21.4,) including the analysis of past experiences (1.1), the transfer of lessons in outreach (1.2), training (2.1) and platforms of agricultural extension officers (3.1).

Addressed

**Agency Response**

Noted.

**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**

Cleared.

**Agency Response**

Noted.

**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**

May 4th, 2019: All the technical points have been addressed. However, please, address the comments below:

- - The break-down by Focal area between table A and table D does not match;
- - Please, fill out the taxonomy again;

- Please describe the definition/ approach used to differentiate between "investment mobilized" and "recurrent expenditures". Moreover, where co-financing truly meets the definition of "in-kind", it should typically be classified as "recurrent expenditures" rather than "investment mobilized". For further details, please refer to the Co-Financing Guidelines ([http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing\\_Guidelines.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf)).

Upon receipt of a revised submission, the PIF will be recommended for clearance.

May 6, 2019

The PIF is recommended for clearance.

## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

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

- Please confirm cofinancing, not only a letter, but explain the role of cofinancing in the project to also better demonstrate the added value of GEF resources;
- Please, confirm the core indicators and the numbers;
  - The number of beneficiaries seem low (1,000);
  - Please, check appropriate indicators related to LD: # of ha under SLM is the core indicator, but change in land productivity, carbon stocks, land cover change, Improved livelihoods in rural areas, or value of investments in SLM may be considered at CEO endorsement.
- Please confirm how the gender issues will have been included in the project design.
- Provide a background check on potential partners to protect the GEF from reputation risks.
- Provide geo-referenced data of targeted forests and landscapes.
- Please provide details about the connection between the private sector and community-based farmer networks, agriculture enterprises, and nature-based enterprises.

- Please, reinforce the rationale for sustainability, innovation and scaling up.

### Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/18/2019	4/26/2019
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/30/2019	5/6/2019
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/4/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/6/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)		