



SGP The GEF
Small Grants
Programme



SMALL GRANTS PROGRAMME RESULTS REPORT (FY 2017-2022)

ZAMBIA



COUNTRY REPORT CARD FY 2017 - 2022

| | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| Country Programme Name | Zambia | | | | | | |
| Year Started | 2008 | | | | | | |
| Portfolio Profile | GEF | Non-GEF | Total | | | | |
| Number of projects | 67 | 17 | 84 | | | | |
| Grant amount committed | 2,312,750 | 566,600 | 2,879,350 | | | | |
| Project level co-financing in cash | 774,516 | 161,028 | 935,544 | | | | |
| Project level co-financing in kind | 406,192 | 62,517 | 468,709 | | | | |
| Total co-financing * | 1,970,852 | | | | | | |
| <p>Source: SGP database as of July 2022 * Total co-financing = Total project level co-financing (in cash and in kind) + Non-GEF grant amount committed</p> | | | | | | | |
| | July 2016 - June 2017 | July 2017 - June 2018 | July 2018 - June 2019 | July 2019 - June 2020 | July 2020 - June 2021 | July 2021 - June 2022 | Total Value 2016 - 2022 |
| Focal Area Distribution (by completed projects) | | | | | | | |
| Biodiversity | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | 1 |
| Climate Change | - | - | 1 | 2 | - | 1 | 4 |
| Land Degradation | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 3 |
| International Waters | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | 1 |
| Total Projects Completed | - | 1 | 4 | 3 | - | 1 | 9 |

Source: Reporting by Country Programme as part of Annual Monitoring Process (2016-2022)

| | July 2016 - June 2017 | July 2017 - June 2018 | July 2018 - June 2019 | July 2019 - June 2020 | July 2020 - June 2021 | July 2021 - June 2022 | Total Value 2016 - 2022 ** |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| ** Kindly note figures in column "Total Value 2016-2022" have undergone comprehensive quality assurance that supports aggregation of results over time. This includes removal of duplicative data over time and/or inclusion of more results based on verification by SGP country teams. | | | | | | | |
| PROGRESS TOWARDS FOCAL AREA OBJECTIVES | | | | | | | |
| Biodiversity | | | | | | | |
| Number of biodiversity projects completed | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | 1 |
| Number of biodiversity based products sustainably produced | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | 1 |
| Climate Change | | | | | | | |
| Number of climate change projects completed | - | - | 1 | 2 | - | 1 | 4 |
| Did the country programme address community-level barriers to deployment of low-GHG technologies? (yes/no) | - | No | Yes | No | - | No | 1 |
| Breakdown of projects | | | | | | | |
| Energy efficiency solutions projects | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| Conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks projects | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | 1 |
| Land Degradation | | | | | | | |
| Number of land degradation projects completed | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 3 |
| Number of community members with improved actions and practices that reduce negative impacts on land uses | - | 200 | 500 | - | - | - | 700 |
| Number of community members demonstrating sustainable land and forest management practices | - | 200 | 500 | - | - | - | 700 |
| Hectares of land brought under improved management practices | - | 400 | 10 | - | - | - | 410 |
| Number of farmer leaders involved in successful demonstrations of agro-ecological practices | - | 4 | 100 | - | - | - | 104 |
| Number of farmer organizations, groups or networks disseminating climate-smart agroecological practices | - | 20 | 2 | - | - | - | 22 |


| | July 2016 - June 2017 | July 2017 - June 2018 | July 2018 - June 2019 | July 2019 - June 2020 | July 2020 - June 2021 | July 2021 - June 2022 | Total Value 2016 - 2022 ** |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| International Waters | | | | | | | |
| Number of international waters projects completed | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | 1 |
| Land based pollution reduced (tons) | - | - | 5,760 | - | - | - | 5,760 |
| Hectares of river and lake basins converted | - | - | 8,800 | - | - | - | 8,800 |
| GRANTMAKER PLUS | | | | | | | |
| Gender | | | | | | | |
| Number of gender responsive completed projects | - | 1 | 4 | 3 | - | 1 | 9 |
| Number of completed projects led by women | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | 2 |
| Programme Management: NSC gender focal point (yes/no) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | No | 4 |
| Indigenous Peoples | | | | | | | |
| Number of completed projects that included indigenous peoples | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | 2 |
| Number of indigenous leaders with improved capacities | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | 4 |
| Programme Management: NSC IP focal point (yes/no) | Yes | No | No | Yes | - | No | 2 |
| Ways to encourage IP projects | | | | | | | |
| Proposals accepted in local languages (yes/no) | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | - | No | 3 |
| Proposals accepted using participatory video (yes/no) | Yes | Yes | No | No | - | No | 2 |
| Involved indigenous peoples in NSC and/or TAG (yes/no) | No | No | No | Yes | - | No | 1 |
| Enhanced outreach and networking with indigenous people's groups (yes/no) | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | - | No | 3 |
| Youth | | | | | | | |
| Number of completed projects that included youth | - | - | 4 | - | - | - | 4 |

| | July 2016 - June 2017 | July 2017 - June 2018 | July 2018 - June 2019 | July 2019 - June 2020 | July 2020 - June 2021 | July 2021 - June 2022 | Total Value 2016 - 2022 ** |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Programme Management: NSC youth focal point (yes/no) | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | - | No | 3 |
| BROADER ADOPTION (Scaling up, Replication, Policy Influence, Improving Livelihoods) | | | | | | | |
| Projects improving livelihoods of communities | - | 1 | 4 | 3 | - | - | 8 |
| PROGRAMME EFFECTIVENESS | | | | | | | |
| Number of projects monitored through field visits | 6 | 13 | - | 41 | - | - | 60 |
| PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT | | | | | | | |
| National Steering Committee | | | | | | | |
| Number of NSC meetings occurred during the reporting period | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | - | - | 14 |
| Average number of NSC members that participated in each NSC meeting | 5 | 5 | 5 | 7 | - | - | 4 |
| Average time in days needed to replace NSC member | 30 | 30 | 14 | 180 | - | - | 51 |

GRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION OF KEY RESULTS


Interpreting the Green Bars in Graphs: The presence of green bars indicates the number of years that the country programme has achieved specific results. If a green bar is absent, it signifies that while the associated result is not observed in the country programme, it is still evident in the overall aggregated SGP portfolio.

Number of Years Country Programme Deployed Capacity Development Strategies (Over 6-year reporting period from 2017-2022)




Source: Annual Monitoring Report 2017-2022

**Number of Years Country Programme Deployed Gender Mainsreaming Strategies
(Over 6-year reporting period from 2017-2022)**




Source: Annual Monitoring Report 2017-2022

**Number of Years Country Programme Deployed Strategies to Improve Community Livelihoods and Quality of Life
(Over 6-year reporting period from 2017-2022)**



Source: Annual Monitoring Report 2017-2022

**Number of Years Country Programme Deployed Market-based and Financial Mechanisms to Improve Community Livelihoods
(Over 6-year reporting period from 2017-2022)**



Source: Annual Monitoring Report 2017-2022

**Number of Years Country Programme Addressed Sustainable Development Goals
(Over 6-year reporting period from 2017-2022)**



EXAMPLES OF PROJECT RESULTS

Climate Change

In **Zambia**, SGP supported grantee *AgriSmart Zambia*, in a project focused on reducing Green House Gas Emissions from livestock through the introduction of improved systems and land use in the Kazungula district. This has been achieved through the promotion of climate smart feeding systems among affected households that have been trained on deed techniques. As key results reported, 100 farmers were sensitized on the effects of climate change and 100 farmers were trained on climate smart animal husbandry practices. Furthermore, three demonstrations on pasture growing and management were also conducted to highlight the importance of reducing methane (CH₄) generated during digestion as well as the amount of CH₄ and nitrous oxide (N₂O) released by decomposing manure. **(Source: Annual Monitoring Report, 2018-2019).**

Land Degradation

In **Zambia**, SGP supported grantee *Kasisi Agricultural Training Centre (KATC)*, in a project focused on a Pluvial Demonstration Garden that proves the effects of climate change on the plans and highlights the importance of sound wetland management, inclusion of green manure-crop rotation strategies, and efficient manure handling. This Pluvial garden has reported significant improvements in farmer's productivity. Food and nutrition security farmers who were struggling with lack of water, now can grow different vegetables during and after the rain season. Farmers who were only producing maize in the rainy season can now grow it throughout the year. The Pluvial garden concept also registered various economic benefits for the project beneficiaries. Indeed, during a UNDP GEF SGP team meeting, it was reported that farmers were able to generate USD 297 revenue from vegetable sales. **(Source: Annual Monitoring Report, 2017-2018).**

Social Inclusion – Gender

In **Zambia**, SGP supported grantee *Food and Trees for Zambia*, in a project focused on enhancing the livelihood diversification of the Solwezi forest. The forest resources in the district are reasonably abundant and in good condition. However, there are high incidences of over exploitation and degradation being experienced, mostly associated with high human population. This project promoted gender equality and empowerment by ensuring that women were highly represented in the executive committee covering key positions such as treasurer, secretary as well as taking part of the decision-making processes throughout the project. As a result, more women were targeted as much as possible during the project implementation and they were involved in chicken production and vegetable gardening. Through this initiative, women's needs were heard and met, and they were also able to gain an income and thus boost their independence. **(Source: Annual Monitoring Report, 2019-2020).**

METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

All results are aggregated reflecting projects completed and are consistent with SGP results generated in past years.

With SGP's rolling modality, results reflect all ongoing operational phases during the indicated period. Please refer to the total projects completed on the first page for information in this regard.

The source of reported results is the annual monitoring process, which is part of the annual monitoring requirements for each country programme. Additionally, evaluative evidence sources have also been leveraged, if available for the country programme.

This results report benefits from extensive quality assurance. All information across all countries in the portfolio is harmonized, verified, and evidenced before being reported. Several layers of this quality assurance have been implemented in the generation of this report, and there are no result duplications across years. This point is important not only for the specific unit of measurement (i.e., indicator selected) but also for results aggregation across years in a given operational phase. Results reported across all countries have been treated uniformly to ensure overall standardization and methodological soundness.

Reported results include both direct and indirect global-environmental and socio-economic benefits. This is due to SGP's work in two key areas:

- **SGP works towards behavioral change at individual, organizational, and community levels.** Social determinants that shape human interaction with the environment play an important role, especially at the community level, as sustainability and the continuation of environmental gains often depend on them. These factors include positive shifts in knowledge, attitudes, practices, social and cultural norms, and conventions. Such interventions shape not only demand but also communication between community leaders and other influencers in promoting the adoption of environmentally friendly behaviors and practices. Often, SGP projects have ripple effects that go well beyond the direct scope of the project, emphasizing the importance of measuring indirect impact.
- **Encouraging Community Action for Environmental Change.** For many years, SGP has focused on promoting and supporting local community groups to bring about broader and sustainable environmental change. This approach is a key aspect of SGP's work and recognizes the power of motivated community groups to create significant impact and drive positive transformation. Community group action refers to informal gatherings of individuals and organizations in the community who share a common belief and purpose. It involves taking practical steps over time to address environmental and socioeconomic challenges and creating positive change. This grassroots-level approach relies on the active involvement and empowerment of the community, with the initial efforts acting as a catalyst for further mobilization. By encouraging self-governance and involving those most affected by the issues, community action can extend its influence to more people in the community, underscoring the importance of measuring indirect impact.