

## 1- Identification

### 1.1 Project details

GEF ID	9802	SMA IPMR ID	36853
Project Short Title	Salonga	Grant ID	S1-32GFL-000617
		Umoja WBS	GFL-11207-14AC0003-SB-009726
Project Title	Promoting the effective management of Salonga National Park by creating community forests and improving the well-being of local communities		
Project Type	Full Sized Project (FSP)	Duration months	Planned 60
Parent Programme if child project			Age 27.0 months
GEF Focal Area(s)	Biodiversity	Completion Date	Planned -original PCA 31 July 2026
Project Scope	National		Revised - Current PCA
Region	Africa	Date of CEO Endorsement/Approval	July 1, 2020
Countries	Democratic Republic of Congo	UNEP Project Approval Date (on Decision Sheet)	September 29, 2020
GEF financing amount	USD 5 694 749	Start of Implementation (PCA entering into force)	September 29, 2020
Co-financing amount	USD 22 860 710	Date of First Disbursement	February 18, 2021
		Date of Inception Workshop, if available	March 2, 2022
Total disbursement as of 30 June	USD 1,433,190	Midterm undertaken?	No
Total expenditure as of 30 June	USD 1 755 330	Actual Mid-term Date, if taken	
		Expected Mid-Term Date, if not taken	September 30, 2023
		Expected Terminal Evaluation Date	31 March 2026
		Expected Financial Closure Date	30 September 2026

1.2 EA: Project description

The Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) is home to the second largest contiguous block of tropical forest in the world, including the Salonga National Park, Africa's largest rainforest park (3,600,000 ha) and the third largest protected forest area in the world. La Salonga is distinguished by the integrity of its forest ecosystem, which is of considerable ecological importance. The Monkoto corridor, which separates the northern and southern sectors of the park, ensures connectivity and provides a migratory passage for large mammals. The decline of commercial agriculture in the corridor has led to a search for alternative income-generating activities. Today, commercial hunting and fishing have become virtually the only sources of cash income, and sources of conflict with the local administration and park management authority.

By attempting to address the mismatch observed to date between conservation objectives and local development priorities, as well as the opportunity offered by improved land tenure, this project will work with communities, local and national government, and conservation partners to achieve a paradigm shift in the approach to conservation in the Salonga landscape. The aim of the project is "to protect the biodiversity of Salonga National Park by reducing pressures on the park's wildlife, forests and habitats". The specific objective is that "community-based forest management and the promotion of sustainable development alternatives support and enhance biodiversity conservation and strengthen livelihoods in the Monkoto Corridor and Salonga National Park".

The project comprises two components, which are directly linked to the elimination of the obstacles described earlier in the document.

Component 1 focuses on developing the foundations for community-based natural resource management, its implementation and monitoring. This project aims to place communities over an area of 90,000 ha under formal and community management in the form of community forests. It will also support the implementation of land-use management plans for a further 90,000 ha.

Component 2, which involves developing sustainable production systems that meet subsistence needs, including food security and cash income, by providing alternatives to destructive hunting and fishing practices. The development of alternative livelihoods directly benefiting 1,500 households will pursue a variety of opportunities as defined in local development plans and reinforced in participatory rural appraisals.

The project will be executed by the Department of Sustainable Development (DDD) within the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD), which is the Project Executing Agency (EA). The EA has delegated project management and field implementation activities to the implementing partners, Rainforest Alliance (RA) and Action d'Aide Sanitaire et de Développement aux plus Démunis (AASD), who will manage the Project Management Unit. The project's implementing partner, Rainforest Alliance, will report to MEDD and have a sub-grant agreement with AASD.

1.3 Project Contact

Division(s) Implementing the project	Ecosystems Division, GEF Biodiversity and Land Degradation Unit, Biodiversity and Land Branch	Executing Agency(ies)	Ministry of Environment, Nature Conservation and Sustainable Development (MEDD), with support from Rainforest Alliance (RA) and Action d'Aide Sanitaire et de Développement aux plus Démunis (AASD)
Name of co-implementing Agency		Names of Other Project Partners	Congolese Institute for Nature Conservation (ICCN), World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF)
TM: UNEP Portfolio Manager(s)	Ersin Esen	EA: Manager/Representative	Nadege Nzoyem
TM: UNEP Task Manager(s)	Andre Toham	EA: Project Manager	Serge Alain Mbong Ekollo
TM: UNEP Budget/Finance Officer	Paul Vrontamitis	EA: Finance Manager	Ruth Kabanya
TM: UNEP Support/Assistant	Eric Mugo	EA: Communications lead, if relevant	

2- OVERVIEW OF PROJECT STATUS

2.1 UNEP PoW & UN

TM: UNEP Current Subprogramme(s)

TM: PoW Indicator(s)

Nature action subprogramme

i, iii, iv

TM: UNEP previous Subprogramme(s)

EA: UNSDCF/UNDAF linkages

EA: Link to relevant SDG Goals

Axis 2: inclusive economic growth, agricultural development, capture of the demographic dividend, protection and sustainable management of natural resources. The project will support de development of sustainable income-generating activities in (agriculture, fish farming, livestock, NTFPs,.) as alternatives to commercial hunting, poaching, illegal fishing.

1, 2,12, 15

EA: Link to relevant SDG Targets

1.4, 2.3, 2.4, 12.2, 15.1, 15.2, 15.7

2.2. GEF Core or Sub Indicators

TM: GEF core or sub indicators targeted by the project as defined at CEO Endorsement/Approval, as well as results

Indicators	Targets - Expected value			Materialised to date
	Mid-term	End-of-project	Total Target	
✓ landscapes under improved management to benefit	105,000 ha	180,000 ha	180,000 ha	0 ha
✓ dscales under sustainable land management in pro	250 ha	1,000 ha	1,000 ha	0.26 ha
✓ 1: People benefitting from GEF-financed investment	1500	3600	3600	675
✓				
✓				
✓				

Implementation Status

2023

3rd PIR

status & Risk

	PIR #	Rating towards outcomes (DO) (section 3.1)	Rating towards outputs (IP) (section 3.2)	Risk rating (section 4.2)
FY 2023	3rd PIR	MS	MS	M
FY 2022	2nd PIR	MS	S	M
FY 2021	1st PIR	MS	MS	M
FY 2020				
FY 2019				
FY 2018				
FY 2017				
FY 2016				
FY 2015				

## 2.3 Implementation :

**EA:** Summary of status  
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

**Rating towards outcomes:** Marginally satisfactory (MS). The main activities carried out from July 2022 to June 2023, including the various sensitizations, enabled us to establish a basis for direct community supervision. We were able to train the leaders among our beneficiaries in the main activities of each project component. One of the two major input production and training centers has been built. Farmers have been trained in sustainable agricultural practices. Wooden bridges have been built to facilitate the movement of staff, people and goods, and major road maintenance equipment has been acquired.

**Rating towards outputs:** Marginally satisfactory (MS) as there has been significant progress on project outcomes. However, there are still constraints in community forestry due to the negative impact of post-election political actions. To this end, awareness-raising and training sessions have been organized to demonstrate the project's merits and facilitate the commitment of communities and various administrative and political leaders. As a result of these efforts, communities have sent us requests for support. Another constraint that delayed the achievement of certain results was logistical. It was long and difficult to get the broodstock (pigs and fish) to the execution sites. This required additional resources. Overall, risks 3 and 11 remained present and had a negative impact on the smooth running of the project, especially as we are in an election year. To mitigate these risks, we have increased the number of explanatory meetings and awareness campaigns, which has required more resources. These two risks may continue to have a negative impact in the project in this current election year (2023). The rhetoric surrounding the sale of forests and the extension of park boundaries is likely to animate election campaigns. What's more, from November to December 2023, local stakeholders' attention may be focused on the election campaign, rather than on development activities as in the past.

## 2.4 Co-finance

**EA:** Planned Co-finance

USD 22 860 710

**EA:** Actual to date:

UDS 16 302 111

**EA:** Justify progress in terms of materialization of expected co-finance. State any relevant challenges.

Delayed start of the project and in implementation created a knock-on effect on other initiatives that were planned. This delayed our efforts of harmonization and creating complementarity with the initiatives of other landscape partners. We are currently receiving co-financing statements from the project's implementing partners (Rainforest Alliance and AASD).

## 2.5. Stakeholder

**EA:** Date of project steering committee meeting

Pending the ministerial decree setting up the steering committee, no date has been set.

**EA:** Stakeholder engagement  
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

This project has established effective coordination with the Salonga program to ensure collaboration and synergies. This was achieved by integrating the project into the overall Salonga National Park program. By aligning the proposed project's activities with the Salonga Management Plan and the Salonga Community Conservation Strategy, which is in its final stages of validation, strong coordination with the park's management unit has been created, with the project already fully integrated into the park's various operational plans from 2021.

In its policy, RA uses an inclusive approach centered on local communities. In the case of the GEF-Salonga project, this inclusivity is reinforced by quarterly meetings bringing together the various strata of the population to assess the state of implementation of the current planning. Following the baseline studies and awareness-raising sessions, the project has received letters from the communities requesting support as an evidence for their engagement and commitment to the project's activities. 8% of beneficiaries (193/2425) are indigenous populations (Batwa) of the Monkoto corridor. Over the next six months, this percentage is expected to increase with activities planned in the Wafanya area (Bianga sector), where several Batwa villages are located.

TM: Does the project have a gender action plan?



Yes

EA: Gender mainstreaming  
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

Paragraph 5.6 of the project document sets out the objectives for involving women in project implementation. These targets are broken down by component and for each of the project's outputs. Overall, the target is for 50% of project beneficiaries to be women. Since the beginning of the project, 371 women (15%) have been involved in project activities. This includes all the stakeholders who were involved and who participated effectively in the implementation of the project activities, like awareness raising in community forestry, building of wooden bridges, building of school farm with its components (piggery, fishponds, hatchery, poultry). This figure can be explained by the fact that, for cultural reasons, women do not take part in meetings with men. With the planning of women-only meetings and training sessions over the coming months, we anticipate that the number of women involved in project activities will improve considerably to reach the 50% target.

It should be pointed out that the expert in charge of monitoring and evaluation has been tasked with gender issues at AASD, facilitating gender awareness-raising among local players such as traditional chiefs, local development committees and civil society on the importance of involving women in development activities.

**TM:** Was the project classified as moderate/high risk at CEO Endorsement/Approval Stage?



Yes

Risk Level: High: Component 1 - Weak capacity amongst decentralized authorities and lack of community forest management tools hinders technical support, approval processes, and oversight of production forestry.

Risk level: High: Component 1 – Conflicts with Park authorities around access to the Park's natural resources  
Risk level: Moderate: Component 1 - Communities' fear that community forestry is another mechanism to create conservation areas.

Risk level: Moderate: Component 1 – Discrimination of minorities: indigenous people and women in particular  
Risk level: Moderate: Component 1 - Award of concessions for oil exploration on February 1, 2018 by Presidential Decree, of which three blocks overlap with part of the Park.

Risk level: Moderate: Component 2 – Availability of funds to rehabilitate and perform maintenance on transport routes that facilitate trade and connect the Corridor to major markets.

Risk level: Moderate: Component 2 – Reducing the Park's isolation through road rehabilitation exposes the Park and its surroundings to more deforestation and resource extraction.

Risk Level: High: Project Management - The difficult access to the Monkoto Corridor and mobility within it makes the monitoring of project activities and the transport of equipment expensive and time-consuming.

Risk level: Moderate: Project Management – Direct implication of stakeholders that do not have a formal role in project implementation or oversight in project management and decision making.

Risk Level: Moderate: External Factors - Political instability and unsafe conditions hampering the work of project personnel, project partners and travel for monitoring of

**TM:** If yes, what specific safeguard risks were identified in the SRIF/ESERN?

**TM & EA:** Has the project received complaints related to social and/or environmental impacts (actual or potential ) during the reporting period?



No

**TM & EA:** If yes, please describe the complaint(s) or grievance(s) in detail including the status, significance, who was involved and what actions were taken.

**TM:** Have any new social and/or environmental risks been identified during the reporting period?



No

**TM:** If yes, please describe the new risks, or changes

**EA:** Environmental and social safeguards management  
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

Our actions with regard to environmental and social safeguards are focused on the following actions::

**Environmental safeguards:** trainings in sustainable agricultural practices including integrated pest management to reduce the use of pesticides and sustainable soil fertility management. We also encourage the establishment of integrated farms whose components are interconnected. These actions also aim to reduce deforestation and forest degradation. **Social safeguards:** awareness-raising sessions were organized to ensure communities Free Prior and Informed Consent on project's activities. For certain activities, such as community forestry, the FPIC process was completed by the communities' letters of request for support. Following these letters, we were able to implement the activities in the communities. It's worth mentioning that the activities implemented are the result of the communities' aspirations through multiple baseline studies and validation meetings. - **Grievance Mechanism: There is a grievance mechanism set up for the management of the Salonga National Parc for all interventions in and around the parc. complementary to this, quarterly meetings with the projects stakeholders, including representative from the communities, participate to discuss issues raised concerning the project. It is planned that the steering committees will also serve to deal with complaints that have not find solutions during stakeholders' quarterly meetings. Representatives of IPLCs and local authorities are part of the project's steering committee.**

**EA:** Knowledge activities and products  
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

Several communication tools for the project have been produced. These include roll-ups, booklets, flyers, folders, banners, labels on equipment and T-shirts. Radio, TV, print and online media reports of all the project's events were broadcast and played in a loop in 5 media outlets. The project document and other communication tools were translated into French and Lingala for better appropriation by project partners in the DRC.

*Please attach a copy of any products*

**EA:** Main learning during the period

Community commitment despite political misinformation

Two actions have enabled communities to get involved: raising awareness has enabled communities to be informed and understand the project's actions. Following awareness-raising, several communities became involved in implementing the project's activities. The development actions implemented helped to convince some of the more skeptical individuals and communities.

**EA:** Stories to be shared  
(section to be shared with communication division/  
GEF communication)

Stories of change based on the impact that the project has had on beneficiaries and target groups will be shared following the next reporting period.

### Objective

Project objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	EA: Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	TM: Progress rating
Community-based management of forests and the promotion of sustainable development alternatives support and enhance biodiversity conservation, and strengthen livelihoods in the Monkoto Corridor and Salonga National Park	O1. Increased frequency of key biodiversity indicator species indicating reduced poaching and illegal commercial hunting	Bonobo (Min. 11,211 ; Med. 14,988 ; Max. 20,166) Elephant (Min. 889 ; Med. 1,562 ; Max. 2,473) (Final Report: Biodiversity Inventory in Salonga National Park, 2019)	Significant improvement over baseline	Significant improvement over baseline	N/A	Baselines data, the next biological inventories have not yet been planned by the Management Unit of the Salonga National Park.	MS
	O2. Reduced rates of deforestation within the Park in immediate proximity to project-supported communities thereby contributing to the protection of habitats and the Park's territorial integrity	In 2019, WWF estimated the annual rate of deforestation in the Park area at 0.0117	Mid-term Maintain the rate of deforestation same as baseline	Stability of the midterm rate	N/A	The results are available annually. We expect the information to be available in the second half of 2023.	MS
	O3. Reduced rates of deforestation in project-supported communities in the Monkoto Corridor thereby contributing to the protection of habitats	In 2019, WWF estimated the annual deforestation rate in the Monkoto Corridor to be 0.2951%	Mid-term: Maintain the rate of deforestation same as baseline	Stability of the mid-term rate	N/A	The results are available annually. We expect the information to be available in the second half of 2023.	MS
	O4. Drop in the share of bushmeat consumption in diets as compared to domestic meat, thereby reducing the health risks associated with bushmeat consumption, and contributing to food security and wildlife conservation	According to the report of socio-economic and well-being surveys of the local populations (2022), households (Monkoto and Wafanya) consume bushmeat an average of 4 days/week	5% of baseline	10% of baseline	N/A	The first well-being survey has been conducted. The next ones, which will be carried out at the mid-term and at the end of the project, will inform us about the evolution of this indicator.	MS
	O5. Percent increase in the proportion of heads of households who perceive an improvement in the quality of life and revenue in the past 12 months thereby reducing the rate of commercial hunting and fishing	According to the report of socio-economic and well-being surveys of the local populations (2022), the average household income is 28,028 Congolese francs (\$13.73) per month or 934 Congolese francs (\$0.46) per day	30% of baseline for male, female- and indigenous people-headed households	50% of the baseline for male-, female- and indigenous people-headed households	N/A	The first well-being survey has been conducted. The next ones, which will be carried out at the mid-term and at the end of the project, will inform us about the evolution of this indicator.	MS



	O6. Percent increase in the proportion of heads of households who experience increased revenues as suggested by changes of key assets and use of education and health services thereby reducing the rate of commercial hunting and fishing	According to the report of socio-economic and well-being surveys of the local populations (2022), 89% of school-age children (45% of girls and 44% of boys) are enrolled in school; 51.04% of households report having access to health care; 90% of households have access to easy access to water in general, of which 46% get it from a developed source	15% of the reference value for households headed by men, women or indigenous people	20% of the reference value for households headed by men, women or indigenous people	N/A	The first well-being survey has been conducted. The next ones, which will be carried out at the mid-term and at the end of the project, will inform us about the evolution of this indicator.	MS
	O7. Drop in the share of households adopting severe survival strategies thereby reducing the rate of commercial hunting and fishing	According to the report of socio-economic and well-being surveys of the local populations (2022), we note the average score of survival strategies 48.70	10% of baseline value for male and female headed households, and indigenous households	20% of baseline value for male and female headed households, and indigenous households	N/A	The first well-being survey has been conducted. The next ones, which will be carried out at the mid-term and at the end of the project, will inform us about the evolution of this indicator.	MS

#### Outcome 1

Community-based natural resource management is implemented in the Monkoto Corridor on a total area of 180,000 ha, including 90,000 ha of community forests and 90,000 ha of land under WWF-supported management plans	1.1 Total area under improved land management	At baseline, 15,000 ha of community forests registered and 90,000 ha of land under management plans. However, baseline is 0 as none of those plans are implemented	105,000 ha	90,000 ha of community forests + 90,000 ha of land under management plans	N/A	Data will be collected and completed as activities are carried out (ongoing activities).	MS
	1.2 Percent reduction in unsustainable hunting/fishing amongst local communities and indigenous people	0%	Significant reduction over baseline	Significant reduction over baseline	N/A	This activity depends on the setting up of monitoring and evaluation committees, which will be in place in the second half of 2023.	MS
	1.3 Improved community participation in Park management activities, based on the Integrated Management Effectiveness Tool (IMET), thereby creating awareness and motivation to respect Park limits and protect biodiversity	IMET 2020's rating for the Stakeholder/Conservation community ratio 53.4%	Increased stakeholder/conservation ratio to 55%.	Increased stakeholder/conservation community ratio to 58%.		The corresponding result of the mid-term evaluation is not yet available.	MS

#### Outcome 2

Sustainable livelihood alternatives implemented by project-supported local communities and indigenous people	2.1 Area under sustainable land management with at least 50% of project-endorsed, sustainable, productivity-enhancing production practices in agricultural production systems and with a significant participation of indigenous people, and a particular focus on indigenous and non-indigenous women	2,500 ha planned in the Monkoto Corridor under the PARCCS programme. Baseline value TBC at project start based on baseline data from survey	Baseline + 250 ha, of which 10% of crops cultivated by indigenous men, 10% by indigenous women, and 40% by non-indigenous women	Baseline + 1,000 ha, of which 10% of crops cultivated by indigenous men, 10% by indigenous women, and 40% by non-indigenous women	N/A	Data will be collected and completed as activities progress. Farmers have been trained. Application support is ongoing.	MS
--	--	---	---	---	-----	---	----

supported local communities and indigenous people improve income of 1,500 households and reduce pressure on wildlife and forests in the Monkoto Corridor and in Salonga National Park	2.2 Percent of 1,500 project-supported producers who have implemented project-endorsed, sustainable, income-generating alternatives with a significant participation of indigenous people, and a particular focus on indigenous and non-indigenous women	0%	At least 25%, of which 10% are indigenous men, 10% are indigenous women, and 40% are non-indigenous women	At least 50% of producers implementing alternatives, of which 10% are indigenous men, 10% are indigenous women, and 40% are non-indigenous women	N/A	Data will be collected and completed as activities progress. Farmers have been trained. Application support is ongoing.	MS

Output	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2022 (%) (Towards overall project targets)	Implementation status as of 30 June 2023 (%) (Towards overall project targets)	EA: Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	TM: Progress rating
<b>Under Comp 1</b>					
Output 1.1: Forest-dependent communities on an area of 75,000 ha with at least 30% of women participating in decision-making community assemblies in the Monkoto Corridor submit legal requests for attribution of a forest concession to the local forest administration	30/06/2023	33%	45%	Ongoing process	MU
Output 1.2: Forest concessions of local communities on an area of 90,000 ha in the Monkoto Corridor establish governance bodies with at least 30% women and are involved in decisions related to Park management	30/06/2023	0%	25%	Ongoing process	U
Output 1.3: Forest concessions of local communities on an area of 90,000 ha in the Monkoto Corridor draft Simple Management Plans in collaboration with the local administration with a participation rate of at least 30% women	30/06/2023	0%	0%	Depends on previous outputs	MS
Output 1.4.a Governance bodies in forest concessions of local communities on an area of 90,000 ha (i) monitor the use of natural resources in collaboration with the local administration and (ii) manage and operate forest concessions	30/06/2023	0%	0%	Depends on previous outputs	MS
Output 1.4.b Local Development and Conservation Committees in communities on an area of 90,000 ha implement WWF-supported natural resource management plans	30/06/2023	0%	5%	Finalization of ToRs for the recruitment of consultants to update natural resource management plans for development activities.	MU
Output 1.5 Community leaders and educators, composed of at least 30% women, in forest-dependent communities on 180,000 ha deliver gender-sensitive awareness building modules on the importance of wildlife and fish protection, habitat and forest conservation, and the risks of poaching and bushmeat consumption	30/06/2023	0%	4%	ToR is being drawn up for the recruitment of a consultant to carry out the activity	U
Output 1.6 A community intelligence network with participating communities on 180,000 ha report on poaching activity in the Monkoto Corridor	30/06/2026	0%	4%	A meeting has been held and another is being planned with the Director of the SNP to carry out this activity. Work will continue with the Park's legal officer. Some points of this coordination of interventions have already been addressed in August 2021 and June 2022 during exchange meetings with the Park Director and the Park's management units.	
<b>3.2 Rati</b>					
Output 1.7 A monitoring network, with at least 30% women, monitor elephant movements and at least two elephant baths in the Monkoto Corridor	30/06/2026	0%	0%	Activities to be implemented following community forestry. As several young people have already been involved in previous projects run by partners WWF and WCS, the project will capitalize on and strengthen their skills in bio-monitoring.	MS
Output 1.8 Knowledge management system in place, and key project learning and communication products on operationalizing community-based management of protected areas are synthesized and disseminated within and beyond the GEF partnership	31/12/2026	0%	22%	A round table was organized at provincial level on the importance of community forestry and the merits of sustainable natural resource management; Tools on community forestry regulations and laws have been developed and translated into Lingala. Some of the tools have been distributed to communities, and others are currently being printed. The completion of this activity has greatly contributed to community involvement in the	MU

<b>Under Comp 2</b>					
Output 2.1 Project partner AASD and 10 local NGOs/CBOs in the Monkoto Corridor, of which at least 50% women's associations, improve their ability to support communities in natural resource management and in developing alternative income-generating activities	28/02/2026	50%	63%	Partner AASD's capacities have been strengthened in previously identified areas (project management and monitoring, administrative and financial management, logistics, IT) as well as the acquisition and use of administrative and financial management software; 35 organizations have benefited from organizational capacity-building. Technical capacity-building within the framework of the activities is carried out as and when the activities are set up (agriculture); Diagnosis of agricultural practices carried out. Report validated by Monkoto farmers; 50 leaders,	MS
Output 2.2 20 producer groups of varying degrees of formality with at least 50% of members that are women efficiently deliver services to their members and aggregate products for sale	31/12/2025	16%	20%	Awareness of the benefits of structuring was raised. Farmers have expressed a desire to group together according to promising sectors. Preparatory work for the construction of two community warehouses is underway at the two sites identified (Wafanya and Yongo): site visits, brick-making, purchase of building materials (cement, sand, sheet metal, iron bars, etc.); The process of identifying the axes to be reinforced with equipment for the improved processing and	MS
Output 2.3 1,000 farmers in project-supported communities, of which at least 50% are women, implement sustainable and productivity-enhancing agricultural practices	31/12/2025	0%	23%	15 farmer field schools have been identified (4 for IPs, 3 mixed for IPs and Bantus, and 8 for Bantus), with 25 learners per field school, a total of 375. A breeding center is being finalized (piggery, fish hatchery, fish ponds, poultry farm) and agricultural equipment and inputs are being acquired (300 machetes, 300 hoes, 200 peaches, 200 spades, 100 rakes, 20kgs of sorrel, 13.5kgs	MS
Output 2.4 300 producers in forest communities, of which at last 50% are women, sustainably harvest and process honey and edible caterpillars	30/06/2025	0%	0%		
Output 2.5 20 micro-enterprises, of which 10 women's enterprises, set up as alternatives to commercial hunting and fishing run profitable enterprises with robust business management systems	30/12/2025	0%	5%	An NGO has been selected to support communities in the process of setting up micro-enterprises. The contracting process is underway.	MS
Output 2.6 Project-supported forest-dependent communities are organized and trained to conduct maintenance on 180km of secondary agricultural roads connected to rural roads of provincial interest or waterways	31/07/2026	0%	50%	A meeting was held in Boendé with provincial authorities on road rehabilitation and forest management. Road maintenance axes were identified with the local authorities and other key players in Monkoto; awareness-raising was carried out with the communities concerned. Formalization is underway; Identification of members in the intervention zone and selection of members of local road maintenance committees is underway. The training consultant has been	S
<b>Under Comp 3</b>					
Output 3.1.1 A multi-stakeholder Project Steering Committee (PSC) established and provides general oversight of the execution of the project and ensure that results are being achieved	30/09/2021	16%	16%	The holding of the sessions of the steering committee awaits the signature of the decree establishing it.	U
Output 3.1.2 A monitoring evaluation reporting and learning system designed and implemented	31/01/2022	100%	50%	The project monitoring tools are ready and in use, and the evaluation and reporting of their use will be made as the project progresses.	S
Output 3.1.3 Stakeholders informed on project's achievements and learnings	31/05/2021	50%	43%	The basis for informing stakeholders is set. Workshops will be organized regularly during the project.	S
Output 3.1.4 On-time reporting of the project's progress	31/03/2026	20%	40%	Progress reports are sent according to deadlines.	S

## 4 Risk Rating

### 4.1 Table A. Project management Risk

Please refer to the Risk Help Sheet for more details on rating

Risk Factor	EA's Rating	TM's Rating
1 Management structure - Roles and responsibilities	Moderate: Well developed, stable Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	
2 Governance structure - Oversight	Substantial: Steering Committee and/or other project bodies do not convene regularly or Limited membership and participation in decision-making processes or SC	
3 Implementation schedule	Moderate: Project progressing according to work plan and Adaptive management and regular monitoring. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	
4 Budget	Low : Activities are progressing within planned budget and Balanced budget utilisation including PMC. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	
5 Financial Management	Low : Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for and Audit reports provided regularly and confirm correct use of funds. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	
6 Reporting	Moderate: Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and Reports are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	
7 Capacity to deliver	Substantial: Weaknesses persist and have been identified or Capacity gaps require longer time to address and are continuously being addressed. Significant likelihood of	

If any of the risk factors is rated a Moderate or higher, please include it in Table B below

### 4.2 Table B. Risk-log

Implementation Status (Current PIR)

3rd PIR

Insert ALL the risks identified either at CEO endorsement (inc. safeguards screening), previous/current PIRs, and MTRs. Use the last line to propose a suggested consolidated rating.

Risk	Risk affecting:		Risk Rating						Variation respect to last rating	
	Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	PIR 6	Δ	Justification
Risk 1: weak capacity amongst decentralized authorities and lack of community forest management tools hinders technical support, approval processes, and oversight of production forestry.	Outcomes 1/ Output 1.1- Output 1.8	H	H	H	M				↓	Several capacity-building initiatives for provincial and local authorities have been organized. Several are still ongoing.
Risk 2 Conflicts with Park authorities around access to the Park's natural resources.	Outcomes 1/ Output 1.1- Output 1.8	H	H	H	S				↓	The activities implemented by the project are beginning to occupy more and more people.
Risk 3 Communities' fear that community forestry is another mechanism to create conservation areas.	Outcomes 1/ Output 1.1- Output 1.8	M	M	M	S				↑	There is real community commitment, as evidenced by the letters from communities requesting support. But fear of reprisals persists.
Risk 4 Discrimination of minorities: indigenous people and women in particular	Outcomes 1/ Output 1.1- Output 1.8	M	M	M	M				=	
Risk 5 Award of concessions for oil exploration on February 1, 2018 by Presidential Decree, of which three blocks overlap with part of the Park	Outcomes 1/ Output 1.1- Output 1.8	M	M	M	M				=	
Risk 6 Reputational risk linked to supporting cases of human rights violations	Outcomes 1/ Output 1.1- Output 1.8	L	L	L	L				=	
Risk 7 Availability of funds to rehabilitate and perform maintenance on transport routes that facilitate trade and connect the Corridor to major markets.	Outcomes 2/ Output 2.1- Output 2.6	M	M	M	M				=	
Risk 8 Reducing the Park's isolation through road rehabilitation exposes the Park and its surroundings to more deforestation and resource extraction.	Outcomes 2/ Output 2.6	M	M	M	M				=	

Risk 9 The difficult access to the Monkoto Corridor and mobility within it makes the monitoring of project activities and the transport of equipment expensive and time-consuming

Risk 10 Direct implication of stakeholders that do not have a formal role in project implementation or oversight in project management and decision making

Risk 11 Political instability, the electoral cycle and unsafe conditions hampering the work of project personnel, project partners and travel for monitoring of activities

Risk 12 Impact of climate change on communities and biodiversity

Risk 13 Impact of the COVID 19 and ebola pandemic on the implementation of the project: in the field and in its management

Management structure - Roles and responsibilities: Well developed, stable Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.

Governance structure – Oversight: Steering Committee and/or other project bodies do not convene regularly or Limited membership and participation in decision-making processes or SC guidance/input provided to project is inadequate. Significant likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.

Implementation schedule: Project progressing according to work plan and Adaptive management and regular monitoring. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.

Reporting: Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and Reports are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.

Capacity to deliver: Weaknesses persist and have been identified Or Capacity gaps require longer time to address and are continuously being addressed. Significant likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery

Outcomes 2/ Output 2.1- Output 2.6	H	M	H	M				↓	The construction of a 13 wooden bridges facilitated the movement of people and goods. It will be important to build concrete bridges that will last longer with a more sustainable impact.
All outcomes/All outputs	M	M	M	M				=	
All outcomes/All outputs	M	M	H	H				=	
Outcomes 2/ Output 2.1- Output 2.6	L	L	L	L				=	
All outcomes/All outputs	Not Applicable	M	M	L				↓	The lifting of restrictive measures by the government has facilitated certain activities.
All outcomes/All outputs	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	M					
All outcomes/All outputs	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	S					
All outcomes/All outputs	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	M					
All outcomes/All outputs	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	M					
All outcomes/All outputs	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	S					

**Consolidated project risk**

	Not Applicable	M	M	M					This section focuses on the variation. The overall rating is discussed in section 2.3.
--	----------------	---	---	---	--	--	--	--	--

#### 4.3 Table C. Outstanding Moderate, Significant, and High risks

List here only risks from Table A and B above that have a risk rating of **M or higher** in the **current PIR**

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	Additional mitigation measures for the next periods		
			What	When	By whom
Risk 1: Weak capacity amongst decentralized authorities and lack of community forest management tools hinders technical support, approval processes, and oversight of production forestry.	The project will engage in dialogue to identify key gaps and strengthen decentralized authorities in their supervisory role over community-managed forests. This includes the participation in key events including the setting up of governance structures, the inventory of forest resources and drafting of management plans. The local authorities will be expected to attend quarterly and annual evaluations of the work of the management committees. Centrally, the project will work to adapt and apply tools and approaches from more advanced contexts where community forestry has already taken hold, while actively participating in national foras to help guide the crafting of new community forestry guidelines and implementation tools.	Training and sensitization of the authorities, provision to them of the community forestry tools developed, their involvement in the implementation of activities	Involvement of decentralized authorities in the project implementation	July 1, 2023 to June 30, 2024	RA AASD
Risk 2 Conflicts with Park authorities around access to the Park's natural resources.	Faced with the specificities of each province, and to facilitate and make efficient the participation of communities in the management of the park, the Management Unit of the park with the support of its steering committee, will organize in each province, meetings of the coordinating committee of the site (COCOSI), unlike the meetings included everyone. The Project will provide support to facilitate the participation of the communities of the corridor.	The project has facilitated the participation of community representatives in COCOSI and is undertaking income-generating activities that will keep people busy.	Coordinating committee of the site (COCOSI)	May 25 to 26, 2023	Management Unit of the Salonga National Park (SNP)
Risk 3 Communities' fear that community forestry is another mechanism to create conservation areas.	Following the recommendations of all participants at the launch of the project, an environmental education and awareness sub-program for community forestry issues is being prepared. This action will integrate the daughters and sons of Monkoto from the territory and those settled in cities such as Kinshasa.	An awareness-raising program on the community forestry process has been set up. This program included the development of tools translated into Lingala, training for local authorities and community relays, and the organization of awareness-raising sessions in the communities.	Community Forestry Awareness Program	Last quarter 2022 and first quarter 2023	RA AASD
Risk 4 Discrimination of minorities: indigenous people and women in particular	Indigenous people and women were consulted separately during the PPG phase and their needs and engagement approaches were discussed. The regulatory framework, which foresees the participation of all social classes in community governance structures, will be enforced and accompanied with awareness building. Consultations will continue during participatory rural appraisals to ensure that individual and collective needs and development priorities are known and met. Livelihood activities will be designed such that they specifically target vulnerable groups as per the disaggregated targets set in the results framework.	Sensitization of local actors on the consideration of women and indigenous peoples in, their involvement in all meetings and activities organized	Continuous involvement of indigenous people and women	July 1, 2023 until the end of the project	RA AASD

Risk 5 Award of concessions for oil exploration on February 1, 2018 by Presidential Decree, of which three blocks overlap with part of the Park	The Government has given assurances by signing agreements and providing needed clarification that the oil concessions overlapping with the Salonga National Park are null and void and that these blocks will be excluded from future auctioning of oil blocks.	None	None	None	None
Risk 7 Availability of funds to rehabilitate and perform maintenance on transport routes that facilitate trade and connect the Corridor to major markets.	None	Discussion with other partners such as EU, provincial government and park officials for concerted actions.	Continue meetings for consultation and harmonization of actions with landscape partners	July 1, 2023 to June 30, 2024	RA AASD
Risk 8 Reducing the Park's isolation through road rehabilitation exposes the Park and its surroundings to more deforestation and resource extraction.	None	None	Support the provincial authorities in the development and implementation of decrees regulating the management of natural resources (fishing, hunting, etc.)	July 1, 2023 to June 30, 2024	RA
Risk 9 The difficult access to the Monkoto Corridor and mobility within it makes the monitoring of project activities and the transport of equipment expensive and time-consuming	None	The project has set up its living base in Monkoto with recruited staff. Consultation meetings with the other partners (WWF) took place for the sharing of logistics-related costs. The implementation of the recommendations is effective	Continue to implement recommendations to reduce logistics costs	July 1, 2023 until the end of the project	RA AASD
Risk 10 Direct implication of stakeholders that do not have a formal role in project implementation or oversight in project management and decision making	None	Discussions on the participation of other actors like ISCO have been undertaken in the cocoa, coffee and palm oil value chain	Finalize discussions on the participation of other actors such as ISCO and involve them in the cocoa, coffee and palm oil value chain	July 1, 2023 to June 30, 2024	RA AASD
Risk 11 Political instability, the electoral cycle and unsafe conditions hampering the work of project personnel, project partners and travel for monitoring of activities	None	We organized specific meetings to explain the project and build the capacity of local and provincial administrative and political authorities.	Capacity building for authorities; Provincial round table	First half of 2023	RA AASD
Management structure - Roles and responsibilities: Well developed, stable Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	None	Close supervision of all staff and partners	Continue close supervision to all staff and partners	July 1, 2023 until the end of the project	RA



Governance structure – Oversight: Steering Committee and/or other project bodies do not convene regularly or Limited membership and participation in decision-making processes or SC guidance/input provided to project is inadequate. Significant likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery.	None	We have reintroduced the draft ministerial decree setting up the steering committee within the legal services of the Ministry	Follow up on the processing of the draft ministerial decree and its signature within the ministry	July 1, 2023 to June 30, 2024	RA, MEDD
Implementation schedule: Project progressing according to work plan and Adaptive management and regular monitoring. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	None	Close supervision of all staff and partners	Continue close supervision to all staff and partners	July 1, 2023 until the end of the project	RA, MEDD
Reporting: Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and Reports are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact	None	Close supervision of all staff and partners	Continue close supervision to all staff and partners	July 1, 2023 until the end of the project	RA, MEDD
Capacity to deliver: Weaknesses persist and have been identified Or Capacity gaps require longer time to address and are continuously being addressed. Significant likelihood of negative impact on the project delivery	None	Close supervision of all staff and partners	Continue close supervision to all staff and partners	July 1, 2023 until the end of the project	RA, MEDD

**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.

**Significant Risk (S):** There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that **assumptions** may fail to hold 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 modest risks.

**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 modest risks.

## Project Minor 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 Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines. Please tick each category for which a change occurred in the fiscal year of reporting and provide a description of the change that occurred in the textbox. You may attach supporting document as appropriate.

### 5.1 Table A: Listing of all Minor Amendment (TM)

Minor amendments	Changes
Results framework	Yes
Components and cost	No
Institutional and implementation arrangements	No
Financial management	No
Implementation schedule	Explain in table B
Executing Entity	No
Executing Entity Category	No
Minor project objective change	No
Safeguards	No
Risk analysis	Yes
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%	No
Co-financing	Yes
Location of project activity	No
Other	

Minor amendments
During the launch of the project, the participants, in addition to the results of the well-being survey that was carried out, provided elements for updating the logical framework (results framework included) and the risk analysis (cf. launch report; Baseline study report). Concerning co-financing, some projects, such as the project "Actions SAINES" implemented by FAO in the Est of the landscape, were completed (03/02/2021) before the beginning of this Salonga project.

### 5.2 Table B: History of project revisions and/or extensions (TM)

Version	Type	Signed/Approved by UNEP
Original Legal Instrument		
Amendment 1	Revision	
Extension 1	Extension	

Entry Into Force (last signature Date)	Agreement Expiry Date	Main changes introduced in this revision

## 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 \(https://www.openstreetmap.org/#map=4/21.84/82.79\)](https://www.openstreetmap.org/#map=4/21.84/82.79) or [GeoNames\(http://www.geonames.org/\)](http://www.geonames.org/) 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\(https://gefportal.worldbank.org/App/assets/general/Geocoding%20User%20Guide.docx\)](https://gefportal.worldbank.org/App/assets/general/Geocoding%20User%20Guide.docx)

Location Name Required field		Latitude Required field	Longitude Required field	Geo Name ID Required field if the location is not an exact site	Location Description Optional text field	Activity Description Optional text field
Ntomba		-1.61826	20.21748		Province Tshuapa; Territory Monkoto; Sector Bianga; Ethnic group: Batwa and Mongo; Area in ha : 94,934.0932 ; Area in km: 949.34	Awareness, Baseline studies
Ntomba		-1.543608	20.183099		Province Tshuapa; Territory Monkoto; Sector Bianga; Ethnic group: Batwa and Mongo; Area in ha : 94,934.0932 ; Area in km: 949.34	Bombimbi traditional meeting shed
Wafanya		-1.51454	20.39151		Province Tshuapa; Territory Monkoto; Sector Bianga; Ethnic group: Mongo; Area in ha : 15,751.98 ; Area in km: 157.5	Awareness, Baseline studies
Wafanya		-1.524076	20.352363		Province Tshuapa; Territory Monkoto; Sector Bianga; Ethnic group: Mongo; Area in ha : 15,751.98 ; Area in km: 157.5	Wele traditional meeting shed
Bolenge (included Monkoto city)		-1.59509	20.59736		Province Tshuapa; Territory Monkoto; Sector Monkoto; Ethnic group: Mongo; Area in ha : 63,403.2618 ; Area in km: 634.0	Awareness, Baseline studies, Training center/farm school, trainings on sustainable agriculture

Bolenge (included Monkoto city)		-1.589605	20.56893		Province Tshuapa; Territory Monkoto; Sector Monkoto; Ethnic group: Mongo; Area in ha : 63,403.2618 ; Area in km: 634.0	Bokele traditional meeting shed
Bolenge (included Monkoto city)		-1.567104	20.860566		Province Tshuapa; Territory Monkoto; Sector Monkoto; Ethnic group: Mongo; Area in ha : 63,403.2618 ; Area in km: 634.0	Bolengo traditional meeting shed
Bolenge (included Monkoto city)		-1.766211	20.724436		Province Tshuapa; Territory Monkoto; Sector Monkoto; Ethnic group: Mongo; Area in ha : 63,403.2618 ; Area in km: 634.0	Betamba 2 wooden bridge
Bolenge (included Monkoto city)		-1.559967	20.552174		Province Tshuapa; Territory Monkoto; Sector Monkoto; Ethnic group: Mongo; Area in ha : 63,403.2618 ; Area in km: 634.0	Azonga wooden bridge
Bolenge (included Monkoto city)		-1.520485	20.520381		Province Tshuapa; Territory Monkoto; Sector Monkoto; Ethnic group: Mongo; Area in ha : 63,403.2618 ; Area in km: 634.0	Ntolengole wooden bridge
Bolenge (included Monkoto city)		-1.469864	20.496516		Province Tshuapa; Territory Monkoto; Sector Monkoto; Ethnic group: Mongo; Area in ha : 63,403.2618 ; Area in km: 634.0	Mbanda 1 wooden bridge
Bolenge (included Monkoto city)		-1.469147	20.496426		Province Tshuapa; Territory Monkoto; Sector Monkoto; Ethnic group: Mongo; Area in ha : 63,403.2618 ; Area in km: 634.0	Mbanda 2 wooden bridge
Imoma Mpako		-1.77966	20.76166		Province Tshuapa; Territory Monkoto; Sector Monkoto; Ethnic group: Mongo; Area in ha : 9,167.18938 ; Area in km: 91.7	Awareness, Baseline studies, Training center, Farm school, Meetings
Isaka 1		-1.65858	20.8556		Province Tshuapa; Territory Monkoto; Sector Monkoto; Ethnic group: Mongo; Area in ha : 57,651.7361 ; Area in km: 576.5	Awareness, Baseline studies
Isaka 1		-1.607309	20.796995		Province Tshuapa; Territory Monkoto; Sector Monkoto; Ethnic group: Mongo; Area in ha : 57,651.7361 ; Area in km: 576.5	Bompoto wooden bridge
Ndomba		-1.62252	20.7556		Province Tshuapa; Territory Monkoto; Sector Monkoto; Ethnic group: Mongo; Area in ha : 6,935.26368 ; Area in km: 69.4	Awareness, Baseline studies
Ndomba		-1.679618	20.719134		Province Tshuapa; Territory Monkoto; Sector Monkoto; Ethnic group: Mongo; Area in ha : 6,935.26368 ; Area in km: 69.4	Liyombo wooden bridge
Yongo Bolongo		-1.5682	20.93028		Province Tshuapa; Territory Monkoto; Sector Monkoto; Ethnic group: Mongo; Area in ha : 12,769.099 ; Area in km: 127.7	Awareness, Baseline studies
Isaka 2		-1.52609	20.91111		Province Tshuapa; Territory Monkoto; Sector Monkoto; Ethnic group: Mongo; Area in ha : 8,817.2565 ; Area in km: 88.2	Awareness, Baseline studies
Bolengangele		-1.482	20.95988		Province Tshuapa; Territory Monkoto; Sector Monkoto; Ethnic group: Mongo; Area in ha : 6,433.65329 ; Area in km: 64.3	Awareness, Baseline studies
Isaka 3		-1.52862	20.98405		Province Tshuapa; Territory Monkoto; Sector Monkoto; Ethnic group: Mongo; Area in ha : 5,650.7953 ; Area in km: 56.5	Awareness, Baseline studies
Mpengue		-1.48357	20.68454		Province Tshuapa; Territory Monkoto; Sector Mongo; Ethnic group: Nongo; Area in ha : 25,937.1303 ; Area in km: 259.4	Awareness, Baseline studies
Mpengue		-1.565028	20.602908		Province Tshuapa; Territory Monkoto; Sector Nongo; Ethnic group: Mongo; Area in ha : 25,937.1303 ; Area in km: 259.4	ISIYO wooden bridge
Mpengue		-1.530073	20.662772		Province Tshuapa; Territory Monkoto; Sector Nongo; Ethnic group: Mongo; Area in ha : 25,937.1303 ; Area in km: 259.4	INTONGU wooden bridge
Mpengue		-1.523822	20.667875		Province Tshuapa; Territory Monkoto; Sector Nongo; Ethnic group: Mongo; Area in ha : 25,937.1303 ; Area in km: 259.4	ITSUALI wooden bridge

Mpengue		-1.426892	20.66969		Province Tshuapa; Territory Monkoto; Sector Nongo; Ethnic group: Mongo; Area in ha : 25,937.1303 ; Area in km: 259.4	NTUMBA traditional meeting shed
Iyonga Nongo		-1.196557	20.592397		Province Tshuapa; Territory Monkoto; Sector Nongo; Ethnic group: Mongo; Area in ha : 25,937.1303 ; Area in km: 259.4	Nongo traditional meeting shed
Nkasa'ekungu		-1.501235	20.944999		Province Tshuapa; Territory Monkoto; Sector Monkoto; Ethnic group: Mongo; Area in ha : 5,650.7953 ; Area in km: 56.5	Belingo traditional meeting shed

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

<https://arcg.is/1GKXOv>

[Annex any linked geospatial file]