



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2023 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE)	4
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	8
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	11
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
Initial project duration (years):	5 years
Project coordinates: <i>This section should be completed ONLY by:</i> a) Projects with 1st PIR; b) In case the geographic coverage of project activities has changed since last reporting period.	<i>No change in the geographic coverage of the report</i>

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	03-Nov-16
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 (USD)³:	<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 delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD):	USD 6,525,981										
Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD)⁴:	USD 6,250,800										
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023⁵	USD 19,218,000										

¹ As per FPMIS

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

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

⁴ The amount should show the values included in the financial statements generated by IMIS.

⁵ Please refer to the Section 13 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

M&E Milestones

Date of Last Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	23 November 2022
Expected Mid-term Review date ⁶ :	15 June 2020
Actual Mid-term review date (if already completed):	12 February 2021
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date ⁷ :	31 September 2023
Tracking tools (TT)/Core indicators (CI) updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	NO

Overall ratings

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

ESS risk classification

Current ESS Risk classification:	L
----------------------------------	---

Status

Implementation Status (1 st PIR, 2 nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):	6 th PIR
--	---------------------

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Coordinator (PC)	Asmar, Fady	Fady.asmar@fao.org
Budget Holder (BH)	Ourabah Haddad, Nora	Nora.OurabahHaddad@fao.org
GEF Operational Focal Point	Yassine, Nasser (MOE)	
Lead Technical Officer (LTO)	Hayder, Malek (SNEA)	Malek.hayder@fao.org
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	Veyret-Picot, Maude (OCBDD)	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 2023	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	1700	1,647ha 624ha (reforestation) + 1,023ha (SFM)	S
		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	S

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	11 SFM Plans partially completed (please refer to IP table below for details)	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	17	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	MS
	iii) # of participatory reforestation plans	0	8	16	27	HS

<p>Outcome 3.1: Increased technical and institutional capacity at national level to replicate participatory climate proof forest management (upscaling community – based reforestation and forest management)</p>	<p>Number of trained MoA staff at central and local level participating in SALMA implementation;</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>23</p>	<p>23</p>	<p>12 MOA engineers (6 females) 90 Forest Guards (1 Female)</p>	<p>HS</p>
<p>Outcome 3.2: Project monitoring and communication</p>	<p>i) Gender disaggregated M&E system established</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>HS</p>
	<p>ii) Communication and awareness strategy developed and implemented</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>HS</p>

Measures taken to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings on Section 2

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 1.1 Improved Forest pest and fire management	Finalize SFM plans	Project team	August 2023
Outcome 1.2: Diversified and sustainable sources of income for vulnerable communities	All projects are identified. LOAs for the community trainings and LOAs for community projects to be implemented	Project team	September 2023 for LOAs
Outcome 2.1: Reduced soil erosion, fragmentation of forest resources and biodiversity loss for more resilient forest and rural mountain forest communities.	The target was not reached because some of the sites were not accessible during the forests and trees resources assessments. Further analysis will be undertaken in August 2023.	Project team	August 2023

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
Outcome 1.1				
Output 1.1.1	Pest outbreak and forest fire risk and vulnerability assessments	0	Forest Fire mapping for the 2022 season done	
Output 1.1.2	Participatory forest management plans with a focus on pest and fire management	8	Below is the percentage of completion per site, expected to be finalized by end of August 2023: Jezzine (90%) Wadi el Hujair (70% - SFM plan will be shared with "Step4Nature" UNDP project to be mainstreamed into the extended management plan they are working on) Karm Saddeh (80%) Hammana (80%) Ras EL Maten (60%) Bcharri (80%) Chahtoul (80%) Akoura (80%) Akkar (80%) Chaat (75%) Lala/Baaloul (30%)	The total number of sites where SFM will be developed and implemented is reduced to 11 because of lack of time and after the recommendations of the midterm evaluation

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 During August 2023	
<u>Output 1.1.4:</u>	Apply sustainable forest management practices	8	Applying sustainable forest management practices was finalized in in 1 site in Hammana in January 2023	
<u>Output 1.1.5:</u>	Construction of water tanks for forest fire control (Green Plan)	5	All water tanks were completed in August 2022	
<u>Outcome 2.1</u>				
<u>Output 2.1.1</u>	Baseline study on soil	0	213 soil samples were taken, analysis is in process. Report expected in June. A second phase of analysis is foreseen between July and August on forest management sites, along with a study that allows the determination of the carbon stocks in the different forest types	
<u>Output 2.1.2</u>	Analysis of land use and land cover changes along the ecological corridors based on remote sensing data	0	11 maps on land/ land cover/use updates on selected SFM sites.	
<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	1 SFM training was conducted in Andakit and Qubayat for the local community.	
<u>Output 3.1.2</u>	Updated and extended assessments of existing eco-system services in selected forests	1	Undertaken in the framework of the SFM Sites.	
<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	Developed with support of Operations Team	
<u>Output 3.2.2</u>	Develop and implement a communication and public awareness raising strategy	1	Multiple videos were finalized (Carob film, Bird man, Insect Film 1, Insect Film – Lymantria, Chahtoul Forest Champion, Akkoura Forest Champion, Charcoal production, Forest edible plants, forest based products...). More movies are being finalized. An additional series of movies might be needed to complete the different themes to be covered in the framework of the communication strategy. 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 2022 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.

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

- 8 forest management plans are in final stages. TORs for Community climate vulnerability assessments, fire risk assessments, insects’ assessments, and baseline assessment of fauna and collection of other relevant data in selected sites have been finalized. Results will be integrated to the Forest Management plans

Output 1.1.3: Apply sustainable and inclusive forest management practices.

- Applying sustainable forest management practices was finalized in in 1 site in Hammana.
- Traditional forest management practices are being documented where applicable.

Output 1.1.4 Construction of water tanks for forest fire control.

- Construction of five water reservoirs for forest fire control completed.

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. LOAs are being launched, and food processing tools and technical specifications prepared and procurement process launched.

Output 2.1.1: Baseline study on soil.

- Soil Samples were taken, analysis is in process. Report expected in June. A second phase of analysis is foreseen between July and August on forest management sites, along with a study that allows the determination of the carbon stocks in the different forest types

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

- Public forests will be assessed by types and their related areas will be calculated at Caza (Region) level.
- A forest monitoring unit with CNRS based on forest criteria and indicators has been developed in coordination with the MOA. LOA is being prepared.

Output 2.1.3: Implement community-based participatory reforestation plans

- 18 monitoring visits for reforestation sites closure were conducted during the reporting period, a second round of technical monitoring visits to the closed reforestation sites has started. The purpose of the visit is to assess the sites after one year of the works completion in the sites.

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

- On-site trainings on SFM is being conducted with the MOA data assessment teams, in total 5 sessions were provided to the 5 MOA regional teams conducting the assessments.

Output 3.1.2 Updated and extended assessments of existing ecosystem services in selected forests

- The Forest Resources Assessment analysis and report was finalized (Annex 1). Some of the plots were inaccessible due to security reasons.

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 to achieve the targets. As per the recommendations of the previous PIR and MTR, the project has improved the landscape-based approach, and will be achieving good results. The project will end in October 2023</i>
Budget Holder	MS	S	<i>Concur with LTO</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</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.

			<i>planned activities, some of these actions need to be consolidated and translated into clear results.</i>
FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	S	MS	<p><i>The MTR had suggested a project no-cost extension, which was granted by the project steering committee, but unfortunately, the deadlines were not met. Continued challenges in the country (economic and financial) caused delays in results delivery. Partner engagement remains challenging. The project was extended, despite the fact that the TE was commissioned and partially conducted already.</i></p> <p><i>The hope expressed in previous PIRs remains valid; despite the complex context in which the project has been operating for a number of years now, tangible results have been delivered. The development objective of the project will be largely met. The project extension has been granted with the understanding that activities that secure durability of achievements and facilitate stocktake and capitalisation, are delivered in full.</i></p>

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

This section is under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

Please describe the progress made to comply 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. Please indicate if new 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	Assessment ongoing on birds and insects	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	11 SFM plans are in progress, with 10 in their final stages. Partial implementation was done in 2 sites (Hammana and Jezzine)	To complete the SFM plans. Partial implementation planned in 2 additional sites (Ras El Maten and Chahtoul)	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)	Genetic analysis finalized in Hammana for both <i>Cedrus atlantica</i> and <i>Cedrus libani</i> , planted in the 60's. The existence of <i>C. atlantica</i> is confirmed. Management guidelines will be mainstreamed into Hammana SFM. Field observations will be undertaken in October to monitor flowering of both species. The sites should be managed as peri-urban forest and arboretum and will be cancelled from the list of seed orchards of the MOA.			
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	All laborers are recruited according to FAO guidance on decent employment	Continuous	Continuous	PMU/partners

and working conditions in rural areas and avoiding practices that could increase workers' vulnerability				
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:

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 (Esm-unit@fao.org) should be contacted. The project shall prepare or amend an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) or other ESS instruments and management tools based on the new risk classification (please refer to page 13 <https://www.fao.org/3/cb9870en/cb9870en.pdf>)

6. Risks

The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified during the 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):

FY2022 rating	FY2023 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2023 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 11.
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 were 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.	Training on Conflict management was undertaken.

Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please summarize	
---	--

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	Budget revision	August 2022	Steering committee
Institutional and implementation arrangements	NA		
Financial management	NA		
Implementation schedule	Extension till December 2023	August 2022	Steering committee
Executing Entity	NA		
Executing Entity Category	NA		
Minor project objective change	NA		
Safeguards	NA		
Risk analysis	NA		
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%	NA		
Co-financing	NA		
Location of project activity	NA		
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 requested 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	Satisfactory
Association of Jouzour Loubnan	Reforestation implementing partner	Completed	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	Satisfactory
Lebanon Reforestation Initiative (LRI)	Reforestation implementing partner	Completed	Satisfactory
Horsh Ehden Nature Reserve (HENR)	Reforestation implementing partner	Completed	Satisfactory
Cooperation Without Borders for Tailored Development (CWB)	Reforestation implementing partner	Completed	Satisfactory
Oaks & Cedars	Reforestation implementing partner	Completed, monitoring reports in progress	Satisfactory
Social, Humanitarian, Economical Intervention For Local Development (SHEILD)	Reforestation implementing partner	Completed	
<i>Private sector entities</i>			
<i>Others[1]</i>			
<i>New stakeholders identified/engaged</i>			
Lebanon Mount Trails	To provide trainings on first based jobs	Ongoing	
CNRS	Implement a forest monitoring unit and system	Ongoing	

[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.

10. 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		

11. 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 will provide reforestation guidelines for different ecosystems 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 implementing the management guidelines recently developed by FAO applicable at local and 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.	The communication strategy is mainstreamed into the communication developed for the MOA. Infographics, short films and photos are developed.
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.	Will be shared in terminal report.
Please provide links to related website, social media account	NA
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	<p><u>The below videos were completed during the reporting period:</u></p> <p>- Charcoal Production: https://youtu.be/qKldHdz2nAg</p> <p>- Champion of Barouk – Forest Hero: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZYP0FQoSvF8</p> <p>- Birdman movie - Forest Hero: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OmH8miGYmDg</p> <p>- Zatar Movie: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dLxs84i0As8</p> <p>- Mushrooms and Forests</p>

2023 Project Implementation Report

	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LDi6RaQuFQw <u>In addition to:</u> Charcoal Infographic (Annex 2) Insect Pest Calendar (Annex 3)
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's Name and contact details	Elite Sfair (National Communication and Media Specialist) Fady Asmar (SALMA Project Manager)

12. 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 during the project period. Local beneficiaries, from each site locality, benefitted from an additional livelihood source.

13. 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	USD 7 Million	USD 10.5 Million		USD 10.5 Million
IFAD/OFID	HASAD	Other	USD 12.3 Million	USD 7.656 Million		USD 7.656 Million
National Government	MOE	Other	USD 11 Million	0		0
BMU (Germany)	FAO – Lebanon FLRM	Grant	USD 450,000	USD 250,000		USD 450,000
TCP	FAO Lebanon	Grant	USD 240,000	USD 240,000		USD 240,000
Norway	FAO Lebanon (Forest Seeds Center)	Grant	USD 372,033	USD 372,033		USD 372,033
		TOTAL	USD 31,362,033	USD 19,018,033		USD 19,218,033

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?

NA

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 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 will 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

Annex 2.

GEO LOCATION INFORMATION

The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate. Web mapping applications such as [OpenStreetMap](#) or [GeoNames](#) use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: <https://coordinates-converter.com> Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking [here](#)

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	Geo Name ID	Location & Activity Description
Ed Dîmâne	34.24804	35.9496	280738	Forest fire prevention network
Karm Saddé	34.3004	35.9009	272723	Forest fire prevention network
Bentâael	34.1399	35.7005	276596	Forest fire prevention network
Jabal Harîssa	33.9837	35.6508	274346	Forest fire prevention network
Ras el Maten - Hima	33.8528	35.6344	275944	Forest fire prevention network
Hammâna	33.8102	35.7433	274652	Forest mangement
Lâla - Baaloul	33.5921	35.7641	272148	Forest mangement
Fâloûqha - Flag site	33.8263	35.7513	275348	Forest mangement
Chaat	34.1645	36.301	267553	Forest mangement
Karm Saddé	34.2967	35.8975	272723	Forest mangement
Ras el Maten - Hima	33.8471	35.6311	275944	Forest mangement
Aaramoûn	34.0173	35.7011	278681	Forest mangement and Landuse planning

Chahtoûl	34.0289	35.7335	267878	Forest mangement and Landuse planning
Hiyâta	34.0202	35.7166	274094	Forest mangement and Landuse planning
Ouadi el Hojeir	33.2656	35.4657	266307	Forest mangement and Landuse planning
El Qabaa	33.5436	35.5543	279131	Forest mangement and Landuse planning
Kaitouly	33.5369	35.5486	7851848	Forest mangement and Landuse planning
Maknounîyé	33.5266	35.5399	279581	Forest mangement and Landuse planning
Haïtoura	33.5199	35.5487	274161	Forest mangement and Landuse planning
Nabha - Barka (Rabiha)	34.1967	36.1442	270005	Forest mangement and Landuse planning
Bechouât	34.1478	36.1444	276355	Forest mangement and Landuse planning
El Aaqôûra - Ard Ouâdi ed Dabboûr	34.0795	35.9447	6276841	Forest mangement and Landuse planning
El Aaqôûra - Nabaa el Roueis	34.1098	35.9021	280481	Forest mangement and Landuse planning
El Aaqôûra - Mâr Edna	34.112	35.889	271384	Forest mangement and Landuse planning
Aakkar El-Aatiqa	34.5278	36.2398	280570	Forest mangement and Landuse planning
Aain Yaaqoub	34.522	36.2001	268209	Forest mangement and Landuse planning
Bezgina	34.5134	36.1905	276453	Forest mangement and Landuse planning
Menneaa	34.503	36.1751	270210	Forest mangement and Landuse planning
Tachaa	34.4973	36.1925	266783	Forest mangement and Landuse planning

Fnaydeq	34.4641	36.2145	273052	Forest mangement and Landuse planning
El Qornet Aakkar	34.4828	36.1652	6279563	Forest mangement and Landuse planning
el Qraiyât	34.4825	36.1524	268961	Forest mangement and Landuse planning
Michmich Aakkar	34.44	36.1755	270399	Forest mangement and Landuse planning
Beït Ayoûb	34.4724	36.1577	276738	Forest mangement and Landuse planning
Es Sâdaqa	34.466	36.1507	268509	Forest mangement and Landuse planning
Hrâr	34.4583	36.1252	273903	Forest mangement and Landuse planning
Bcharré	34.2475	36.0028	276359	Forest mangement and Landuse planning
Charbîne	34.3951	36.2530	278253	Reforestation
El Qâa	34.3097	36.4602	279268	Reforestation
Bqarsoûna	34.3743	36.0509	276408	Reforestation
Râs Baalbek	33.3152	35.3428	268745	Reforestation
Horch Ehden	34.3014	35.9862	273724	Reforestation
Aïnâta	34.1912	36.1099	277534	Reforestation
Maqné	34.0659	36.2065	271666	Reforestation
Baalbek	34.0137	36.2437	277130	Reforestation
Chmistâr	33.9666	36.0056	267305	Reforestation
Qsarnaba	33.5509	35.9200	269216	Reforestation
Falougha	33.8219	35.74857	275374	Reforestation
Hammâna	33.8109	35.7443	274652	Reforestation
Aanjar	33.7307	35.9439	278925	Reforestation
Bakka	33.80556	35.73694	277142	Reforestation
Nîha	33.5566	35.619	269798	Reforestation
Kfar Qoûq	33.5509	35.9200	6280257	Reforestation
Aabba	33.3555	35.3926	281064	Reforestation

Tair Falsay	34.2634	36.4026	266753	Reforestation
Et Taibé	33.2643	35.5255	277872	Reforestation
Rmaysh	33.0733	35.3707	268585	Reforestation
Bcharré el Arz	34.2292	36.0628	280454	Reforestation
Jâj	34.1479	35.8335	273550	Reforestation (2017-2020), Conservation Biodiversity Assessment
Mouchaa kesserwan	34.01806	35.880672	276991	Reforestation and Landuse planning

Please provide any further geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions is taking place as appropriate.