

## ANNUAL PROJECT REPORT (APR/PIR) FOR UNDP/GEF PROJECTS 2005

**OFFICIAL TITLE:** Management of Indigenous Vegetation for the Rehabilitation of Degraded Rangelands in the Arid Zone of Africa

**COUNTRY:** Botswana **REGION :** Southern Africa

**UNDP PROJECT NUMBER:** BOT98G32/A/1G/99 **GEF PROJECT NUMBER:** PIMS 942

**DATE OF REPORT:** August 4<sup>th</sup> 2005 **DATE OF PREVIOUS REPORT:** June 27<sup>th</sup> 2003

IS THIS THE TERMINAL APR/PIR? NO: X  
YES: Date Project was Operationally Closed :

1. BASIC PROJECT IDENTIFIERS- Please enter all date (DD/MM/YEAR)		
FOCAL AREA	Biodiversity	
OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME	Conserve Biodiversity and Rehabilitate Degraded Areas in Arid and Semi-Arid Zone Ecosystems.	
STRATEGIC PRIORITY	<b>BD-2 Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production landscapes and Sectors</b>	
PROJECT SIZE (FULL, MEDIUM SIZED)	Full	
DATE OF ENTRY IN WP		
PRODOC SIGNATURE DATE	2-JULY-2001	
DURATION (MONTHS)	60	
DATE OF FIRST DISBURSEMENT	July 2002	
CLOSING DATE	Original: June 2007	
	Revised 1:	
	Revised 2:	
PROJECT FUNDING	GEF	\$2,286,591
	CO-FINANCING	\$1,100,000
	TOTAL :	\$3,386,591

**BRIEF PROJECT DESCRIPTION. (To be filled by Regional Coordinating Unit)**

*As it appears in PIMS. Please adjust if required.*

This project is a demonstration programme for biodiversity conservation and dryland ecosystem restoration in the arid and semi-arid zones of Africa. The project will combine community based indigenous knowledge, the findings of scientific research and past practical experience to rehabilitate degraded ecosystems and conserve biodiversity by developing sustainable natural resource management systems. A major goal of the project is to facilitate an exchange of knowledge and experience between three comparable but different situations and develop models, which can be transferred elsewhere within the continent. Technology transfer and supporting research will be a vital part of the project. This will be achieved by (i) strengthening appropriate indigenous management systems; (ii) developing integrated bio-socio-economic data systems; (iii) rehabilitating indigenous vegetation and degraded land; (iv) improving the effectiveness of livestock production and marketing and developing of alternative livelihood systems. Implementation of the project is based on a firm partnership with African arid-zone pastoralists and on close technical co-operation between the collaborating countries.

Has it been adjusted? :

YES:

NO:

**2. IMPACTS AND RESULTS RELATED TO THE NEW**

**3. PROJECT PERFORMANCE**

SRF Goal (*):	Goal 3. Energy and environment for sustainable development
SRF Sub Goal (*)	Service line 3.4 Sustainable land management to combat desertification and land degradation
Strategic Area of Support (*)	Monitoring and assessment of environmental sustainability

(\* The UNDP Country Office will fill out these fields)

<b>3.1 OBJECTIVE :</b> (pls. describe)	To develop models for the conservation of biodiversity and rehabilitation of degraded rangelands, and to develop sustainable management systems using indigenous knowledge.
---	---

Description	Value in year 0	Mid-term Target Value (2005)	End of Project Target Value (2007)	2004 Value	2005 Value	Last year Rating	This year Rating <sup>1</sup>
<b>Indicator 1:</b> Two years after termination of the project, the majority of the collaborating communities in each country are actively implementing management plans using indigenous knowledge that are believed to halt further land degradation and reduction in species richness in communal rangelands.	No organised community-based management	Management plans begin formulation	4 management plans in place and implemented	N/A	Agreed management planning process	N/A	S
<b>Indicator 2:</b> Two years after termination of the project, government and non-government institutions in the three participating countries demonstrate continued commitment to the creation of an enabling environment for community-based natural resource management by the incorporation of project goals in programmes and planning documents and policy initiatives.	CBNRM policy in draft form, no rangeland management policy	Policy makers engaged in dialogue	Explicit support by policy makers for community-based management of rangeland resources	N/A	IVP has had input into draft CBNRM policy and draft Land Policy. Executing Agency in Ministry of Agriculture has incorporated IVP outcomes into strategic plan 2003-6.	N/A	MS
<b>Overall Rating</b>							<b>MS</b>

<sup>1</sup> Ratings. HS: Highly Satisfactory / S: Satisfactory / MS: marginally Satisfactory / U: Unsatisfactory. Please refer to Instruction Sheet for definition of each rating.

<i>Project Comment on rating</i>	<i>Rating fair: There have been many hesitations in embarking on the management planning process due to the many externalities that could potentially undermine the process, such as lack of explicit policy support. Nevertheless, in retrospect the management planning process should have been undertaken earlier. Due to limitations of project funds, two plans will be undertaken initially while funds are sought for another two. As the creation of an enabling environment is so crucial to long term sustainability of IVP initiatives, the incorporation of IVP goals into departmental action plan is therefore positive, but more concrete action needs to be taken to operationalise this integration</i>
<i>Country Office Comment</i>	Rating: Unsatisfactory. The bulk of activity in the first half of the project life have not contributed to the project objective. This is attributable to (i) inappropriate sequencing of activities and (ii) that not all project outcomes relate to the project objective.
<i>UNDP/GEF Regional Coordinator Comment</i>	
<i>UNDP/GEF Principal Technical Advisor Comment</i>	

**3.2 OUTCOMES.<sup>2-</sup>**

<i>Outcome 1: (pls. describe)</i>	<b>Establishment of appropriate indigenous management systems.</b>						
<b>Description</b>	Value in year 0	Mid-term Target Value (2005)	End of Project Target Value (2007)	2004 Value	2005 Value	Last year Rating	This year Rating <sup>3</sup>
<b><i>Indicator 1: By the end of the project, a majority of collaborating communities in each country have started to implement land use plans that incorporate indigenous practices expected to have beneficial effects on local species richness and rangeland condition.</i></b>	No organised community-based management	Management plans begin formulation	4 management plans in place and implemented	N/A	Agreed management planning process	N/A	S
<i>Outcome 1 rating:</i>							S

<i>Outcome 2: (pls. describe)</i>	<b>Regional and national data availability on indigenous production and management systems significantly enhanced.</b>						
<b>Description</b>	Value in year 0	Mid-term	End of Project	2004 Value	2005 Value	Last	This

<sup>2</sup> Please use the same format to report on additional outcomes in case the project has more than three.

<sup>3</sup> Ratings. HS: Highly Satisfactory / S: Satisfactory / MS: marginally Satisfactory / U: Unsatisfactory. Please refer to Instruction Sheet for definition of each rating.

		Target Value (2005)	Target Value (2007)			year Rating	year Rating
<b>Indicator 1: By the end of the project, indigenous practices of natural resource management have been described and catalogued for all project sites and have been analyzed for their overarching validity in arid and semi-arid zones in Africa.</b>	<i>No systematized documentation existed at beginning of project</i>	<i>Indigenous practices fully documented</i>	<i>Practices analysed for their overarching validity</i>	N/A	<i>Ecological baseline data collection almost complete for all project sites, but three years too late for adequate measure of baseline. Documentation of indigenous practices of natural resource management integrated into research project with University of Botswana</i>	N/A	MS
<i>Outcome 2 rating:</i>							MS

<i>Outcome 3: (pls. describe)</i>	<b>Indigenous vegetation in degraded rangelands rehabilitated, through reducing pressure on the vegetation resources.</b>						
<b>Description</b>	Value in year 0	Mid-term Target Value (2005)	End of Project Target Value (2007)	2004 Value	2005 Value	Last year Rating	This year Rating <sup>4</sup>
<b>Indicator 1: By the end of the project on sites chosen by and managed with the active involvement of communities under the guidance of the University of Oslo, standardized parameters for species richness and soil degradation show values that are superior to those of similar reference sites that were not actively managed by community members.</b>	<i>No active rehabilitation attempts</i>	<i>Exclusion zones complete</i>	<i>210Ha rehabilitated through natural regeneration or tree planting, 10ha of sand dunes stabilised</i>	N/A	<i>Exclusion fences completed for 5Ha of sand dunes. 6 km of semi-enclusiion (drift) fences completed)</i>	N/A	S
<i>Outcome 3 rating:</i>							S

<i>Outcome 4: (pls. describe)</i>	<b>Provision of alternative livelihoods, and improved livestock markets and feed resources in other arid areas.</b>						
<b>Description</b>	Value in year	Mid-term	End of Project	2004 Value	2005 Value	Last	This

<sup>4</sup> Ratings. HS: Highly Satisfactory / S: Satisfactory / MS: marginally Satisfactory / U: Unsatisfactory. Please refer to Instruction Sheet for definition of each rating.

	0	Target Value (2005)	Target Value (2007)			year Rating	year Rating <sup>5</sup>
<b>Indicator 1: By the end of the project, average purchasing power for a random, statistically valid sample of households at each site has increased by 10% as compared to baseline data.</b>	<i>Few income-generating opportunities in the project sites</i>	<i>All income-generating projects operating</i>	<i>Measurable increase of purchasing power (10%)</i>	N/A	<i>Infrastructure almost complete for Kgalagadi horticultural and indigenous tree nursery production, and Kweneng agroforestry nearing production. Boteti drift fence 40% complete. Report with recommendations from livestock marketing consultancy</i>	N/A	S
<i>Outcome 4 rating:</i>							S

<i>Outcome 5: (pls. describe)</i>	<b>Transfer of technology and information.</b>						
<b>Description</b>	Value in year 0	Mid-term Target Value (2005)	End of Project Target Value (2007)	2004 Value	2005 Value	Last year Rating	This year Rating <sup>6</sup>
<b>Indicator 1: By the end of the project, community members elected to management committees are capable of putting into operation the various land use and management plans adopted by their respective communities</b>	<i>Committees did not exist</i>	<i>Committees active, understand their roles and overseeing development of management plans</i>	<i>Committees overseeing rangeland resource management in their areas</i>	N/A	<i>Committees exist in all project sites, although some less active than others. Committee members have taken part in exchange trips to Namibia and other communities within Botswana. Have also received training in how to develop constitutions.</i>	N/A	S

<sup>5</sup> Ratings. HS: Highly Satisfactory / S: Satisfactory / MS: marginally Satisfactory / U: Unsatisfactory. Please refer to Instruction Sheet for definition of each rating.

<sup>6</sup> Ratings. HS: Highly Satisfactory / S: Satisfactory / MS: marginally Satisfactory / U: Unsatisfactory. Please refer to Instruction Sheet for definition of each rating.

<b>Indicator 2: Staff of the concerned supervisory authorities have the necessary skills to fully assist the communities in implementing these plans</b>	<i>Some skills in overseeing CBNRM existed</i>	<i>Some exposure provided to supervisory authorities</i>	<i>Supervisory authorities competent to fully assist communities to implement plans</i>	N/A	<i>Officers from national and district levels have taken part in seminars and exchange trips to learn about community-based management of rangeland resources</i>	N/A	S
<b>Indicator 3: By the end of the project, Mali, Kenya and Botswana have formalized a network of specialists working in the field of community-based natural resource management</b>	<i>CBNRM Forum existed</i>	<i>Network exists</i>	<i>Network exists and fully informed of issues in CB management of rangeland resources</i>	N/A	<i>IVP and partners form executing agency members of CBNRM Forum and regular contributors in promoting the widening of CBNRM to include rangeland resources and in strengthening the Forum</i>	N/A	HS
<i>Outcome 5 rating:</i>							S

<b>Outcome 6: (pls. describe)</b>	<b>Targeted research in the project areas used for developing methods for replicating the project findings in other arid areas</b>						
<b>Description</b>	Value in year 0	Mid-term Target Value (2005)	End of Project Target Value (2007)	2004 Value	2005 Value	Last year Rating	This year Rating <sup>7</sup>
<b>Indicator 1: By the end of the project, the results of all research activities carried out within the project's research and training framework have been synthesized and presented in the form of management and policy recommendations pertinent to the three collaborating countries as well as to other arid zone countries in Africa</b>	<i>No systematic research undertaken</i>	<i>Research projects beginning to produce data to guide project implementation</i>	<i>Synthesis report</i>	N/A	<i>Some research results achieved through direct collaboration by IVP with research students Research proposal for formal IVP research programme produced in collaboration with University of Botswana</i>	N/A	U
<i>Outcome 6 rating:</i>							U

<sup>7</sup> Ratings. HS: Highly Satisfactory / S: Satisfactory / MS: marginally Satisfactory / U: Unsatisfactory. Please refer to Instruction Sheet for definition of each rating.

<b>Overall Rating</b>	<b>S</b>
-----------------------	----------

<b>3.3 WORK PLAN</b>	TIMING
For outcomes rated MS or U please describe priority Actions planned for the following reporting period to overcome constrains	
<p>ISSUE/CONSTRAINT: Mainstreaming of project goals into policies and programmes of Government of Botswana (objective indicator #2)</p> <p>PRIORITY ACTION: Develop a concrete plan for institutional oversight within executing agency for community-based rangeland management as soon as possible <u>during project cycle</u>, rather than leaving such considerations until the end of the project.</p> <p>BY WHOM: National Coordinator and IVP Team</p>	<p>Date Entered: July 2005</p> <p>Expected Completion: July 2006</p>
<p>ISSUE/CONSTRAINT: Baseline ecological data for project sites late (outcome #2)</p> <p>PRIORITY ACTION: Ensure continued support is given to team that is collecting ecological data, eg in refining methods and capabilities for database creation and management</p> <p>BY WHOM: Project Leader in oversight and University of Oslo in design and training for database management</p>	<p>Date Entered: July 2005</p> <p>Expected Completion: December 2005</p>
<p>ISSUE/CONSTRAINT: Slow progress in research component (Outcome #6)</p> <p>PRIORITY ACTION: Ensure proposed collaborative research programme with University of Botswana is not delayed due to inaction by University of Oslo</p> <p>BY WHOM: Project Manager, in liaison with RCU/UNOPS/University of Oslo</p>	<p>Date Entered: July 2005</p> <p>Expected Completion: December 2005</p>

<b>3.4 RISKS</b>
------------------

	Risk Description	Describe Status of Risk at start of project (Year 0)	Describe Status Last Year	Describe Status this Year	Rating*
A	<b>No major negative changes in drought patterns</b>	<i>Drought forecast</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>This has been a drought year, but drought is not unusual or</i>	<i>L</i>



				<i>unexpected</i>	
B	<b>No major political perturbations in countries</b>	<i>None</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>L</i>
<i>Additional Risks or unexpected problems encountered during the last year of implementation</i>					
C	<i>Policy-level support for decentralization of rangeland management to community level</i>				<i>S</i>
D	<i>Lack of agreement on management strategies at community level</i>				<i>M</i>
E	<i>Insufficient institutional arrangements to continue developing and replicate community-based approaches to rangeland resource management</i>				<i>S</i>

(\*) H= High ; S= Substantial ; M=Modest ; L= Low. Please refer to Instruction sheet for definition of ratings for risks

Please describe actions taken or planned to respond to High and Substantial risks
<p><i>Policy:</i> The past year has seen significant setbacks over in the planned adoption of a national CBNRM policy, however such support is crucial for the long-term sustainability of IVP’s initiatives. IVP plans to hold briefing and consultative meetings with stakeholders over the coming year to promote an understanding of the potential strengths of community-based management, and will continue to work closely with the Inter-Ministerial Technical Committee on the ranching of communal lands to promote community-based management as a viable option for Botswana’s rangelands. In addition, IVP is a member of the National and Regional CBNRM Forums, where it actively promotes an integrated approach to community-based management of rangeland resources.</p> <p><i>Institutional arrangements:</i> Although the goals of IVP are integrated into the departmental strategic plan 2003-6, no arrangements have been made at this stage towards ‘institutionalising’ community-based rangeland management within the executing department. This issue will be addressed in consultation with the executing department over the coming year once the restructuring process is complete and the organizational structure within which IVP fits is finalised</p>

<b>4. ADJUSTMENTS TO ORIGINAL PROJECT STRATEGY</b>				
Please indicate whether changes have been made at any of the four levels of the Logframe hierarchy. Where changes have occurred, please describe.				
<b>Changes to:</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>If Yes, please describe:</b>		
<b>Goal</b>	N			
<b>Objective</b>	N			
<b>Outcomes</b>	N			
<b>Inputs/Activities</b>	N			
<b>Has the Logframe been modified?</b>	Y	<b>Although the hierarchy of the logframe has not been changed, the indicators by which progress is measured have been retrofitted, resulting in a modified log frame</b>		
<b>5. LESSONS</b>				
5.1 Are there lessons that could benefit the design or the implementation of other GEF-funded projects? Please list up to three and indicate which one/s could be worth of developing case studies of good / bad practice				
<p>a. The importance of giving adequate consideration in project design to policy issues where these may be a root cause and a critical success factor. It is therefore important to carefully consider country policies and developmental approach in project design. UNDP/UNEP/GEF as the contracting partners are well placed to address such upstream considerations with national governments</p> <p>b. The time scale for mainstreaming and demonstrating community-based natural resource management is longer than the 5 years of the project cycle. Perhaps being more focused in project design, and allowing for several project cycles addressing the issue over as many stages would be effective</p> <p>c. Encouraging participating communities to identify how they understand their environmental challenges and solutions to them – and having the flexibility to shift project implementation accordingly – encourages community ownership and involvement</p>				
5.2 Have these lessons been exchanged with other GEF or NON-GEF-funded projects? If so, please list the projects and describe the process.				
<p>These and other lessons learnt have been shared through contribution to a GEF brochure on initiatives to combat land degradation, and they will be shared through the IVP Botswana website which is soon to be set up (<a href="http://www.gov.bw/agric/ivp">www.gov.bw/agric/ivp</a>), as well as a chapter submitted for an IFAD/ILC book on lessons learnt in common-property management in rangelands</p>				
<b>6. PARTNERSHIP STRATEGIES</b>				
<i>This section refers to collaboration among institutions to achieve mutually shared or agreed upon objectives and goals that draws on individual strengths and maximizes synergies. For the purpose of this report partners are understood as those that either: i) cooperate with the project (through in kind, or financial collaboration); or ii) are subcontracted providers of project services.</i>				
6.1 Please provide the following information				
Partner Full Name (Do not give acronym only!)	Type (*)	Role (*)	\$ Value	
			Contributed (leveraged)	Contracted
International Union for the	NGO	Financial project Cooperation	\$37,500	\$10,000

Conservation of Nature				
Sanitas	PVT SEC	Sub-contracted provider of project services		\$1,000
CBNRM programme of the University of Western Cape/University of Zimbabwe	ACAD	Financial project Cooperation	\$2,000	
New Earth Foundation	NGO	Financial project Cooperation	\$200	
(*) Please refer to Instruction sheet for guidelines on how to fill out this section.				
6.2 Please describe any changes on partnership strategy (if any) from previous year				
None				
6.3 Additional information on Private Sector Involvement. <i>This refers to companies that contribute to a project as opposed to receiving financing from it as subcontractors.</i>				
1. What <b>economic sector</b> does the company work in (e.g. tourism, fisheries, forestry, agriculture)? Agriculture				
2. <b>How</b> is the company contributing to project objectives? Promoting technology it has developed for horticultural production ('bow benches')				
3. How is the company being involved in project implementation? Hired by IVP for one training session, but involved on an ongoing basis in monitoring uptake and advising on horticultural production, and sits on national steering committee				
4. What benefit is the company deriving from contributing to the project? Exposure				
5. If the project has not involved companies but could benefit from their resources please explain, given sufficient resources, what could be done within the project to develop such involvement?				
<b>7. PROJECT SUSTAINABILITY</b> <i>This section refers to the extent to which project environmental benefits continue once GEF assistance has come to an end.</i>				
7.1 What are the key changes produced (or that will be produced) by the project which must be maintained so that project environmental benefits continue after project closure? 1) Functioning livelihood improvement projects 2) Functioning environmental management bodies in the pilot sites 3) Community-level rules and regulations governing local rangeland resource use				
7.2 What are the critical conditions that must be maintained in order for these changes to be sustained? <i>Please refer to instructions for additional guidance.</i>				
Condition Required		Indications that it will be maintained		

1) Institutional arrangements within executing department to provide ongoing support to initiatives already started, and continuing development and replication of the approach	As yet, this has not been prepared for, either institutionally or in the adequate involvement of officers to allow sufficient skills transfer.
2) Continued capacity building of, and advisory services to, community-based institutions overseeing rangeland management	Will require the setting up of an institution with the executing agency that will oversee this
3) Policy-level support for the devolution of rangeland resource management to community level	There is demand from technocrats within the executing ministry for approaches to community-based rangeland management, but support for this at the policy level remains tenuous

7.3

a. Does the project make use of a micro-finance facility?

It is currently setting one up

b. If so, was such a facility developed specifically for the project, or was an existing one used? How effective is it?

Developed specifically for the project, but with the advice and involvement of NGOs that have experience in micro-credit. Level of success will become apparent once the fund is up and running

**8. NON-PROJECT ASSISTANCE PROVIDED BY CO AND UNDP/GEF IN CONNECTION WITH THE PROJECT**

*This section aims to identify activities carried out by UNDP (either the country office or the GEF unit) that were not a part of the project, or which resulted from an unanticipated problem, but that have directly contributed towards the achievement of project objectives. It encompasses activities such as advocacy, policy dialogue, and knowledge management efforts. If soft assistance is not an issue for the project or too sensitive to address, this section can be left empty.*

CO has been helpful in promoting synergies with a proposed GEF project in land management that would complement IVP by addressing complementary issues on an upstream level. Senior Technical Advisor, UNDP-GEF from NY office (Dr Maryam Fuller) made a number of keynote presentations in a seminar for stakeholders in Botswana on best practice in common-property rangeland management

9. MONITORING AND EVALUATION.			Comments
Please enter date (DD/MM/YEAR)			
CO Field Visit	LAST: 20.04.05	NEXT: not scheduled	
UNDP GEF Field Visit	LAST: 15.01.04	NEXT: not scheduled	
Tripartite Review	LAST:	NEXT:	
Mid-Term Evaluation	PLANNED: 05.09.05	DONE:	
Final Evaluation	PLANNED:	DONE:	
Other Evaluations or studies (*)			

(\*) Please explain whether the project has been subject to any additional review e.g. UNDP Country or Outcome Evaluations, GEF Thematic Reviews, others.

## 10. FINANCIAL INFORMATION -

*Please present all financial values in US\$ millions (e.g. 3,502,000 = 3.502)*

		<b>10.1 PROJECT FUNDING. Please present all financial values in US\$ millions (e.g. 3,502,000 = 3,5)</b>					
		GRANT	Loans (*)	Credits	Equity invest.	In -kind	TOTAL
A. GEF FUNDING	P	2,287,000					2,287,000
	A	2,286,591					2,286,591
<b>B. CO-FINANCING:</b>							
UNDP (TRAC)	P						
	A						
UN AGENCY	P						
	A						
GOVERNMENT	P					.7906	.7906
	A					.3094	.3094
BILATERAL DONORS	P						
	A						
MULTILATERAL DONORS	P						
	A						
REGIONAL BANKS	P						
	A						
NON-GOVERN. ORG.	P						
	A					.002	.002
PRIVATE SECTOR	P						
	A						
OTHER	P						
	A						
TOTAL CO-FINANCING	P					.7906	.7906
	A					.3096	.3096
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>					<b>PROPOSED</b>	1.898859	
					<b>ACTUAL</b>	1,102,000	

P=Proposed ; A=Actual

(\*) Concessional or market rate

## 10.2 PROJECT DISBURSEMENTS. From project start up to date of this report

Cumulative actual disbursement (\$millions)	1.178332
Cumulative planned disbursement (\$millions)(*)	1.108259
Disbursements ratio (% of actual vs. planned expenditures)	51.5%

(\*) As stated in original budget in PRODOC

## 11. PROCUREMENT DATA

Note : For projects or project components executed by UNOPS this section ***must not*** be filled in - data will be provided by UNOPS headquarters-.

Please report the **US\$ value** (*in Thousands, e.g. 70,000 = 70*) of UNDP/GEF Payments to Supplying Countries for Procurement in GEF Donor Countries. Please enter Project **expenditure accumulated** from project start up to the date of this report into the matrix against the donor country **supplying** the personnel, sub-contract, equipment and training to the project. Please report only on contracts over US\$ 2000.

<b>Supplying Country</b>	<b>Personnel</b> (US\$ thousands)	<b>Sub-contracts</b> (US\$ thousands)	<b>Equipment</b> (US\$ thousands)	<b>Training</b> (US\$ thousands)	<b>Total</b> (US\$ thousands)

**Annex 1.**

**Impacts and Strategies related to the Strategic Priorities (\*)**

(\*)Where projects pre-date the strategic priorities, include their contributions in all relevant sections

Answer all applicable questions	State: Yes, No or In- Progress	Additional Notes
<b>BD1: Protected Areas</b>		
How many new protected areas have already been established as a result of this project? (if any)		If yes, name these and state the area of each (hectares):
Has the project resulted in any changes to the policy, legislative, or regulatory environment of protected areas?		If yes, list the changes that have been made:
Has the project raised awareness or knowledge about protected areas in people beyond the project team?		If yes, amongst which target audiences:
Has the project resulted in any changes in institutional arrangements and mandates concerning protected areas		If yes, list the changes that have been made:
How many protected areas already have improved management capacity as a result of this project?		If yes, name these and state the area of each (hectares):
Have any new financial mechanisms for protected areas been created, or existing mechanisms strengthened as a result of this project.		If yes, list these: eg. environmental service payments, trust funds, etc
Has the project improved relationships between protected areas and local communities?		If yes, how?
Has the project worked with Indigenous communities?		If yes, name the groups and what was done:
Has the project taken any measures associated with adaptation to climate change?		If yes, what?
Has the project assessed the carbon benefits of the protected areas with which it is working?		If yes, state number of tonnes.
<b>BD2: Mainstreaming</b>		
<b>Spatial:</b>		
Has the project resulted in any changes in the policy, legislative, or regulatory environment so that biodiversity is better addressed in the political and spatial planning for an area such as a whole country, province, district or community?	<i>Yes</i>	If yes, what is the area covered? (ha) <i>Potentially thousands</i> List the changes that have been made? <i>IVP actively involved in Inter-Ministerial Technical Committee considering communal land for feasibility of ranching in different districts of Botswana.. IVP has been instrumental in promoting the possibility of communal rangeland management systems as a viable alternative</i>
Has the project resulted in any changes in institutional arrangements and mandates so that biodiversity is better addressed in the political and spatial planning for an area such as a whole country, province, district or community?	<i>Not yet</i>	If yes, what is the area covered? (ha) List the changes that have been made?

Has the project resulted in any changes in practices such that biodiversity is better addressed in the political and spatial planning for an area such as a whole country, province, district or community?	<i>Not yet</i>	If yes, what is the area covered? (ha) List the changes that have been made? <i>Steps have been made towards this impact with the production of a consultancy report recommending institutional and legal arrangements for community-based management of rangeland resources</i>
<b>Sectoral:</b>		
Has the project resulted in any changes in the policy, legislative, or regulatory environment so that biodiversity is better addressed in a particular government sector such as forestry, fisheries, mining, tourism, agriculture, etc.?	<i>Yes</i>	If yes name the sectors and for each sector: <i>As #1 above, in the agricultural sector</i> List the changes that have been made in that sector?
Has the project resulted in any changes in institutional arrangements and mandates so that biodiversity is better addressed in a particular government sector such as forestry, fisheries, mining, tourism, agriculture, etc.?	<i>Not yet</i>	If yes name the sectors and for each sector: List the changes that have been made in that sector?
Has the project resulted in any changes in practices so that biodiversity is better addressed in a particular government sector such as forestry, fisheries, mining, tourism, agriculture, etc.?	<i>Not yet</i>	If yes name the sectors and for each sector: List the changes that have been made in that sector?
<b>Business / Industry:</b>		
Has the project resulted in any changes in business practices such that biodiversity is better addressed?	<i>No</i>	If yes, list business / industry: eg. tourism, coffee production, cotton farming, etc and list the changes for each.
Has the project improved the markets or profitability for biodiversity friendly business?	<i>No</i>	If yes, list business / industry: eg. tourism, coffee production, cotton farming, etc and list the changes for each.
Has the project resulted in certification or certification systems for any products?	<i>No</i>	If yes, list products being certified: eg. timber, coffee, etc
Has the project increased the level of sustainable use of any species, races or groups of species or races?	<i>Not yet</i>	If yes, list the species, races or groups: eg. medicinal plants, wild rice relatives, <i>Prunus africana</i> .
Has the project resulted in an improvement in the level of sustainable use of particular areas?	<i>Not yet</i>	If yes, what is the area over which sustainable use has been improved (ha)? Explain how this was achieved <i>5Ha of mobile sand dunes that threatened dwellings are being managed for rehabilitation through exclusion of grazing and tree planting</i>
Has the projects increased the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits of BD?	<i>Not yet</i>	If yes, list the actions being taken: eg. changing policy, changing regulations, training communities, raising awareness, etc?
Has the project involved Indigenous communities?	<i>Yes</i>	If yes, name the groups and how they were involved: <i>Indigenous people (San/Basarwa) form a portion of all participating communities (Nama in Kgalagadi south, Kua in Kweneng, and Bateti and Shuakhwe in Boteti),, and effort is made to involve Basarwa representatives on all relevant committees</i>
Has the project taken any measures associated with adaptation to climate change?	<i>No</i>	If yes, what?
Has the project assessed the carbon benefits of the protected areas with which it is working?	<i>No</i>	If yes, state number of tonnes.



<b>BD3: Biosafety</b>		
Has the project resulted in the enactment of any legislation affecting biosafety?		If yes, explain
Has the project helped put in place any institutional arrangements to address biosafety?		If yes, explain
Has the project helped put in place a national biosafety framework?		
Has the project helped to launch the implementation of the national biosafety framework?		If yes, explain
<b>BD4: Lessons learning, dissemination, uptake</b> <i>(for BD 1, BD 2 and BD 3 projects please report on lessons through section 5 of main PIR document)</i>		
Has the project compiled any lessons or good practices?		If yes, list the subjects of these and attach these to the PIR report.
Does the project have any demonstrations of good practice in place?		If yes, list the subjects of these.
Have any of the lessons or demonstrations from the project been adopted elsewhere?		If yes, list the subjects of these and where they have been adopted. Explain any actions taken by the project to assist in this.