## **Inventory Sheet on SLM Approaches**



Country/region:	Contributor:	Date:
	(name, institution, project, email)	

#	Name of Approach For which		Location Area	Type of Approach	Stakeholders involved	Objectives	Local Land user/local communities' involvement		
		land use type						Initiation phase	Implementation phase
1									
2									
3									
	Give name of the Approach (be specific to ensure that the Approach can be distinguished from similar ones)	Choose one of the following:  C cropland G grazing land F forest/woodlands M mixed (mixture of land use types within same land unit) S settlements, infrastructure W waterways, waterbodies, wetlands I mines, extractive industry U unproductive land For definitions see QT Core3.2	Name of location/ region; coordinates (if available)	Area covered by Approach in km <sup>2</sup>	Choose one of the following types:  traditional/indigenous recent localinitiative/innovative project/programme based other (specify)	Choose one or two of the following:  local land users/local communities communities Stam specialists/agricultural advisers researchers teachers/schools children/students NGO private sector local government national government international organization	What are the main objectives of the Approach	<ul><li>none</li><li>passive</li><li>active: pa</li><li>active: int</li></ul>	f-mobilization

#	Short description of Approach (containing key characteristics of the Approach)
1	
2	
3	

1

#	Technical support	External material support	Motivation of land users to implement SLM	Impact	Potential for spread
1					
2					
3					
	State if technical support has been provided. Choose:  no yes, specify (e.g. training, capacity building, advisory service, research)	State if external material support has been provided. Choose:  • no  • yes, specify (subsidies, compensations, labour, agricultural inputs, equipment etc.)	Choose from the following and list in order of importance:  increased production increased profitability reduced land degradation reduced risk of disasters reduced workload payments/ subsidies rules and regulations (fines)/ enforcement prestige, social pressure/ social cohesion affiliation to movement/project/ group/ networks environmental consciousness customs and beliefs, morals enhanced SLM knowledge and skills other (specify)	Choose from the list below (or consult the full list of impacts in QA Core 6.1 for more categories):  Did the Approach:  • help land users to implement and maintain SLM Technologies?  • improve coordination and cost-effective implementation of SLM?  • mobilize/ improve access to financial resources for SLM implementation?  • improve knowledge and capacities of land users to implement SLM?  • build/strengthen institutions, collaboration between stakeholders?  • mitigate conflicts?  • improve issues of land tenure/ user rights that hindered implementation of SLM?  • lead to improved food security/nutrition?  • improve access to markets?  • lead to improved access to water and sanitation?  • improve land users' resilience to climate changes and extremes?  • other (specify)	Assess what the potential of the Approach is to be spread/taken up widely by land users. Choose from the following:  • high potential: +++  • medium potential: ++  • low potential: +

#	Strengths of Approach	Weaknesses of Approach	Name of related Technology (if existing)
1			
2			
3			