



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Africa
Country (ies):	Democratic Republic of Congo
Project Title:	The Restoration Initiative, DRC child project: Improved Management and Restoration of Agro-sylvo-pastoral Resources in the Pilot Province of South-Kivu
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP /DRC/054/GFF
GEF ID:	9515
GEF Focal Area(s):	Multi Focal Area Biodiversity BD-4.9, Climate Change Mitigation CCM-2.4, Land Degradation LD-3.4, Sustainable Forest Management SFM-3
Project Executing Partners:	Ministry of Environment, Nature Conservation and Sustainable Development (MEDD); World Resources Institute (WRI) for the implementation of the Restoration Opportunity Assessment Methodology (ROAM) in South Kivu; Provincial Governorate of the South Kivu Province
Project Duration:	5 years

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	06 April 2018
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	22 October 2018
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	30 June 2023
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	N/A
Actual Implementation End Date³:	2023

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	3,600,000 USD
Total Co-financing amount as	12,381,530 USD

¹ as per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

³ Actual date at which project implementation ends/closes operationally -- only for projects that have ended.

included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD):	134,849 USD
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019⁵	USD 1 090 800 (GIZ for land use planning at chiefdom level + FAO to support the inception phase with its FLRM + Ministry of Environment, Nature Conservation and Sustainable Development (MEDD))

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	04 April 2019
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	First semester of 2021
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	No
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	No
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	2023
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁶	No

Ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	S
Overall implementation progress rating:	MS
Overall risk rating:	L

Status

Implementation Status (1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):	1 st PIR
--	---------------------

⁴ This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

⁵ Please see last section of this report where you are asked to provide updated co-financing estimates. Use the total from this Section and insert here.

⁶ Please note that the Tracking Tools are required at mid-term and closure for all GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects. Tracking tools are not mandatory for Medium Sized projects = < 2M USD at mid-term, but only at project completion. The new GEF-7 results indicators (core and sub-indicators) will be applied to all projects and programs approved on or after July 1, 2018. Also projects and programs approved from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018 (GEF-6) must apply core indicators and sub-indicators at mid-term and/or completion

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Floribert Mbolela	Floribert.Mbolela@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Christophe Besacier	Christophe.Besacier@fao.org
Budget Holder	Aristide Ongone Obame	Aristide.Ongone@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division	Maude Veyret-Picot	Maude.VeyretPicot@fao.org

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Objective(s): To increase development opportunities in DRC through the sustainable exploitation of natural resources						
Outcome 1: An enabling policy framework for FLR is in place in a pilot province of DRC, South-Kivu	Number of policies and regulatory frameworks in TRI countries that support forest and landscape restoration while incorporating biodiversity conservation, accelerated low GHG development and emissions reduction, and sustainable livelihood considerations.	Existing text are outdated or not implemented. Several key texts for sustainable resource management are missing.	Gaps in the policy framework identified	At least one policy in the forest sector (Provincial Forest Restoration Strategy and Action Plan), at least one in the agricultural or environmental sector (Environment provincial programme for sustainable agriculture development) and two Chiefdom Development Plans, drafted and submitted for adoption	During the inception phase, contacts were established with GIZ and the Chiefdoms of Kabare and Ngweshe to understand the current context of Chiefdoms Development Plans (CDP) revision/development phase. This will facilitate the full integration of FLR during this revision phase. Through the elaboration of a Letter of Agreement (LoA) with the Provincial Coordination and with the World Resources Institute, the elaboration of the Provincial Forest Restoration Strategy and Action Plan was initiated with, as first phase the implementation of a Restoration Opportunity Assessment using the Methodology developed by WRI/IUCN and known as ROAM. This is a key first crucial step in order to inform policy makers on FLR priority in South Kivu province.	S

⁷ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

⁸ Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework) therefore this column should only be filled when relevant.

⁹ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**, **Satisfactory (S)**, **Marginally Satisfactory (MS)**, **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)**, **Unsatisfactory (U)**, and **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)**.

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Outcome 2: Forest and land degradation in Kabaré and Ngweshe Chiefdoms is reduced through the promotion of FLR good practices (including agroforestry) in pastoral lands, agricultural lands, forest lands and on hillsides	1) Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment	1) High level of poverty and land degradation in the targeted chiefdoms	1) 6,000 people of 1,000 households	1) 30,000 people or 6,000 households including 50% of women	All stakeholders and partners briefed during the inception phase on the planned interventions for 2019-2020 and through collaboration with WRI a ROAM assessment has been initiated at chiefdoms scale to prioritize restoration intervention areas based on the beneficiaries needs and the level of degradation of the landscapes.	S
	2) Average annual household income from forest and from tree products, and increased agricultural and pastoral productivity	TBD	TBD	TBS	Preliminary discussions held with LCD (Louvain Cooperation Development) to collaborate to start training of community associations on structure and governance issues linked to managing an association.	S
Outcome 3: Institutional and financial capacity is strengthened to enable implementation of FLR in South-Kivu Province and at the country scale	1) number of investment plans, strategies and action plans that include FLR in their set of interventions	1) FLR interventions are not prioritized in current investment plans, strategies or actions plans related to natural resources management and sustainable development.	1) At least one investment plans, strategy or action plan includes FLR in their set of interventions	1) At least two investment plans, strategies or action plans (e.g. FONAREDD investment plan, REDD+ strategy, INDC strategy) include FLR in their set of interventions	First consultations with FONAREDD (Fonds National pour la Réduction de la Déforestation et la Dégradation des Forêts en République Démocratique du Congo) have taken place to provide an opportunity to include the Province of South Kivu for future project proposal submission. FONAREDD is a multi-trust fund and financial mechanism that could add value to TRI. It finances action against deforestation and forest degradation in DRC, and could be a potential source of finance for FLR work in South-Kivu. Discussions are also ongoing within FAO with ONUREDD team to support the development of joint project proposals in DRC.	S

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
	2) Number of cross-sectoral (e.g., agriculture, forestry, transportation, energy, etc.) planning mechanisms and/or frameworks incorporating and supporting restoration established/strengthened at national and sub-national levels in DRC	0	Provincial cross-sectoral platform established to coordinate restoration interventions in South-Kivu	Cross-sectoral platforms operational at chiefdom, provincial and national level.	The establishment of the PMU within the Provincial Coordination of the MEDD facilitates the necessary coordination between the different stakeholders. By empowering, the DDD of MEDD and the Provincial Coordination long-term coordination will be ensured.	S
	3) Value of resources (public, private, development partners) flowing into restoration in DRC	0	0	At the end of the project 25 million USD additional resources (public, private, development partners) flowing into restoration and sustainable land management interventions in DRC	Through the online TRI community of practice, the PMU has understood the expertise offered by partners and preliminary contacts were made with key potential private/public partners	S
	4) number of bankable projects developed & submitted (according to the scorecard matrix)	4) No bankable projects	4) One bankable project	4) Four bankable projects	A core group of key stakeholders (Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development MEDD, Province Coordination on Environment CPE, TRI Steering Committee, GIZ, World Resources Institute (WRI), Université Catholique de Bukavu, Louvain Coopération Développement and independent CSO observer) was established and capacitated with improved understanding of the requirements for climate-restoration related proposals. This will enhance national and provincial capacity to deliver the necessary results.	HS

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Outcome 4: Awareness, long-term monitoring, and knowledge sharing on FLR interventions are increased to promote the sustainability and replication of the TRI child project interventions	1) # of TRI knowledge products developed, disseminated and accessed through relevant knowledge platforms	1) No TRI knowledge Products	1) At least 1 university curricular chapters and 1 school curricula booklet	1) At least 2 university curricular chapters, 1 school curricula booklet, 2 short documentaries, 1 pamphlet, 2 radio talks, 1 theatre play and 2 kids games	Members of the PMU have joined the online Community of Practice of TRI to promote sharing of best practices and lessons learned throughout the project. Discussions with on the ground partners such as universities, youth and indigenous associations have been initiated to capture local best practices on FLR.	S
	2) Child project monitoring system established and providing relevant information to managers	2) No M&E system to monitoring FLR interventions	2) One project specific M&E system developed and implemented	2) One project specific M&E system and one provincial M&E system for FLR interventions	The M&E expert, with the support of the global TRI project, has established an M&E plan in synergy with the overall global M&E requirements. Through the establishment of the PMU within the Provincial Coordination, the local capacity for M&E on FLR will also be ensured as part of the development of the Provincial Strategy on FLR.	S

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating ¹⁰

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
N/A			

¹⁰ To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs ¹¹	Expected completion date ¹²	Achievements at each PIR ¹³					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁴ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
Output 1.1. Provincial Forest Restoration Strategy developed using the Restoration Opportunities Assessment Methodology (ROAM) approach in South-Kivu	Q4 Y1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An operational partnership was developed with Provincial Coordination to lead the participatory process to develop a Provincial Forest Restoration Strategy - LoA developed with World Resources Institute (WRI) to enhance capacity of decentralized institutions and key stakeholders to undertake a Restoration Opportunities Assessment exercise for the province of South Kivu (ROAM) - strategic and technical consultations with operational partners of the environment sector in the territories of Kabare and Walungu have taken place, and specific discussions have been organized with the Provincial Coordination of Environment, the Official University of Bukavu (UOB) and GIZ - Consultation and discussions with GIZ through their programme on “Biodiversity and Forests” which contributes to the protection of the biodiversity and the sustainable management of tropical forests in order to align the annual work plan 2019-2020 against the strategies 					5%	Progress according to workplan with work starting in August 2019 and to be finalised by year 4.

¹¹ Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

¹² As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

¹³ Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

¹⁴ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

		<p><i>and timeline already identified within the Local Development Plans and ensure synergies of the restoration interventions planned by the different baseline projects during this period 2019-2020</i></p> <p><i>- These synergies include: (i) restoration of degraded forests and landscapes, (ii) restoration of soil fertility, (iii) support to individual and community reforestation, (iv) contribution to reduction of tenure conflicts and (v) support programme to food security.</i></p>						
<p>Output 1.2. Workshops organised with relevant stakeholders to address the barriers within the national and provincial policy environment to promote FLR</p>	<p>Q1 Y2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>An operational partnership was developed with WRI to undertake policy gap analysis</i> - <i>The first Project Steering Committee has been organized in April 2019 in Bukavu with as outcome the validation of the annual work plan and budget June 2019-June 2020</i> - <i>Through this meeting, the following results were achieved:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <i>Improved understanding of project interventions</i> o <i>The members of the PSC have discussed and validated their ToRs and fully understood the scope of the project</i> o <i>Recommendations were provided to improve the AWPB (Annual Work Plan and Budget) and lessons were learned to organize future capacity building workshops</i> - <i>The Annual Work Plan and Budget 2019-2020 has been developed, presented and validated by the PSC members.</i> - <i>An awareness workshop on FPIC (Free, Prior and Informed Consent) was organized on 2-3 April 2019 with the support of experts from FAO Rome. This workshop launched the first</i> 	<p><i>n/a (or done)</i></p>				<p>5%</p>	

		<p>steps towards raising the awareness on the implication and integration of Indigenous Peoples rights, knowledge, concerns into project decision making and implementation (Road Map).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - During the workshop, 20 participants have been informed on the rights of indigenous peoples and on best practices to ensure their full integration into the project. A draft roadmap was also developed to ensure next steps of the project take the concerns onboard. 						
Output 1.3. Development Plans for Kabare and Ngweshe Chiefdoms within the territories of Kabare and Walungu respectively promoting the restoration and sustainable management of natural resources developed	Q1 Y2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - stocktaking missions carried out by PMU to discuss with key partners, such as Chiefdoms and GIZ to plan support to update existing CDPs - awareness raising with Chief of Kabare and local leaders has taken place to facilitate land access for the vulnerable communities such as women and indigenous peoples - a support mission has been undertaken to strengthen the capacity of 30 local leaders on the evaluation of indicators and expected results to be achieved through the project, especially on: protection of biodiversity, protection and promotion of ecosystem services through the restoration of degraded landscapes and sustainable land management practices in the project sites. 					40 %	With the support of GIZ (as co-financier of the project), Kabare and Ngweshe Chiefdoms have started to update their Development Plans by addressing FLR issues
Output 2.1. Site-specific restoration plans developed in the targeted Chiefdoms including the identification of priority zones, species, restoration practices and land-tenure systems	Q1 Y2	<i>An operational partnership was developed</i> with World Resources Institute (WRI) to enhance capacity of decentralized institutions and key stakeholders to undertake a Restoration Opportunities Assessment for the province of South Kivu					%	

Output 2.2. 4,800 ha of forest, agricultural and pastoral ecosystems under improved landscape management practices using APFS and Dimitra clubs approaches	Q3 Y3	Foreseen as from Q1 Y2 -ToR developed for consultants to initiate Farmer Field Schools and Community Listeners Clubs in the pilot communities -Roadmap developed with the support of UEFA on indigenous peoples' considerations integration into all project interventions and M&E related activities through capacity development event organized with key stakeholders in Bukavu with the support of experts from FAO Rome					5%	
Output 2.3. 70 micro-projects for the development of cost-effective and sustainable livelihoods based on the sustainable management of natural resources in the intervention sites implemented to increase the economic value of forest, pastoral and agricultural resources thereby promoting natural resources' conservation	Q3 Y5	Discussions launched with partner LCD (Louvain Cooperation Development) to develop a Letter of Agreement to train local associations in terms of structure, management and preparation of micro-project proposals					0%	
Output 3.1. Training events on best practices and methods for planning, implementing and monitoring FLR organised for government and nongovernment entities in South-Kivu	Q3 Y3	Foreseen as from Q1 Y2					0%	
Output 3.2. An observatory for the civil society to support FLR in South-Kivu	Q3 Y2	First contacts were made with civil society and a draft plan of action has been developed to establish the independent observatory for the civil society to monitor progress of FLR interventions. An exchange visit is also planned in another province of DRC (2019) in order to see an example of a similar observatory supported in the context of another GEF project led by FAO					5%	

Output 3.3. Four bankable, largescale restoration projects submitted to appropriate funding sources	Q4 Y3	Collaboration with UNFF established to develop capacity of national staff on FLR/GCF proposal development. A first training workshop took place July 2018 to establish a core group of national experts on GCF.					5%	
Output 4.1. Awareness-raising events and education on the value of natural resources particularly forests implemented for pupils, students and adults in South-Kivu	Q2 Y5	PMU actively participate to all webinars and meetings organized by Global TRI project.					5%	
Output 4.2. A long-term Monitoring and Evaluation strategy implemented for FLR interventions beyond the TRI child project implementation in South-Kivu	Q4 Y5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - LoA with Provincial coordination developed and with WRI to initiate Strategy development. M&E expert has been recruited and project M&E plan developed - Capacity assessment in M&E was carried out and planning of capacity M&E is established in local level - A draft M&E strategy has been developed and it will be updated as soon as possible according to the constraints of project implementation and others 					5%	

Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

Please briefly summarize main progress achieving the outcomes (cumulative) and outputs (during this fiscal year):

The project has been launched following a national inception workshop which brought together 90 participants representing all relevant stakeholders of the project, namely (i) Government through the participation of the National and Provincial Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD), (ii) representatives of the agricultural and Environmental research institutions, (iii) national and international organizations targeting the environmental sector and (iv) members of the communities and traditional leaders of the targeted project sites (Kabare and Ngweshe).

This national inception workshop has raised awareness on the project scope and ensured that all stakeholders have a common understanding of the expected results and implementation modalities of the project interventions. The high-level representation also provided a solid indication of the interest in successfully implementing the project for the benefits of the local communities, the Province, the country while providing global benefits as well. Through this inception workshop, the participants were also made aware of the global scope of the TRI programme and the following key recommendations were made:

- Promote synergies between projects and actors working in the environment sector in proposed project zone;
- Necessary to coordinate proposed project interventions and activities of cofinancing partners;
- Build on expertise and experience at the local level: willingness of partners to create synergies (for example, UCB has courses on M&E with regards to the utilization of drones for data collection on the level of degradation in South Kivu), availability of IITA to develop a partnership to undertake soil assessments through their existing laboratory;
- The availability of the Provincial Ministry of Environment to provide office space to the Project Management Unit to ensure efficient coordination and synergies with the provincial administrations.

The Project Management Unit has also been established and an agreement was signed with WRI to undertake important first activity to identify and prioritize restoration opportunities both at provincial and chiefdoms scales. Discussions were also held with co-financing partners to start implementing interventions linked to the identification of options for micro-credit to support community-based projects.

The designing of Local Development Plan for Ngweshe and Kabare Chiefdom has already started with the support of GIZ and the GEF support will allow to update these plans with Forest and Landscapes Restoration options. Stakeholders were reminded during capacity building assessment to really address FLR issues. A validation workshop will be organized in a timely manner with the participation of all stakeholders.

What are the major challenges the project has experienced during this reporting period ?

The election process in DRC at the end of 2018 has caused certain delays to start implementing the project and some key inception actions have been postponed during the period from December 2018 to February/March 2019. The first Letter of Agreement (LoAs) could not be formally approved and signed before organization of the first Project Steering Committee Meeting in late April 2019 and, consequently, the first support missions/capacity building workshops/PMU field visits/WRI technical assistance, required to start effective implementation on the ground, took place only from April to June 2019.

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating ¹⁵	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating ¹⁶	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	MS	<i>The Project Management Unit, together with its wide partnership, duly implement project activities coherent with the workplan. They will continue doing so for the period 2019-2020 for which a workplan has already been approved by the Project Steering Committee, and is therefore expected to deliver the results attended from this project.</i>
Budget Holder	S	MS	<i>There are no further observations with respect to the achievement of objectives and implementation progress. FAO-Kinshasa and FAO-Bukavu will continue following up on the financial management of the project in order to ensure timely delivery of quality results.</i>

¹⁵ **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet.

Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁶ **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

Lead Technical Officer¹⁷	S	MS	<p><i>During the initial phase of implementation of the project, just after the inception workshop held in Bukavu in October 2018, the PMU has been only partially established with one FAO project coordinator (M. Floribert Mbolela) and one designated national project coordinator (M. Nzale). The hiring process for all other members of the PMU (M&E and Assistant to the Designated National Coordinator took time and was not possible during the election period from late November 2018 to early March 2019). For this reason, the first Letters of Agreement, supposed to provide resources to the National and Provincial Coordination teams, have been signed only in April/May 2019 after the organization of the first Steering Committee in Bukavu (22 April 2019).</i></p> <p><i>The designated national coordinator from the MEDD has a limited knowledge on FAO procedures and has a limited experience in leading such GEF project... Consequently it will be probably necessary to reinforce the PMU in the coming weeks after discussion with the MEDD (SG)</i></p> <p><i>The existing / demonstrated strong political will to achieve the outcomes/outputs of this project GCP/DRC/054/GFF, both at national and provincial levels, will hopefully allow us to fast-track the implementation of the Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWPB) approved for the period June 2019 to June 2020 and, finally, to compensate the 3/4 months of delays noticed during this inception phase (mainly due to the pre/post electoral uncertainties and the long hiring procedures within FAO)</i></p>
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	S	MS	<p><i>During this inception period of the project implementation phase, emphasis was put on mobilising partners in support of the project's intervention logic. This has been done mainly through information exchange in the context of bilateral meetings, workshops, and field missions. These led to increased awareness on the problems and barriers the TRI project is hoping to address, as well as the proposed solutions and approaches. It is expected that awareness raising, sensitization and capacity development activities will continue, and eventually catalyse behavioural changes needed to embed FLR at multiple levels. In this initial phase, therefore, mostly decision makers have been reached out to. The project has also taken the necessary steps in order to initiate a number of operational partnerships with a number of international, regional and local stakeholders. As such it leverages the knowledge, networks and expertise of these partners to the benefit of the project, and it starts building strong partnerships and ownership of project results. Furthermore, the project seems to be well connected to the global TRI child project, and it would be great to monitor the benefits from these additional services provided.</i></p> <p><i>The project has faced, and will face exogenous risks that are likely to impair timely project delivery. The project would benefit from a more thorough risk assessment and mitigation plan.</i></p>

¹⁷ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

3. Risks

Environmental and Social Safeguards (Under the responsibility of the LTO)

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid¹⁸. If not, what is the new classification and explain.
LOW	YES

Risk ratings

RISK TABLE					
	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Political risk: Provincial, territorial and local authorities do not fully support the resolution of governance problems regarding land-use because of the development challenges faced by the province and economic stakes.	Medium-low	Several workshops will be organized at the onset of the project to identify all the potential land-use issues. Mitigation strategies will be developed in a participatory with an implementation plan and official agreements with the responsible parties.	Inception workshop has been organized involving all key stakeholders to ensure up-to-date knowledge on potential land-use are taken on board while planning work plan.	The Minister of Environment, Nature Conservation and Sustainable Development officially opened the inception workshop together with the Governor and local Chiefs. The SG and the Provincial Minister chaired the first PSC meeting.

¹⁸ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

¹⁹ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

²⁰ If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period".

2	<p>Institutional risk: Difficulties in institutional cooperation between Environment, Agriculture and Mines sectors preventing to improve the policy framework and resolve the contradictions for improved management of natural resources.</p>	Low	<p>Cross-sectorality has been promoted during project preparation through the participation of all the relevant sectors during the inception and validation workshops. It will continue to be promoted throughout the project implementation phase via the biannual multi-sectoral PSC meetings, multisectoral training workshops, and MoUs with relevant sectors for the implementation of specific activities. This will improve knowledge sharing, communication and coordination between the sectors involved in natural resources management.</p>	<p>Through the inception workshop and first PSC meeting, all stakeholders have been invited to participate and identify bottle-necks and possible solutions to overcome them. The coordination of different sectors and stakeholders is embedded in the ToR of the PMU, and through a LoA with Provincial coordination and Ministry, this best practice will be promoted as well.</p>	
3	<p>Social risk: Indigenous communities leaving in the surroundings of PNKB do not support the project.</p>	Low	<p>The on-the-ground interventions of the project will be designed in collaboration with indigenous communities to enable their ownership of the project interventions and ensure that the project raise direct benefits for these communities.</p>	<p>The PMU organized with the support of FAO and the global TRI project a capacity development workshop on FPIC and the mainstreaming of indigenous peoples context throughout the project implementation and a roadmap was developed with the support of UEFA.</p>	
4	<p>Land-tenure risk: The unclear land ownership between the government and traditional authorities is likely to prevent the project from receiving the support of these major stakeholders.</p>	Medium-low	<p>Potential land ownership issues will be assessed as a priority as part of the design of specific on the ground interventions. Only the sites where government representatives and traditional Chiefs have clear responsibilities, ownership over land, and a good relationship will be selected.</p>	<p>Preliminary discussions were undertaken with local government and traditional Chiefs to assess potential land ownership issues. This will be further followed upon through the ROAM assessment.</p>	

5	<p>Natural resources ownership risk: Property rights' conflicts between land owners, the government and traditional Chiefs over the trees planted on private land will likely arise.</p>	Low	Land and trees ownership systems will be clearly defined and signed off before starting the implementation of the interventions on the ground. A management plan for all the outputs of the project – including the planted trees – will be developed in a participatory manner and signed off by all the relevant actors.	Not yet undertaken.	
6	<p>Ecological risk: Climate change including short and intense rainfall, long drought periods (and correlated bushfires) prevent the restoration interventions from being successful in the long term.</p>	Low	Observed climate changes and future climate scenarios will be taken into account when designing the restoration activities and selecting the set of species to be planted. Only climate-resilient species will be promoted by the project as well as species diversity and complementarity. The selection criteria for each species will include inter alia: climate-resilient, indigenous (or naturalized) and fire resilient.	Through the ROAM assessment possible restoration solutions will be identified followed a participatory approach, and initial contacts were made with INERA to support proper choice of species.	

Project overall risk rating (Low, Medium, Substantial or High):

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
LOW	LOW	The risk rating at this stage of the project is basically the same as at project design. However since august 2018, when DRC declared their tenth outbreak of Ebola in 40 years, primarily in North-Kivu province, the epidemic spread to neighbouring South Kivu province, where a number of people became sick in Goma (major hub) and in Mwenga, 100 kilometres from the capital of the Province Bukavu. This could influence the efficiency of support provided, especially from external experts, and slow down down potentially project implementation. The PMU is monitoring all risks and is actively engaged to minimise them.

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months²¹

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outcomes	No	
Project Outputs	No	

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

If the duration of the project, the project work schedule, or the timing of any key events such as project start up, evaluations or closing date, have been adjusted since project approval, please explain the changes and the reasons for these changes. The Budget Holder may decide, in consultation with the PTF, to request the adjustment of the EOD-NTE in FPMIS to the actual start of operations providing a sound justification.

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> Original NTE: Revised NTE: </div> Justification:

²¹ Minor adjustments to project outputs can be made during project inception. Significant adjustments can be made only after a mid-term review/evaluation or supervision missions. The changes need to be discussed with the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, then approved by the whole Project Task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

5. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable)?

A rapid and limited gender analysis was conducted during project preparation phase and gender disparity exists at three levels in South-Kivu: education, work and social participation.

During the project preparation phase and focus group discussions it was acknowledged that women have an important role in the degradation of natural resources and as such should be strongly engaged in restoration interventions. The role of women associations and the uptake of the Dimitra Club approach will empower women through enabling access to information for all as well as increasing their opportunities to express their needs and priorities and to participate in decision-making processes at different levels. Awareness-raising campaign for the entire community will be implemented with women, men and youth on gender issues to further promote behavioural changes. Income-generating activities that are specifically suitable for women needs and lifestyle will be selected using a participatory approach. Furthermore, as part of the project, women – including Pygmy women – access to financial opportunities such as micro-loans will be increased following a participatory approach.

During the first Steering Committee meeting held on 15th of April discussions were held with the representative of the Provincial Division of the Ministry of Gender, Children and Family to develop a strategy to ensure full understanding and participation of women in sustainable environmental management practices and to reinforce the capacities of stakeholders to develop policies, strategies and action plans that fully integrate gender concerns and context.

The data collected as part of the M&E plan throughout the project implementation phase will be disaggregated by gender to monitor women participation and potential differential impacts of the project on female beneficiaries in all project activities. Women will make up at least 40% of the direct beneficiaries of the project. 50% of the micro-projects will be allocated to women associations. In addition, it is envisioned to have at least 40% of the PSC and LTMC members to be women.

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

Are Indigenous Peoples involved in the project? How? Please briefly explain.

The Democratic Republic of Congo is a multi-ethnic country accounting with some 250 ethnic groups including several indigenous people's communities, the majority of which are Mbuti, Baka and Batwa. Over 80 percent of DRC's indigenous peoples are located in three provinces: Katanga (48%), Equator (26%) and South Kivu (10%). The project is focusing on two territories (Kabare and Ngweshe) in South Kivu. In the project target chiefdom of Kabaré, approximately 11 percent of the population belongs to an indigenous peoples' group, mainly the Batwa. The project undertook initial consultations with indigenous peoples in the Chiefdoms during project development in order to identify potential project activities and areas of interest linked to forest and landscape restoration. A detailed training was carried out in Bukavu from 31st of March until 5 April 2019 on the implementation of the process of Free, Prior and informed Consent (FPIC) for project managers and key stakeholders of the project. Amongst the participants were the indigenous organization 'Union pour l'Emancipation de la Femme Autochtone (UEFA)' as well as experienced government, academia and civil society members. In line with the best practices on FPIC implementation, the project has included an indigenous organization as a member in the Project Steering Committee, which will ensure that issues pertaining indigenous peoples are duly included, discussed and considered during project implementation.

7. Stakeholders Engagement

Please report on progress, challenges and outcomes on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan included at CEO Endorsement/Approval (when applicable))

A wide range of stakeholders have been engaged throughout the project development and project inception phase.

The following stakeholders were consulted:

Government representatives/institutions	Role in implementation	Engagement
Governor of South-Kivu	The governor will be consulted throughout the implementation phase to ensure his support for the project and contribute to coordinate the different institutions to facilitate the implementation of the project interventions.	Governor has taken part in the Project Inception workshop to guide the implementation of the project in South Kivu.
DDD of the MEDD	Supervision, and monitoring and evaluation will be the responsibilities of the MEDD regarding the TRI child project implementation. The Project Steering Committee meetings will also be led by this institution. In addition, MEDD will be responsibility for controlling that policies and regulations regarding the sustainable management of natural resources are followed in all project interventions.	The Minister has presided the inception workshop and the Secretary-General is acting as president of the PSC which took place in April 2019.
Provincial Coordination of the MEDD in South-Kivu	Support and coordination of FLR interventions in South Kivu	The Provincial Minister of Environment also participated in the inception workshop and the first PSC meeting and the PMU sits within the Provincial Coordination.
FAO	Support the local communities in terms of good practices linked to FLR Support beneficiaries through utilization of Club Dimitra approach, FFS/JFFS	
GIZ, Food for the Hungry (FH), WCS, WWF	NGOs with past experience in project target zone in terms of reforestation, afforestation, territorial planning, biodiversity conservation	In the Chiefdoms Kabara and Walungu, three coordination meetings were held between the Provincial coordination and the local actors such as GIZ, FH and LCD to discuss past actions related to community-based reforestation interventions and learn from lessons learned in order to plan project interventions
Traditional leaders		
Chiefs	Traditional leaders to coordinate project interventions in the targeted chiefdoms of Kabare and Ngweshe	Participated at the inception and PSC meetings and additional consultations to ensure project interventions are planned in accordance to Development Plans at the local level
Research Institutions in Agriculture and Environment		
IITA in Kalambo	Providing research support	Participated at the inception and PSC meetings to discuss their potential contribution.
INERA-Mulungu	Providing research support	Participated at the inception and PSC meetings to discuss their potential contribution.
University and Technical Training Institutions		
UOB	Providing academic support	Participated at the inception meeting to discuss their potential contribution.
UEA, UCB, UERHA, ISEAVMushweshwe	Providing academic support	Participated at the inception meeting to discuss their potential contribution.
WRI	Expertise on ROAM assessment and policy support.	Discussions were held to finalize LoA to undertake ROAM assessment in South Kivu in order to also develop Provincial Strategy on FLR.
OSFAC	Data support	Expertise will be provided through LoA with WRI.
National NGOs		
Diobass, Action for Peace, Education and Development76 (APED), NGO for the Promotion and Support of Community Development (PADECO)	Expertise on local project execution	
Union for Indigenous Women Emancipation	Expertise on issues concerning indigenous peoples	Participated both in inception workshop, first PSC meeting and training organized to develop roadmap for further integration of indigenous peoples concerns during project implementation
Anti-Bwaki Committee	Expertise on issues concerning indigenous peoples	

8. Knowledge Management Activities

During this initial phase, no KM products have been produced and disseminated at scale. The team will report diligently in future progress reports.

9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²²	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019-	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
Recipient Government	National and Provincial Coordination MEDD	Grant	1 900 000			1 900 000
Recipient Government	National and Provincial Coordination MEDD	In-kind	30 000	35 800		35 800
GEF Agency	FAO	Grant	400 000 S	55 000		400 000 S
Bilateral agency	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)	Grant	9 424 800	1 000 000		9 424 800
Donor Agency	Louvain Cooperation for Development (LCD)	Grant	626 730			626 730
	TOTAL		12 381 530	1 090 800		12 387 330

Please explain any significant changes in project co-financing since Project Document signature, or differences between the anticipated and actual rates of disbursement

²² Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. **DO Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** - Project is expected to achieve or exceed **all** its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”); **Satisfactory (S)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings); **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits); **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** - Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major global environmental objectives); **Unsatisfactory (U)** - Project is expected **not** to achieve **most** of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits); **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** - The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, **any** of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

Implementation Progress Rating – Assess the progress of project implementation. **IP Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as “good practice”. **Satisfactory (S):** Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action. **Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action. **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action. **Unsatisfactory (U):** Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.