



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):	Sao Tomé e Príncipe (STP)
Project Title:	Landscape Restoration for Ecosystem Functionality and Climate Change Mitigation in the Republic of São Tomé e Príncipe
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/STP/022/GFF
GEF ID:	9517
GEF Focal Area(s):	CC-2 Program 4: Promote conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks in forest, and other land use, and support climate smart agriculture LD-2 Program 3: Landscape Management and Restoration LD-3 Program 4: Scaling-up sustainable land management through the Landscape Approach SFM-3: Restored Forest Ecosystems: Reverse the loss of ecosystem services within degraded forest landscapes
Project Executing Partners:	The Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD), through the Directorate of Forests and Biodiversity (DFB)
Project Duration:	2019-2023 – five years

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	24 April 2018
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD:	15 February 2018
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	15 February 2023
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	N/A
Actual Implementation End Date³:	N/A

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	4,666,515
--------------------------------	-----------

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.

Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	16,700,000
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	132,785
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019⁵	835,000

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	16 May 2019
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	N/A
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	N/A
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	Yes or No
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	Yes or No
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	N/A
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁶	Yes or No

Ratings

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

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

Status

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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Faustino Oliveira	faconeol@yahoo.com.br
Lead Technical Officer	Christophe Besacier	Christophe.Besacier@fao.org
Budget Holder	Helder Muteia	Helder.Muteia@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division	Paola Palestini	paola.palestini@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):						
Outcome 1: Enhanced national commitment to Forest and Landscape Restoration in STP.	(i) # of operational FLR coordination platforms	There is no such thing as a coordination body or platform in STP, to steer/support forest-related work.	PFLR established and recognised by the GoSTP. Inception workshops held. Learning visits planned and locations identified	1 permanent Platform for Forest and Landscape Restoration officially established and operational.	Platform established (PFLR). PFLR members identified. TOR produced. PFLR officially recognised by MARD. Four thematic sub-groups of PFLR established.	HS
	(ii) # of FLR management plans	No updated forest landscape plan exists: the last national forest survey was issued in 1999.	Baseline report on the state of forests and existing FLR policies produced by DFB.	1 Forest Landscape Plan produced and validated.	LOA between FAO and DFB agreed, which includes completion of FLP by end of Y2	S
	(iii) # of people providing inputs to FLR policy planning and development	There is no such thing as a coordination body or platform in STP, to steer/support forest-	PFLR established and recognised by the GoSTP. Inception workshops held.	At least 30 people are active members of the platform, of which 30% women.	Platform established (PFLR). PFLR members identified. TOR produced. PFLR officially recognised	HS

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
		related work.	Learning visits planned and locations identified		by MARD. Four thematic sub-groups of PFLR established.	
Outcome 2: Improved and conducive policy framework for the conservation, restoration, and sustainable management of STP forest.	(i) # of policy blueprint produced.	Several laws regulating forest management and conservation exist, but none specific on FLR. Several gaps on regulations and	Set of guidelines and recommendation s to improve policy framework ready for validation	1 blueprint for policy improvement and cross-sectoral integration.	TOR produced and validated to hire consultants, first CVs of candidates received and currently being evaluated.	HS
	(ii) # of normative documents (decrees, laws, regulations) produced and/or approved.	difficult implementation mechanisms. Poor collaboration and coordination mechanisms among different branches of the administration. Poor link between forest-related legislation and agriculture, fisheries and husbandry legislation.	National consultant hired to support the mainstreaming of new policies, laws and regulation into the existing framework	At least 5 FLR-related policies, laws, or regulations produced/improved	Sub-group of PFLR created to steer the policy improvement work throughout the projects. It includes specialists from different sector (public and private).	HS
Outcome 3: Participatory FLR interventions to enhance ecosystem services and mitigate climate change in vulnerable natural forest areas	(i) # of hectares of the Contador watershed restored. ii) # of hectares of degraded natural forests restored (iii) # of hectares of mangroves restored	Environmental and Social Management Framework report for the PRSP project available. Environmental and Social Impact Assessment ready by	Contador FLR working group operational; FLR plan produced and ready for implementation, operational partners	(i) 4,500 ha of the Contador watershed and corridors along evacuation lines restored. (ii) 23,000 ha of natural forestland restored and sustainably managed in	TOR for Contador Working Group established and first field visits organized. LOA prepared for DFB including mapping of all target landscapes by end of	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
in STP as a public-private partnership.	(iv) # of beneficiaries trained on FLR techniques. (v) # of beneficiaries hired and trained on surveillance.	end of 2017. Management guidelines for buffer areas of natural parks developed under ECOFAC project. Draft management plan available for Malanza mangrove	identified. Target degraded forest landscapes selected and mapped; FLR plans for degraded forests on both islands produced and ready for implementation; operational partners identified; seedling production plans in place; beneficiaries trained on FLR techniques; mangrove management plans validated and ready for implementation, operational partners identified, project in contact with NCP Guinea Bissau; twenty members of local communities identified hired	target forest areas. (iii) 600 ha of mangroves restored and sustainably managed. (iv) 3500 beneficiaries trained on FLR restoration techniques in the target Districts of both islands, (gender disaggregated) v) 20 members of local communities hired and trained to carry out surveillance of restored areas	Y1 of the project. Sub-group of PFLR set up to steer and support the restoration work of DFB.	

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
			and trained on surveillance			
Outcome 4: Enhanced and improved use of forest resources for the benefit of local communities living in sensitive landscapes of STP.	<p>(i) # of ha of shadow forests supporting high-quality agro-forestry plantations restored.</p> <p>(ii) # of households benefitting of improved shade forest plantations.</p> <p>(iii) # of community members supplied with sustainably harvested and processed wood and timber.</p> <p>(iv) # of ha reforested by CECAQ11 cooperative and the RAP under the “intelligent wood processing plant” scheme.</p> <p>(v) # of beneficiaries engaged in new NWFP economic activities and expected increase in annual income</p>	<p>Pilot scattered reforestation work carried out by the PAPAC cooperatives within their mandates.</p> <p>No portable sawmills exist on STP, no experience carried out so far on “intelligent” use of the biomass felled trees.</p> <p>Pilot successful NWFP initiatives finalized by several projects (ADB, IFAD, HBD).</p> <p>SME and NGOs exist in STP that are willing to establish economic agreements with local communities for the purchase of NWFP</p>	<p>GEF/PAPAC steering committee operational; Target shadow forest areas identified and mapped; FLR plans finalized and ready for implementation; Community nurseries adapted, enlarged or established; Representatives of communities trained by DF.</p> <p>Portable sawmills purchased and installed in pilot communities; Community members trained on their use; Controlled felling areas identified by DF;</p>	<p>i) 7,150 ha of shadow forests supporting high-quality agro-forestry plantations restored.</p> <p>(ii) 15,600 people belonging to 85 communities benefit of improved shade forest plantations.</p> <p>(iii) Sustainably harvested and processed wood and timber supplied to 1300 inhabitants of pilot communities.</p> <p>(iv) 250 hectares of forest land reforested by beneficiary communities.</p> <p>(v) 650 beneficiaries from 4 rural communities engaged in new NWFP economic activities. Increase of \$ 1000 in annual income per community from PY 4.</p>	<p>All partners and stakeholders contacted, and agreements being negotiated. LOA prepared for DFB including mapping of all target landscapes by end of Y1 of the project. Sub-group of PFLR set up to steer and support the restoration work of DFB.</p>	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
			<p>Reforestation areas identified and plans ready for implementation.</p> <p>MoU with target communities signed for implementation of new NWFP-based economic activities;</p> <p>Members of the target communities trained;</p> <p>Equipment and resources identified and purchased;</p> <p>Contacts with buyers started;</p> <p>work plan for the initiatives ready for implementation.</p>			

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 5: Strengthened national capacity on the principles and practices of FLR, on the concepts and use of ecosystem services, and on FLR financial instruments.	<p>(i) # of people from all stakeholder groups trained and aware of FLR principles, practices and financial instruments.</p> <p>(ii) of investment tools developed or improved to support FLR initiatives (ie ASB code of conduct, specialized credit lines, improved NFFD, etc.)</p>	<p>No capacity development work on FLR, PES and related financial instruments carried out in STP so far. No financial instruments exist to date in STP to support SME in FLR or agroforestry. ASB and other financial bodies in STP lack specific policy to support FLR work. Benefit of fiscal incentives poorly known by agro-forestry practitioners. NFFD weak and hardly operative to date</p>	<p>FAO Capacity Needs Assessment carried out in STP. 3 training courses organized on FLR, PES and related financial instruments. Partnership agreement with ASB-STP signed and in place. Funding Opportunities Forum and “peer-to-peer” meetings between experts and local enterprises organized. National specialist hired to run a critical assessment of the NFFD and to analyze the new regime of benefits and fiscal incentives.</p>	<p>i) At least 150 people from all stakeholder groups trained and aware of FLR principles, practices and financial instruments. (ii) At least 3 investment tools are developed or improved (i.e. Code of Conduct adopted by ASB to screen investment against criteria for sustainable forest management, improvement of the NFFD and increase in its capital, specialized credit lines, etc.)</p>	<p>The support of FAO is being negotiated and a national consultant is being sought to carry out capacity needs assessment. PIU filled template of priority needs for support and shared it with GCP and TRI partner agencies. Webinar on GCP support for NCPs attended on 4 June. Preliminary meetings held with ASB and TOR for partnership are being negotiated. TOR produced and validated to hire consultants, first CVs of candidates received and being evaluated (NFFD improvement, regime of fiscal incentives).</p>	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
Outcome 6: The FLR work of TRI is upscaled by triggering and supporting the development of public-private partnerships for nationally-implemented bankable projects.	i) # of medium-large bankable projects developed and submitted to donors. (ii) # of small-medium bankable projects implemented by the end of the project	No sizable actions carried out in STP in the domain of FLR and agro-forestry, little private funding mobilized so far. Relevant international funding schemes remain untapped because of weak capacity. Lack of financial instruments for SME involved in FLR and agro-forestry business	Two public-private partnerships signed, project development grant awarded and project development work plan approved. Written agreement signed between DF and private business companies, project grants delivered to beneficiaries and projects started.	i) Two medium-large bankable projects developed and submitted to donors by the end of the project. (ii) At least three small-medium bankable projects implemented by the end of the project.	Preliminary contacts made with possible partners and information on the opportunity for development of bankable projects being circulated in STP.	S
Outcome 7: Collaborative M&E system successfully implemented to support the NFLMS at DF and report properly on FLR initiatives (including	(i) National Forest and Landscape Monitoring System (SNMFP) set up and operative at DF. (ii) # of DF staff and other partners	No SNMFP exists in STP. Total lack of national capacity to run M&E systems and tools for FLR	SNMFP designed with help of international consultant. Training programmed designed with the input of GCP.	(i) SNMFP operational and providing relevant information to DF managers. (ii) Team of at least 10 people from DF and partner institutions fully trained and able to	M&E Specialist hired for PIU. Synergies established with other GEF project of UNDP, which is also aiming at setting up SNMFP for DFB. Division of tasks	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
NCP) in STP	trained on FLR M&E systems and tools.		Members of the working group for FLR M&E appointed	manage the system	agreed and budget being revised to adapt it to new situation. The available budget will be used to: (i) install fast internet connection and reliable energy supply for DFB so the SNMFP can be run effectively; (ii) enhance capacity of DFB on M&E.	
Outcome 8: TRI related lessons learned and best practices from the NCP and the TRI network disseminated among relevant audiences.	(i) Info Hub for KM on FLR. (ii) # of people in STP reached by the project's communication work. (iii) # of project partners benefitted of international learning visits (iii) % of GCP-organized events attended by STP GEF	There is not systematic gathering, management and circulation of FLR information and data in STP. The concept of FLR is new in STP and just few specialists are acquainted with the concept	Service provider hired for set up of the Info Hub. DF and other partners trained on communication. Info Hub designed and work plan approved. Preliminary identification of venues and	(i) Info Hub for KM on FLR fully operative under DF and providing information to stakeholders. (ii) At least 10,000 people informed of the best practices and lessons learned by the project and TRI. (iii) 20 project partners benefitted of international learning visits.	TOR for Info Hub provider produced and circulated in STP. Candidates are sending their CVs. Interviews held with some candidates. First global TRI meeting in February 2019 (Naivasha, Kenya) attended by three members of PIU and one representative of	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
	team.		experiences for international visits. STP GEF team has attended at least 30% of GCP organized events	(iii) At least 75% of GCP-organized events attended by STP team	DFB.	

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

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

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 1.1.1 National Platform for Forest and Landscape Restoration created and operational, to support and steer FLR work, including concerned institutions, private sector, civil society, local communities and partner projects	Q4 Y5	<i>PFLR established, sub-groups created, first meeting held</i>					25%	N/A

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.

Output 1.1.2 Directorate of Forest empowered to produce a Forest Landscape Plan (FLP) to inform and guide future forest management, conservation, and restoration initiatives	Q4 Y2	<i>LOA between FAO and DFB agreed</i>					5%	N/A
Output 1.2.1 Blueprint for FLR policy improvement including recommendations produced, based on gap analysis of the policies, laws and regulations on forest management, conservation and FLR.	Q2 Y3	<i>TOR for consultant ready, candidate consultants being selected, assistance being negotiated with GCP</i>					15%	N/A
Output 1.2.2 Policy framework enhanced through the	Q4 Y5	<i>Foreseen as from Q3 Y3</i>					0%	N/A

improvement of existing, and the adoption of new laws, regulations, and incentives.								
Output 2.1.1 4,500 ha of the Contador river watershed restored in partnership with the WB-supported PRSP project.	Q4 Y5	<i>Contador working group being created, first field visits held</i>					5%	N/A
Output 2.1.2 23,000 ha of natural forestland restored and sustainably managed in degraded areas of STP	Q4 Y5	<i>LOA between FAO and DFB agreed</i>					5%	N/A
Output 2.1.3 600 ha of the mangrove sites in STP restored and managed for conservation and recreational	Q4 Y5	<i>LOA between FAO and DFB agreed. IFAD shared old plan for Malanza mangroves with PIU</i>					5%	N/A

purposes								
Output 2.2.1 7,150 hectares of shadow forests supporting high-quality agro-forestry plantations restored and sustainably managed in the buffer zones of Obo and Príncipe Natural Parks	Q4 Y5	<i>First meetings held between concerned parties: PIU, DFB, IFAD and PAPAC cooperatives</i>					5%	N/A
Output 2.2.2 Pilot “Intelligent Wood Processing Plants” using portable sawmills established, as a private/ public partnership	Q4 Y5	<i>First meetings held between concerned parties: PIU, DFB, CECAQ11 and RAP</i>					5%	N/A
Output 2.2.3 Income generating activities related to the production, processing and sale of NWFP	Q4 Y5	<i>Negotiations started to selected beneficiary communities</i>					5%	N/A

promoted for 650 beneficiaries of 4 rural communities of both islands, based on the replication of existing experiences and on capacity development								
Output 3.1.1 Capacity building program targeting FLR Platform Members, project partners, and other stakeholders from the institutional, private, and civil society sectors organized, on the principles and practices of FLR, ecosystem services, and on FLR and PES-related	Q4 Y5	<i>Negotiations started to get support from FAO for capacity needs assessment</i>					5%	N/A

financial instruments								
Output 3.1.2 Pathway identified and capacity and consensus created for the opening of new credit lines for FLR-related actions that can fit the needs of SME, and for the elaboration of a Code of Conduct to be adopted by ASB and other private financial entities	Q4 Y4	<i>Negotiations started to get support from GCP for take-off of the work. Firsts meetings held with ABS and TOR being drafted</i>					10%	N/A
Output 3.1.3 Assessment study carried out on the National Fund for Forest Development of STP (NFFD) and the new regime of benefits and fiscal incentives and, with	Q1 Y3	<i>TOR for consultant ready, candidate consultants being selected, assistance being negotiated with GCP</i>					15%	N/A

recommendations for their enhancement								
Output 3.2.1 Two medium-large size bankable FLR project are developed through public-private partnerships between nationally-operating actors by the end of the project	Q2 Y5	<i>Activity not yet started</i>					0%	N/A
Output 3.2.2 Three small-medium size bankable FLR project are started through public-private partnerships between nationally-operating actors by the end of the Project	Q4 Y5	<i>Activity not yet started</i>					0%	N/A

Output 4.1.1 Collaborative National Forest and Landscape Monitoring System established and operational, in close partnership, and fully harmonized with the GCP of TRI	Q4 Y5	<i>New work plan being formulated in collaboration with UNDP</i>					5%	This output needs to be reformulated as DFB already setup SNMFP thanks to other GEF project led by UNDP. FAO, UNDP and DFB are now negotiating new use of the funds to enhance and complement their respective work
Output 4.1.2 All concerned project partners are enabled to take part to the collaborative M&E system	Q4 Y5	<i>Activity not yet started</i>					0%	N/A
Output 4.2.1 Information clearinghouse and focal node for knowledge management created and operational through partnership agreement with national actor.	Q4 Y5	<i>TOR for consultant ready, candidate consultants being selected, assistance being negotiated with GCP</i>					15%	N/A

Output 4.2.2 The STP NCP team benefits of the best practices, lessons learned and capacity development initiatives run by the GFP of TRI and involving the partners of the National Child Projects	Q4 Y5	<i>PIU actively participates to all webinars and meetings organized by GCP</i>					25%	N/A
--	-------	--	--	--	--	--	-----	-----

Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

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

Max 200 words:

The first months of the project were dedicated to building the preliminary conditions that will allow full-speed work towards the achievement of the outcomes and outputs. These include: setup of Project Steering Committee, hiring of Project Implementation Unit, project launch and technical inception workshops, purchase of equipment, initiate dialogue with co-financing partners - World Bank and IFAD/PAPAC and other stakeholders, and integration within the GCP and TRI network. Substantial progress was made on Outcome 1.1 thanks to the creation of the Platform for Forest Landscape Restoration (PFLR), which gathers over 30 actors representing the main national stakeholders in the field of FLR. The first meeting of the PFLR was held in May 2019, and four operational sub-groups were established to support the main areas of the project. National and international consultants are being selected, to deliver key components of the work plan. A framework agreement was negotiated with the Directorate of Forests and Biodiversity, which will undertake a baseline assessment of forest areas and the mapping of the landscapes where FLR work will be developed as from Y2. Meanwhile the GEF/TRI has joined the "Liga das Florestas", an informal coordination body gathering donors and implementors of FLR-related projects in STP.

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

Max 200 words:

The setup of the Project Steering Committee was delayed by the fact that general elections were held in STP during project start, and negotiations to establish a new Government lasted a few months. Another challenge was the negotiation of a comprehensive agreement with the Directorate of Forests and Biodiversity because, always due to the political changes, the new Director only took office quite recently. A bureaucratic challenge is the opening of specific bank account of DFB for the funds allocated through the LOA. This issue was raised with the Minister of Agriculture who promised his help through the opening of a new account with signatures from the Director of DFB, the Director of the Directorate of Administration of MARD and an official of the Directorate of Finance. A third challenge is posed by the unreliable internet connection and energy supply in the PIU/DFB office. For this reason, the decision was taken to use part of the funds saved on Output 4.1.1 thanks a new partnership with UNDP to install solar power panels and secure fast internet connection to the office. The instalment is expected soon, meanwhile the PIU is using the fast internet connection at the FAO office whenever necessary.

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating¹⁵	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating¹⁶	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	S	The smooth completion of most preliminary work including the development of agreements with the many partners and stakeholders shed optimism on the capacity of the project to start full-speed as of summer 2019 and achieve all the set objectives with no significant delay. The main obstacle towards this is of bureaucratic nature and concerns the opening of a specific bank account for DFB, which will enable transfer of the funds approved through the LOA.
Budget Holder	S	S	Activities are performing correctly as planned. Some delay on procurement of material, because of FAO internal process are not attributable to decentralized office.
Lead Technical Officer¹⁷	S	S	The implementation is satisfactory even if I noticed some delay due to internal/complex FAO procedures. National team members in Sao Tomé should be familiarized/trained on key FAO procedures to increase their ability to interact properly with our decentralized office in Libreville. The upcoming arrival of a new sub-regional forestry officer within FAOSFC will probably facilitate the implementation of the first annual work plan by July 2020.

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.

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

GEF Funding Liaison Officer	S	S	Despite some initial delays in getting the team in place and functional and in kick starting project implementation (also due to general elections), the team on the ground is moving smoothly and laying the grounds for a very successful project. The project team is building strong partnerships at different levels of intervention, from local to national. It is excellent that the project team is well integrated with the Directorate of Forests, which allows for closer partnership and capacity building. Overall, the project seems to be well on track.
-----------------------------	---	---	---

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 valid ¹⁸ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low	Still valid

Please make sure that the below risk table include also Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans.

Risk ratings

RISK TABLE
The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation. The <u>Notes</u> column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, as relevant .

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.

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	The political will to implement reforms and improve the legislative and policy framework for FLR is not forthcoming. Turnover and changes in decision makers and institutional arrangements beyond the control of the project lead to a volatile environment that hampers the long-term success of the work.	M	Project priorities are in line with the international commitment of the GoSTP and with the most recent national legislation. Support for FLR will be further strengthened through implementation of components 1 and 4 focusing on policy development and information and awareness-raising work. The leading role of the DF will build robust support to FLR among technical staff that enjoy a more stable position within the administration. The setup of a FLR platform including representatives from many sectors of the GoSTP and the improved governance and legislation framework conveyed by the project will increase the chances of long term buy-in and conduciveness.	Although the change of government in STP brought to some delay in the take-off of parts of the project, the PIU engaged in a proactive dialogue with the members and officers of the new GoSTP, especially the Minister of Agriculture and Director of DFB. All key partners have been fully briefed and are committed to a timely and successful implementation of the GEF/TRI.	The Minister of Agriculture chaired the first meeting of the PSC, which includes several other members of the GoSTP

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".

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
2	There is insufficient capacity within the institutions of the GoSTP to successfully engage in a complex, comprehensive FLR program touching on many different aspects at the national level.	M	Component 3 will strengthen capacity at the national level to enable a range of institutions at different scales to effectively coordinate and engage in FLR and sustainable land management. Capacity development efforts will also be supported by Component 4, particularly opportunities for South-South learning and knowledge sharing. The development of a broad range of operational partnerships with the private sector and civil society will allow the outsourcing of large chunks of the work plan, helping to distribute workloads on several partners and alleviating implementation fatigue.	The PIU is actively negotiating the support of FAO and the GCP or TRI to grant the necessary assistance. A list of priority capacity development needs was delivered to FAO and consultants are being sought to assist the PIU and DFB.	
3	The private sector is reluctant to invest in FLR and agro-forestry due to lack of information, experience, and to the un-conductive framework for FLR finance	M	A key emphasis of Component 3 will be to develop, test, and scale up financing tools and risk mitigation instruments that demonstrate the potential for restoration to yield a high return on investment. The actions under OP 3.1.2 and 3.1.3 will develop the capacity of the private sector and will help create a better environment for FLR investments. The development of public-private partnerships for nationally-implemented bankable projects under OT3.2 will minimize the financial risks for the initiation of pilot bankable projects and will set models for the private sector.	Dialogue is ongoing with the local private sector whose representatives are part of the recently-established PFLR.	

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
4	Local communities are reluctant to engage in the FLR effort in their respective territory, and unable or unwilling to grant the long-term support and monitoring that is needed to ensure the long-term success of the interventions	M/L	The participatory nature of the FLR plans and interventions led by the DF and the accompanying capacity development work will maximize community buy in. The fact that most FLR work is clearly aimed at improving the rural economy and creating business opportunities for the communities will encourage involvement of the grassroots beneficiaries.	Dialogue is ongoing with the local communities whose representatives are part of the recently-established PFLR. The first actions of DFB (landscape mapping and forest assessment) are being planned in close collaboration with the concerned local communities.	
5	Current and future climate change impacts threaten the sustainability of FLR investments	M/L	The project seeks to restore and enhance the ecological integrity in deforested and degraded landscapes and enhance human wellbeing. In doing so, the objective of strengthening resiliency to anticipated climate impacts will be embedded into all restoration planning and investments.	The objective of strengthening resiliency to anticipated climate impacts will be embedded into all restoration planning and investments.	
6	The project is unable to secure the external expertise and technical assistance required to ensure a proper and timely implementation of the work plan	L	The fact that the project is nested within the wider TRI, the pool of expertise made available by the GCP and the implementing partners (FAO, UNEP, IUCN), the involvement of the FAO Sub-Regional Office for Central Africa and the effort to secure as much external expertise in Portuguese language as possible will highly minimize this risk	The PIU is highly aware of the need to secure qualified external expertise and technical assistance and is actively negotiating with the TRI partners and other providers.	

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
	L	The risk rating at this stage of the project is basically the same as at project design (Low). The PIU is monitoring all risks and 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	N/A
Project Outputs	No	N/A

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>Original NTE: Revised NTE:</div> <div>Justification:</div>

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 social and gender analysis was carried out at project design, in order to make the project interventions more people-centred and socially inclusive, by ensuring a close fit with local contexts, culture and livelihoods, and to safeguard the interests of the weaker sections of the population, including women. Based on the outcome of the assessment, the project is working to ensure that all user groups especially women are represented in the design of the FLR plans and in the actions to promote economic diversification, that women entrepreneurs and institutions with a balanced gender component are involved in the development of bankable projects, and that the capacity development work promoted by the projects targets a balanced and equitable share of social groups, with a special focus on women and youth. A quota of 1/3 of women is being sought in the FLR platform established under Component 1, while all the CD programs delivered will ensure that at least 1/3 of the participants are women. As documented in the baseline assessments, women's participation in community forestry and decision-making processes is quite healthy: the project will sustain this and will work to improve it further. Gender and social equitability criteria will also be paramount in the selection of the partner enterprises and organizations for the development of public-private partnerships for nationally-implemented bankable projects of the project.

The M&E system has gender-disaggregated data when it comes to the beneficiaries of capacity building and income-generating activities, and for the participation of women into the steering and decision-making bodies set up by the project. The project staff does not have specific gender expertise, but women make up almost 50% of the PIU.

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

The islands São Tomé and Príncipe do not hold any population of indigenous people as these are commonly defined, because both islands were uninhabited until Portuguese explorers arrived in the 15th century. The current population of the countries is made up of descendants from African slaves and Europeans, slaves freed at abolition and contracted African plantation laborers from elsewhere, mainly in Lusophone Africa (Cape Verde and Angola above all). This being said, local communities are fully involved in the project, through: (i) active participation in all stages of the FLR process, from the mapping of the landscapes to the design and eventual implementation of the FLR plans; (ii) membership of the PFLR, the National Platform for FLR set up by the project, which act as a steering body for all components of the project (represented by District Authorities); (iii) beneficiaries of the numerous training and other capacity development opportunities included in the project.

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))

Although stakeholder engagement plan was not requested at CEO endorsement stage, the project is engaging a full range of stakeholders, and its work plan includes many actions to secure their active engagement. The national stakeholders fall into the following categories:

1. National authorities and institutions pertaining to the Government of STP: Ministry of Agriculture, Directorate of Forests and Biodiversity, Directorate of Agriculture; Management of Obo and Principe natural parks; Ministry of the Environment; Directorate for Nature Conservation; Directorate of Natural Resources and Energy; Ministry of Finance; Regional Government of Principe including Regional Directorate of Forests; CADR (Centre for the Support to Rural Development); CIAT (Centre for Agriculture Research); Police; Armed Forces of STP.
2. Civil Society Organizations: FONG (Coordination Body of STP NGOs); ONG Principe; ONG Alisei; Association of Lumbermen of Sao Tomé.
3. National and International actors in the field of Agriculture: PAPAC/IFAD cooperatives (CECAB, CECAQ-11; CEPIBA; CECAFEB), SATOCAO, Agripalma.
4. Local District Authorities: District Authorities of Lembá, Cantagalo, Mé Zóchi, Lobata, Caué.
5. Local communities: all local communities in the landscapes where the project is active, both on Sao Tomé and Principe Island.
6. International donors and representatives of other related projects: UNDP, European Commission/ECOFAC VI; BirdLife International; Project Obo Carbono; World Bank/AFAP for Contador Project; African Union/Treasures of Obo project; Foundation Principe Trust.

Progress on the engagement of the above stakeholders in the reporting period includes:

- I. Organization of two inception workshops on the islands of Sao Tomé and Principe in November 2018;
- II. Organization of the first Steering Committee Meeting (COPIL) on 16 May 2019;
- III. Organization of the first/inception workshop of the National Platform for Forest and Landscape Restoration (PFLR) on 21 May 2019;
- IV. Specific planning and consultation meetings held with partners and stakeholders including: IFAD, PAPAFA cooperatives, UNDP, World Bank, UNDP, ASB, and others.
- V. Integration of the GEF/TRI project in the “Liga das Florestas” (League for Forests), an informal coordination body gathering all national/international projects dealing with forest conservation/management/restoration/sustainable rural development.

See [Annex 1](#) for stakeholders’ engagement plan and more information on the objectives of the partnership and modalities of engagement.

8. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in knowledge management approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval

As the project is moving its first steps, few knowledge management actions have been carried out so far. The PIU produced a flyer describing the highlights and objectives of the project, which is being circulated among the target audience in STP. A poster was also produced in view of the Global TRI Meeting held in Naivasha (Kenya) in February 2019. Most communication and KM actions within the project will be managed through an “Information Hub” that the project will outsource, partnering up with a local civil society organization. The TOR of the Info Hub have been circulated and a selection of the candidate partners is being undertaken now. The scheduled start of the Info Hub program is early 2020. The Info Hub will work in close liaison with FAO, GCP, DFB and other project partners to disseminate project activities and results using a variety of tools (TV, radio, social media, informal events, publications etc.). It will also act as a clearinghouse with the wider network of TRI, making sure that relevant information from member countries is available to the society of STP, and that the lessons learned in STP are disseminated through the network.

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
Other Multi-lateral Agency	World Bank, PRS project	Grants	10,600,000	530,000		10,600,000
Other Multi-lateral Agency	IFAD, PAPAC project	In-kind	6,100,000	305,000		6,100,000
		TOTAL	16,700,000	835,000		16,700,000

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. Stakeholder Engagement Plan

Stakeholder engagement event	Targeted stakeholders	Purpose of the Event	Resources Allocated
Inception Workshop (November 2018, one in each island)	All stakeholders	Define and validate project methodologies and action plan with project stakeholders, M&E. Confirm institutional roles of project stakeholders. Define the project the local and national entry points of the project grievance mechanism in a participatory manner	Available PPG funds.
National Platform for FLR	Approx. 30 stakeholders representing main concerned institutions	Define mechanisms to support the leading partners in project implementation Validate reports, work plan, strategies, consultancy reports Build capacity of main actors in FLR through training, learning visits etc. It includes four sub-working groups (policy; restoration; communications and education; rural development) and plenary meetings.	93,900 \$USD
Contador Working Group	Stakeholders involved in OP 2.1.1	Share all documents relevant to the restoration of the Contador Watershed (EIA etc.) Help design and validate FLR plan for the Contador Watershed led by DFB Monitor and evaluate the FLR work	2,100 \$USD
IFAD/PAPAC Working Group	Stakeholders involved in OP 2.2.1	Share all documents relevant to the restoration of the shadow forests of the PAPAC cooperatives CECAB, CECAQ-11; CEPIBA and CECAFEB Help design and validate FLR plan for the shadow forests led by DFB Coordinate, monitor and evaluate joint implementation of the FLR work	None specific. Included in the financial package of OP 2.2.1
Liga das Florestas (Forest League)	International donors managing projects dealing with forest	Share information and news regarding each other's work Create synergies and avoid duplication Coordinate work and position vis-à-vis other parties	None. Voluntary for all members

	conservation, management, restoration, sustainable rural development		
Final Workshop (3 months before project closure)	All stakeholders	disseminate project outcomes and discuss on lessons learned for future projects. Share success stories with and within producers' organizations, as well as with other national and international livestock sector actors. assess project implementation, share Final Evaluation, consult with co-executing partners, and identify weaknesses and strengths at institutional and operational levels (local and national). Consolidate inputs for the Project Terminal Report.	5,000 \$USD
Project Steering Committee Meetings	Primary stakeholders	To make important decisions about project management, including strategic direction, approval of work plans and budgets	2,000 \$USD
Regular planning meetings	Primary and secondary stakeholders; representatives from other projects (ad hoc)	To plan and coordinate activities and the involvement of the different partners (government agencies and other implementing partners).	No specific budget for the planning meetings. Included in budget for each action