

FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2022 – Revised Template


Period covered: 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022

Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE)	4
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	7
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	10
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	15
6. RISKS	18
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION	20
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	22
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	23
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING	25
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	26
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	28
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	29

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	RNE
Country (ies):	Lebanon
Project Title:	Smart Adaptation of Forest Landscapes in Mountain Areas SALMA
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/LEB/027/SCF
GEF ID:	5125
GEF Focal Area(s):	Climate Change, Adaptation
Project Executing Partners:	Ministry of Agriculture
Project Duration (years):	6 years
Project coordinates:	Guidance on how to record project coordinates will be provided separately  Coordinates_SALMA_Sites.xlsx

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	3 November 2016
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	01 December 2016
Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	30 November 2021
Revised project implementation end date (if approved) ²	31 December 2023

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	USD 7,147,635										
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc³:	<table> <tr> <td>MOE</td><td>USD 11,000,000</td></tr> <tr> <td>IFAD/Green Plan HASAD</td><td>USD 8,340,000</td></tr> <tr> <td>USAID/LRI</td><td>USD 6,900,000</td></tr> <tr> <td>FAO-Lebanon</td><td>USD 740,000</td></tr> <tr> <td>Sub-total co-financing</td><td>USD 26,980,000</td></tr> </table>	MOE	USD 11,000,000	IFAD/Green Plan HASAD	USD 8,340,000	USAID/LRI	USD 6,900,000	FAO-Lebanon	USD 740,000	Sub-total co-financing	USD 26,980,000
MOE	USD 11,000,000										
IFAD/Green Plan HASAD	USD 8,340,000										
USAID/LRI	USD 6,900,000										
FAO-Lebanon	USD 740,000										
Sub-total co-financing	USD 26,980,000										
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2022 (USD)⁴:	USD 5,801,775										
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2022⁵	19,018,033										

¹ As per FPMIS

² If NTE extension has been requested and approved by the FAO-GEF CU.

³ This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

⁴ For DEX projects, the GEF Coordination Unit will confirm the final amount with the Finance Division in HQ. For OPIM projects, the disbursement amount should be provided by Execution Partners.

⁵ Please refer to the section 12 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

M&E Milestones

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	14 June 2021
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	June 2020
Actual Mid-term review date (when it is done):	12 February 2021
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date⁷:	July-August 2022
Tracking tools/Core indicators updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	NO

Overall ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	<i>MS</i>
Overall implementation progress rating:	<i>S</i>
Overall risk rating:	<i>M</i>

ESS risk classification

Current ESS Risk classification:	<i>L</i>
---	----------

Status

Implementation Status (1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):	5 th PIR
--	---------------------

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Asmar, Fady	Fady.asmar@fao.org
Budget Holder	Ourabah Haddad, Nora	Nora.OurabahHaddad@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Hamid, Abdel Hamied (RNETD)	AbdelHamied.Hamid@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Veyret-Picot, Maude	Maude.VeyretPicot@fao.org

⁶ The Mid-Term Review (MTR) should take place after the 2nd PIR, around half-point between EOD and NTE. The MTR report in English should be submitted to the GEF Secretariat within 4 years of the CEO Endorsement date.

⁷ The Terminal Evaluation date should be discussed with OED 6 months before the project's NTE date.

2. Progress towards Achieving Project Objective(s) (Development Objective)

(All inputs in this section should be cumulative from project start, not annual)

Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating ¹¹
Enhance resilience of fragile forest ecosystems and vulnerable communities in forested mountain areas		i) # Ha of climate resilient forest ecosystems (restored and reforested)	0	1000	2000	624	MS
		ii) # of communities with increased adaptive capacity to reduce risks of and response to climate variability (AMAT 2.2.1)	0	12	24	27	S
		iii) # vulnerable communities with diversified sources of income	0	12	24	30	HS

⁸ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project.

⁹ 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.

¹⁰ Please report on results obtained in terms of Global Environmental Benefits and Socio-economic Co-benefits as well.

¹¹ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory** (HS), **Satisfactory** (S), **Moderately Satisfactory** (MS), **Moderately Unsatisfactory** (MU), **Unsatisfactory** (U), and **Highly Unsatisfactory** (HU).

	Vulnerability assessment undertaken for main forest ecosystems	0	20	30		
	Fire and pest vulnerability assessment being undertaken as part of the SFM planning process					
	iii) # of participatory and sustainable forest management plans	No SFM plans	8 plans	8	4	MS
Outcome 1.2: Diversified and sustainable sources of income for vulnerable communities	i) Men and women, households and communities have more secure access to livelihood assets	Poor access to livelihoods access (poverty is amongst the selection criteria of targeted community groups) (Level 2, AMAT 1.3.1)	0		0	HU
Outcome 2.1: Reduced soil erosion, fragmentation of forest resources and biodiversity loss for more resilient forest and rural mountain forest communities	i) Creation of a baseline monitoring system for soils # of soil samples taken	0%	0	250	213	S
	iii) # of participatory reforestation plans	0	8	16	27	S
Outcome 3.1: Increased technical and institutional capacity at national level to replicate	Number of trained MoA staff at central and local level participating in SALMA implementation;	0	23	23	12 MOA engineers (6 females) 90 Forest Guards (1 Female)	HS

	participatory climate proof forest management (upscaling community – based reforestation and forest management)						
	Outcome 3.2: Project monitoring and communication	i) Gender disaggregated M&E system established	0	1	1	1	HS
		ii) Communication and awareness strategy developed and implemented	0	1	1	1	HS

Action Plan to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 1.1 Improved Forest pest and fire management	Speed-up finalization of SFM plans	Project team	August 2022
Outcome 1.2: Diversified and sustainable sources of income for vulnerable communities	All projects are identified. LOAs for the community trainings and LOAs for construction of water reservoirs drafted to be implemented after project extension. The volume of the projects relying on procurement of tools and equipment will be decided after launching and receiving the procurement offers.	Project team	September 2022 for LOAs December 2022 for procurement of tools and equipment

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

(Please indicate progress achieved during this FY as per the Implementation Plan/Annual Workplan)

Outcomes and Outputs ¹²	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹³ (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁴ in delivering outputs
<u>Outcome 1.1</u>				
<u>Output 1.1.1</u>	Pest outbreak and forest fire risk and vulnerability assessments	0	Pest assessment completed and cleared in 2021. Forest fires map for 2022 is expected to be reported during the PPR in December 2022	
<u>Output 1.1.2</u>	Participatory forest management plans with a focus on pest and fire management	8	4 SFM plans are in their final draft stages. The remaining 4 plans are still in progress. The SFM plans are ongoing. With the extension all the plans should be delivered by end of Dec 2022. Below is the percentage of completion per site: Jezzine (90%) Wadi el Hujair (30%) karm Saddeh (80%) Hammana (60%) Ras EL Maten (60%) Bcharri, Chahtoul, Akoura & Akkar (50%) Chaat (30%) Lala/Baaloul (10%)	8 plans to be delivered as per MTR

¹² Outputs as described in the project Logframe or in any approved project revision.

¹³ Please use the same unit of measurement of the project indicators as per the approved Implementation Plan or Annual Workplan. Please be concise (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.

<u>Output 1.1.3</u>	Enhance the capacity of local communities to apply climate-proof forest management practices	8	Community-based projects mainstreamed within the implementation of the SFM Training and capacity-building on forest-based jobs will be provided via an agreement with a service provider.	
<u>Output 1.1.4:</u>	Apply sustainable forest management practices	8	Should start after the completion of the plans. The implementation of the SFM plans will be initiated in the framework of the project but cannot be completed as SFM plans spread over several years.	
<u>Output 1.1.5:</u>	Construction of water tanks for forest fire control (Green Plan)	5	All water tanks are being implemented in final stages	
<u>Outcome 2.1</u>				
<u>Output 2.1.1</u>	Baseline study on soil	113	223 Soil samples out of 250 total samples were collected and analyzed (90%)/ Final report on the findings are being drafted. To be shared in the coming PPR.	
<u>Output 2.1.2</u>	Analysis of land use and land cover changes along the ecological corridors based on remote sensing data		The forest change, 2000-2020 is calculated by combining the reference tree cover 2000 with gains (recorded from 2000 to 2012) and losses of forest recorded up to 2020 in one map.	
<u>Output 2.1.3</u>	Implement community – based participatory reforestation plans	14	All reforestation activities started by meetings with the local communities to agree on the area and species to be planted. Local communities have participated in the planting operations as local manpower. Management plans will be developed for planted sites during extension period.	
<u>Outcome 3.1</u>				
<u>Output 3.1.1</u>	Enhanced capacity on sustainable forest management of the Reforestation Programme Coordination Unit (RPCU) in MoA	1	Training of MOA staff on new SFM guidelines drafted by FAO Participation of MOA team in SFM process Strong participation of MOA staff in Forest and Trees Resources Assessment	

			Forests and OWL Monitoring system being drafted and will be implemented with CNRS and MOA during extension phase	
<u>Output 3.1.2</u>	Updated and extended assessments of existing eco-system services in selected forests	1		
<u>Outcome 3.2</u>				
<u>Output 3.2.1</u>	Develop and implement a monitoring and evaluation plan for adaptive project management and lessons learnt	1	Will be reported on in next PPR	
<u>Output 3.2.2</u>	Develop and implement a communication and public awareness raising strategy	1	Short movies being produced Pictures data-base ready/training provided to MOA on use of database Info-graphs drafted/ two finalized Communication grid filled with MOA	

4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

Please provide a summary paragraph on progress, challenges, and outcome of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR.

Output 1.1.1: Forest Management Plans prepared and validated for selected sites

- Forest fire assessment surveying: A new user-friendly KOBO survey toolbox link has been developed in collaboration between SALMA team and MoA, this survey has been tested and approved during the last 2021 forest fire season. The main objective for creating this survey is to update and share data, locations, and photos, related to forest fires when they occurred. The survey is linked to a group of 44 forest guards and MoA engineers from different regions” Fire Info Group”; every group member can share forest fire data etc.
- The “Fire info group” has been trained on how to assess forest fire using KOBO survey toolbox, MoA engineers have been trained on the use of satellite imagery (Sentinel 2) for the delineation and mapping forest fires.
- During 2021 more than 120 forest fires had been identified in 115 villages, the total area was 2890 ha out of which 1470 ha inside forested areas and 460 ha in other wooded lands, the remaining area is distributed between agricultural land (360 ha) and grass land (600 ha). (See annex 1)

Output 1.1.2: Enhance the capacity of local communities to apply climate-proof management practices

- SFM plans being prepared involving local communities: The preparation of the SFM plan includes the meeting with the local authority and community. During this meeting, the stakeholders, the uses and the users of the forest, the vision and the objective of the forest are identified. When the SFM is draft, it will be shared with the community for comments and approval.

Output 1.1.3: Apply sustainable and inclusive forest management practices.

- Applying sustainable forest management practices will start after finalizing the planning phase and preparation of the SFM plans (4 sites are ongoing)
- Traditional forest management practices are being documented where applicable.

Output 1.1.4 Construction of water tanks for forest fire control.

- Implementation on 5 sites started in February 2022. 3 sites will be completely finalized by mid of June 2022 (Ras el Maten network, Benta el network and Daroun-Darb el Sama). Excavation and installation in the two remaining sites (Karm saddad and Dimane) will start in the second week of June. An extension of 12 weeks has been approved to complete all civil work, installation, and testing of the system. All forest prevention systems will be ready before the end of August 2022.

Output 1.2.1: Identification of sustainable and innovative uses of wood and non-wood forest products (community projects).

- Community support projects were identified for 17 sites. Procurement documents and LOAs are being prepared. The community projects will consist of trainings on green jobs, fire prevention, procurement of Firefighting equipment, construction of water reservoirs. (See annex 2 for details)

Output 2.1.1: Baseline study on soil.

- 213 soil samples were collected, the report is being prepared. The soil samples and resulting report will constitute the first data base on soils and will help to put in place a soil monitoring system. Soil samples are taken from all the FRA points, from the reforestation sites and from the SFM sites.

Output 2.1.2: Analysis of land use and land cover changes along the ecological corridors based on remote sensing data.

- LOA to develop a forest monitoring unit with CNRS based on forest criteria and indicators is being drafted.
- The forest change, 2000-2020 is derived from processing Hansen Global Forest Cover Change database. The process is calculated by combining the reference tree cover 2000 with gains (recorded from 2000 to 2012) and losses of forest recorded up to 2020 in one map, the layout is the result from time-series analysis of Landsat images characterizing forest extent and change. Trees are defined as vegetation taller than 5m in height and are expressed as a percentage per output grid cell. 'Forest Cover Loss' is defined as a stand-replacement disturbance, or a change from a forest to non-forest state, during the period 2000-2020. 'Forest Cover Gain' is defined as the inverse of loss, or a non-forest to forest change entirely within the period 2000-2012. 'Forest Loss Year' is a disaggregation of total 'Forest Loss' to annual time scales.
 - Tree Covered Area (ha) 94,619.06
 - Area Lost (ha) 7,111.11
 - Area Gain (ha) 1,751.86
 - Forest Cover Loss (%) 7.52
 - Forest Cover Gain (%) 1.85
 - Forest Covered Area (%) 9.34

Output 2.1.3: Implement community-based participatory reforestation plans

Final monitoring visits to the reforestation sites are in progress for the closure of the activity. The total targeted area decreased by 40 hectares after the drop of two sites in South Lebanon. the expected total of planting should be around 624 hectares. A final report on the reforestation sites will be shared with the coming PPR.

The original target of planting 1,000 Hectare could not be reached due to the below main reasons:

- The original estimation of planting costs per hectare was below the actual expenses.
- In the 2 calls for proposals launched, only 4 major stakeholders with reforestation capabilities applied (LRI, AFDC, SHEILD and LOST). Due to Covid outbreak and the economic crisis in Lebanon, and due to the reforestation approach, to plant young seedlings,

a third call was not practical. And hence the remaining budget was shifted to provide direct support to the MOA to procure pesticides, fertilizers, and other field needs.

Output 3.1.1: Enhanced capacity on sustainable forest management of the Reforestation Programme Coordination Unit (RPCU) in MoA.

- A Potential reforestation map, showing the distribution of potential areas suitable for reforestation has been elaborated. The early result of this map shows that the potential area for reforestation in Lebanon is around 80,000 ha classified into three classes: Highly suitable (8000 ha), Suitable (38,000 ha) and less suitable (34,000 ha). The elaboration of this map does not take into consideration the socio-economic indicators nor the water availability, more efforts shall be undertaken to have more accurate results.

Different layers have been overlaid with the following indicators:

- Land cover land use map (NCRS 2017)
- Slope map (calculated in percentage from a 10 m DEM)
- Elevation map (calculated from 10 m DEM)
- Soil map (NCRS 2005)
- Aridity index (calculated from remote sensing data precipitation / Potential evapotranspiration).

Output 3.2.2 Develop and implement a communication and public awareness raising strategy.

- Strategy ready
- Implementation is ongoing

Development Objective (DO) Ratings, Implementation Progress (IP) Ratings and Overall Assessment

Please note that the overall DO and IP ratings should be substantiated by evidence and progress reported in the Section 2 and Section 3 of the PIR. For DO, the ratings and comments should reflect the overall progress of project results.

	FY2022 Development Objective rating¹⁵	FY2022 Implementation Progress rating¹⁶	Comments/reasons¹⁷ justifying the ratings for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	<i>Despite the difficulties caused by the COVID and the economic situation in the country, the project is moving forward trying to achieve the targets</i>
Budget Holder	MS	S	<i>Concur with LTO and FLO</i>
GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁸			<i>Ratings/comments</i>
Lead Technical Officer¹⁹	MS	S	<i>Ratings/comments No doubt the project performance was highly impacted by the multiple crises that the country has experienced from the pandemic lockdown to the socio-political and economic situation. Under a situation where people are preoccupied by how to sustain a living, their sense of duty to national/public goals often diminishes. In such a situation it becomes difficult to guide project participants towards achieving results. Nonetheless, the project has delivered many of its planned activities, some of these actions need to be consolidated and translated into clear results.</i>

¹⁵ **Development Objectives Rating** – A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.

For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁶ **Implementation Progress Rating** – A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project's components and activities is in compliance with the projects approved implementation plan. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁷ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

¹⁸ In case the GEF OFP didn't provide his/her comments, please explain the reason.

¹⁹ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	MS	S	<p><i>The multiple crises the country is facing, from a health crisis to a financial and political crisis, have had a negative bearing on the project delivery. Nevertheless, large part of the very ambitious work plan has been delivered and results are being recorded on the ground. However, some key actions still need to be engaged, including the community projects. These latter are a central part of the transformational approach of the project, which really endeavours to engage communities in the forest management and reforestation efforts, in order to achieve results at scale. The landscape level is a dimension that needs to remain central in the project, otherwise it may miss out on its expected impact, which is climate change resilience of the fragile forest ecosystems.</i></p>
--	-----------	----------	---

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

Under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

Please describe the progress made complying with the approved ESM plan. Note that only projects with **moderate** or **high** Environmental and Social Risk, approved from June 2015 should have submitted an ESM plan/table at CEO endorsement. This does not apply to **low** risk projects. Add new ESS risks if any risks have emerged during this FY.

Social & Environmental Risk Impacts identified at CEO Endorsement	Expected mitigation measures	Actions taken during this FY	Remaining measures to be taken	Responsibility
ESS 1: Natural Resource Management				
ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats				
Make reasonable and feasible effort to avoid practices that could have a negative impact on biodiversity, including agricultural biodiversity and genetic resources	Assessment of fauna for mainstreaming fauna into SFM plans/ promoting biodiversity through avoiding monoculture and using bird and pollinators friendly tree species in reforestation	The expected activities were identified	To launch the assessment	PMU
Safeguard the relationships between biological and cultural diversity	Involvement of local communities in the decision-making process, taking into consideration forest-based food, existence of cultural heritage sites, existence of specimen trees and of sacred forests/sites	Started	Ongoing with all relevant activities	PMU

Be located such that it poses no risk or impact to protected areas, critical habitats and ecosystem functions?	Development of SFM plans in one PA and in 2 Hima sites, taking into consideration the FAO guidelines	8 SFM plans are in progress, with 4 in their final stages	To complete the SFM plans.	PMU
ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
Have a credible forest certification scheme, national forest programmes or equivalent or use the Voluntary Guidelines on Planted Forests (or an equivalent for indigenous forests)	Undertaking genetic analysis on sites where it is said that both <i>Cedrus atlantica</i> and <i>Cedrus libani</i> were planted in the 60's. If the existence of <i>C. atlantica</i> is confirmed, then the sites will be managed as arboretums and will be cancelled from the list of seed orchards.			
ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management				
ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement				
ESS 7: Decent Work				
Adhere to FAO's guidance on decent rural employment, promoting more and better employment opportunities and working conditions in rural areas and avoiding practices that could increase workers' vulnerability	All laborers are recruited according to FAO guidance on decent employment	Continuous	Continuous	PMU/partners
ESS 8: Gender Equality				
Have the needs, priorities and constraints of both women and men been taken into consideration	Women are participating in activities			
Promote women's and men's equitable access to and control over productive resources and services	Participation of women is crucial to the project			
Foster their equal participation in institutions and decision-making processes	Women participate in the decision-making process at the municipality level			
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage				

New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY				

In case the project did not include an ESM Plan at CEO endorsement stage, please indicate if the initial Environmental and Social (ESS) Risk classification is still valid; if not, what is the new classification and explain.

Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)	Current ESS risk classification Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ²⁰ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
L	Still valid

<i>Please report if any grievance was received as per FAO and GEF ESS policies. If yes, please indicate how it is being/has been addressed.</i>
N/A

²⁰ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

6. Risks

The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation (including COVID-19 related risks). The last column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in the project, as relevant.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	Devaluation of the Lebanese pounds is causing a challenge for both procurement of services and products	M	N	SALMA will follow up directly with FAO procurement unit to ensure best practices	The PMU is following up with the relevant stakeholders to ensure casual labor was paid fairly with-in the market range. Payments made to LOAs were followed on a case by case bases to minimize the impact.	

²¹ Risk ratings means a rating of accesses the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High. For more information on ratings and definitions please refer to Annex 1.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
2	Due to the economic crisis, more civil disturbances and roadblocks may delay the field work	M	N	SALMA team will consider accessibility to field sites when recruiting consultants	Consultants have been selected based on the knowledge of the respective areas. Also, the PMU is directly communicating with MOA regional offices and municipalities to ensure accessibility.	
3	Another wave of Covid-19 may cause another lockdown or hinder the implementation of certain activities	M	N	SALMA team is coordinating closely with partners to ensure activities are on track	Covid-19 safety measures were followed by SALMA and local partners.	
4	Climate related factors such as high mortality rate because of increasing water needs and high fire danger may jeopardize the survival of the seedlings on several sites	M	Y	SALMA team is encouraging partners to use different methods that would contribute to the reduction of the water needs (mulches and polymers). Fire risks are being addressed through increased awareness	This was dealt on a case-by-case bases. One of the measures taken with a reforestation partner was to extend the area of implementation while reducing the number of seedlings per hectare.	

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

FY2021 rating	FY2022 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
M	M	

7. Follow-up on Mid-term review or supervision mission (only for projects that have conducted an MTR)

If the project had an MTR or a supervision mission, please report on how the recommendations were implemented during this fiscal year as indicated in the Management Response or in the supervision mission report.

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented <u>during this Fiscal Year</u>
Recommendation 2: More explicit focus on institutionalization and policy change/better integration of project components to maximize transformative change	The MOA was involved in all the activities planning and implementation An LOA for implementing a monitoring unit at the MoA was drafted with the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique. The LOA will be signed after the extension. Working on a landscape level in the forest management planning process, integrating reforestation/afforestation into planning wherever possible.
Recommendation 3: Prioritise sites	SFM sites were prioritized in-collaboration with the MOA. The number of sites dropped from 16 to 8.
Recommendation 4: Link livelihood development with SFM management planning process.	SFM plans are being linked to other ongoing activities. E.g. socio-economic assessment Basic regional Territorial planning will be undertaken in some regions. Existing forest-based jobs and forest products are being assessed.
Recommendation 5: Simple, scale-able and endorsed community based SFM guidelines	Accessible, user friendly and compliant with international guidelines of SFM. In line with the criteria and indicators of sustainable forest and range management.
Recommendation 8: Advise government to develop agreements similar to those for SFM sites that devolve rights and responsibilities.	The MOA regional officers are being involved directly in data collection and meeting with the local communities.
Recommendation 11: More explicit focus on advancing community-based afforestation and SFM in policy and practice.	A forest slope identifier was completed
Recommendation 13: Official guidelines developed, disseminated.	Guidelines for different types of forests including traditional uses are a part of the SFM planning process

Recommendation 19: It is clear that a better articulation, communication and visibility of the project identity is required	
Recommendation 26: Stronger local engagement – especially of women	All activities are gender sensitive, and gender indicators were already developed. Ongoing process
Recommendation 27: Social safeguard and conflict management system set up.	A training on conflict Management was planned before the social uprising and corona lock down. The training will be given when the overall situation is favourable.
Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please describe	

8. Minor project amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines²². Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories. And, provide supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

Category of change	Provide a description of the change	Indicate the timing of the change	Approved by
Results framework	NA		
Components and cost			
Institutional and implementation arrangements			
Financial management			
Implementation schedule	The implementation schedule to be extended till the end of 2023 to finalize SFM, community projects and capacity building activities	The extension suggested is till the end of 2023	
Executing Entity			
Executing Entity Category			
Minor project objective change			
Safeguards			
Risk analysis			
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%			
Co-financing			
Location of project activity			
Other			

²² Source: <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy-2020-update>

9. Stakeholders' Engagement

Please report on progress and results and challenges on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan) included at CEO Endorsement/Approval during this reporting period.

Stakeholder name	Role in project execution	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
Government Institutions			
Ministry of Agriculture	Steering committee	MOA is highly engaged in the project activities. Decisions on activities are participatory. The MOA also provides monitoring support to the field activities. SFM data collection in some sites is being implemented between FAO and the MOA.	The MOA priorities' are slightly different from FAO (e.g. the fire assesment was dropped by the MOA and replaced by fire mapping), the MOA prefers direct implementation over outsourcing (this has effected the implementaion timeline of SFM activities). Also due to the economic collapse, the MOA is requesting operational support.
Ministry of Envirnoment	Steering committee	MOE votes in steering committee meetings	NA
Green Plan	Steering committee	Provided technical support to the implementation of the water reserviors component	
Non-Government organizations (NGOs)			
Association for Forests, Development and Conservation (AFDC)	Reforestation implementing partner	Completed, monitoring reports in progress	Satisfactory
Association of Jouzour Loubnan	Reforestation implementing partner	Completed, monitoring reports in progress	Satisfactory

Al Shouf Cedar Society (ACS)	Reforestation implementing partner	Completed	Satisfactory
The Committee of Cedar Forest Friends	Reforestation implementing partner	Completed	Satisfactory
Lebanese Organization for Studies and Training (LOST)	Reforestation implementing partner	Completed, monitoring reports in progress	Satisfactory
Lebanon Reforestation Initiative (LRI)	Reforestation implementing partner	Completed, monitoring reports in progress	Satisfactory
Horsh Ehden Nature Reserve (HENR)	Reforestation implementing partner	Completed, monitoring reports in progress	Satisfactory
Cooperation Without Borders for Tailored Development (CWB)	Reforestation implementing partner	Completed, monitoring reports in progress	Satisfactory
Oaks & Cedars	Reforestation implementing partner	Ongoing	Satisfactory
Social, Humanitarian, Economical Intervention For Local Development (SHEILD)	Reforestation implementing partner	Completed, monitoring reports in progress	
Private sector entities			
Others[1]			
New stakeholders identified/engaged			
Lebanon Mount Trails			
CNRS			

[1] They can include, among others, community-based organizations (CBOs), Indigenous Peoples organizations, women's groups, private sector companies, farmers, universities, research institutions, and all major groups as identified, for example, in Agenda 21 of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit and many times again since then.

Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on Gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable) <u>during this reporting period.</u>		
Category	Yes/No	Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period
Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.		
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?		
Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):		
a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources		Under the participatory reforestation component, SALMA and partners engaged women and men in community roundtables and ensured their equal participation in species selection, sites delineation, prioritization of community support actions, and capacity building activities.
b) improving women's participation and decision making		Gender mainstreaming was among the evaluation criteria of the proposed participatory reforestation plans, including evidence on women participation in sites and species selection and prioritization of livelihood support activities.
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women		
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?		
Staff with gender expertise		
Any other good practices on gender		

10. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval <u>during this reporting period.</u>	
Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far.	<p>At the end of the project, SALMA plans to produce reforestation guidelines for each ecosystem based on the success rates, pros and cons of each method/technique used.</p> <p>The project team is studying different reforestation scenarios to help develop a national reforestation suitability map that will ensure sustainability of future reforestation initiatives.</p> <p>In addition, the project is in the process of developing simplified results-based forest management guidelines applicable at municipal levels. These guidelines aim at facilitating the process of developing forest management plans for municipalities, NGOs, and local communities.</p>
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.	
Please share a human-interest story from your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihoods while contributing to achieving the expected Global Environmental Benefits. Please indicate any Socio-economic Co-benefits that were generated by the project. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.	
Please provide links to related website, social media account	
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	<p>Forest Champions: Bechara Salameh https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tPxmq_zctlk&list=PLzp5NgJ2-dK4l6DJfv4v_WW1Urq0rtTYN&index=4</p> <p>Forest Champions: Lamia https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cwkUIHIE0xI&list=PLzp5NgJ2-dK4l6DJfv4v_WW1Urq0rtTYN&index=9&t=48s</p> <p>Carob of Lebanon: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wnd1iB8s2oQ&list=PLzp5NgJ2-dK4l6DJfv4v_WW1Urq0rtTYN&index=8</p>

	<p>Lebanon and FAO: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0KAe4pFgphs&list=PLzp5NgJ2-dK4l6DJfv4v_WW1Urq0rtTYN&index=13&t=6s</p> <p>On the occasion of the International Day of Forests (IDF): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3S1RA0pkO0c&list=PLzp5NgJ2-dK4l6DJfv4v_WW1Urq0rtTYN&index=15&t=8s</p> <p>Beekeeping for Women empowerment in Lebanon: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mUeT1WxBIAM&list=PLzp5NgJ2-dK4l6DJfv4v_WW1Urq0rtTYN&index=16&t=3s</p> <p>Charcoal Infographic (Annex 3) Pest Calendar (Annex 4)</p>
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's Name and contact details	

11. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Involvement

Are Indigenous Peoples and local communities involved in the project (as per the approved Project Document)? If yes, please briefly explain.

More than 5,000 man-days were provided through the reforestation activities. Local beneficiaries, from each site locality, benefitted from an additional livelihood source.

12. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²³	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2022	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
USAID	Lebanon Reforestation Initiative	Other	7 Million USD	10.5 Million USD		10.5 Million USD
IFAD/OFID	HASAD	Other	12.3 Million USD	7.656 Million USD		7.656 Million USD
National Government	MOE	Other	11 Million USD	0		0
BMU (Germany)	FAO – Lebanon FLRM	Grant	450,000 USD	250,000 USD		450,000 USD
TCP	FAO Lebanon	Grant	240,000 USD	240,000 USD		240,000 USD
Norway	FAO Lebanon (Forest Seeds Center)	Grant	372,033 USD	372,033 USD		372,033 USD
		TOTAL	31.362 Million USD	19.018 Million USD		19.218 Million USD

²³ 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.

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

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development Objectives Rating. A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.	
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. A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project’s components and activities is in compliance with the project’s approved implementation plan.	
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.

Risk rating. It should assess the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale:	
High Risk (H)	There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
Substantial Risk (S)	There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face substantial risks
Moderate Risk (M)	There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only moderate risk.
Low Risk (L)	There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only low risks.