



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2022 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022

Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE)	5
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	12
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	18
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	22
6. RISKS	24
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION	32
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	34
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	35
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING	39
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	41
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	42
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	43

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Central Africa
Country (ies):	Republic of Cameroon
Project Title:	Sustainable Forest Management under the Authority of Cameroonian Councils
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/CMR/033/GFF
GEF ID:	4800
GEF Focal Area(s):	Multi-focal Areas
Project Executing Partners:	- Ministry of Forests and Wildlife (MINFOF) of Cameroon - Ministry of the Environment, Nature Protection and Sustainable Development (MINEPDED) of Cameroon - Cameroon Association of Council forests (ACFCAM)
Project Duration (years):	4 years
Project coordinates:	<p><u>East region</u></p> <p>Yokadouma council forest: 3.538481 N, 15.049461 E Moloundou council forest: 2.050466 N, 15.213246 E Gari – Gombo council forest: 3.933638 N, 15.109742 E Messamena/Mindourou council forest: Messamena: 3.741168 N, 12.823707 E, Mindourou: 3.575199 N, 13.413748 E Dimako council forest: 4.385876 N, 13.571335 E Lomié council forest: 3.170895 N, 13.630289 E</p> <p><u>Centre region</u></p> <p>Dzeng council forest: 3.764477 N, 11.885188 E Nanga Eboko council forest: 4.683200 N, 12.375871 E Minta council forest: 4.558996 N, 12.830778 E Yoko council forest: 5.539928 N, 12.316743 E Messondo council forest: 3.692776 N, 10.452207 E Ndikinimeki council forest: 4.784877 N, 10.827484 E</p> <p><u>Littoral region</u></p> <p>Ngambè/Ndom/Nyanon council forest: Ngambè: 4.237641 N, 10.623026 E, Ndom: 4.392926 N, 10.810170 E, Nyanon: 4.262422 N, 10.953144 E</p> <p><u>South region</u></p> <p>Akom 2/Efoulan council forest: Akom 2: 2.802023 N, 10.569525 E, Efoulan: 2.944628 N, 11.052883 E Mvangan council forest: 2.658038 N, 11.741795 E Oveng council forest: 2.415180 N, 12.262147 E Djoum council forest: 2.677977 N, 12.671094 E</p>

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	15/01/2015
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	01-Jun-2015

Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	01-Mar-2019
Revised project implementation end date (if approved) ²	31-Dec-2022

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	3,573,333
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc³:	17,850,000 USD
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2022 (USD)⁴:	2,340,487 USD
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2022⁵	5,085,044 USD

M&E Milestones

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	23 September 2020
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	June 2019
Actual Mid-term review date (when it is done):	February 2020
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date⁷:	April 2022
Tracking tools/Core indicators updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	Yes

Overall ratings

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

ESS risk classification

¹ As per FPMIS

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

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

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

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

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.

Current ESS Risk classification:	Low
---	-----

Status

Implementation Status <i>(1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):</i>	Final PIR
--	-----------

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Nguembou Kamgang Charlemagne/FAOCM	Charlemagne.nguemboukamgang@fao.org
Budget Holder	Mravili Athman, FAOR/FAOCM	Athman.Mravili@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Mbairamadji Jérémie/FAOSFC	Jeremie.Mbairamadji@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Kuena Morebotsane/OCB	Kuena.morebotsane@fao.org

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

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating ¹¹
----------------------------------	----------	---------------------------------	----------	------------------------------	-----------------------	---	-------------------------------

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).

<p>- The Global Environmental Objective of the project is to reduce deforestation and forest degradation in council forests in order to improve biodiversity conservation, reduce emissions and enhance carbon stocks.</p> <p>- The Development Objective is to improve livelihoods of local communities by promoting sustainable income generating activities.</p>	<p>Outcome 1: Increased forest area managed for sustainable use, biodiversity conservation and enhancement in unprotected ecological zones.</p>	<p>56,200 ha of council forests effectively integrate biodiversity conservation into their management by the end of year 3.</p>	<p>0 ha ha of council forests do not effectively integrate biodiversity conservation into their management</p>		<p>561,825 ha under sustainable management and biodiversity loss reduced in the council forests</p>	<p>- Technical guidelines for sustainable management of council forest including biodiversity conservation have been produced and adapted to council forests. The document has been edited and the process for printing initiated.</p> <p>- A consultant data based specialist was recruited and the development of the biodiversity database is ongoing.</p> <p>- The procurement of 23 computers, inverters and hard disks to house this database at the level of 21 councils and the 2 ministries targeted by the project has been completed. These activities provide the basis for the establishment of a database to capture, stock and monitor the evolution of biodiversity in the council forests. Few computers have already been dispatched in some councils.</p> <p>- Biodiversity inventories were carried out in 13 council forests. Reports are available. The data collected will be used to feed the biodiversity database.</p> <p>- The designation and zoning of biodiversity sites are completed in 7 council forests and ongoing in 2 council forests. These activities will contribute the designation of biodiversity conservation sites of 32 114 ha of council forest.</p> <p>- Implementation of activities related to the revision of management plans are completed in 7 council forests and ongoing in 2 council forests. These activities will contribute to Sustainable Forest</p>	<p>MS</p>
---	--	---	--	--	---	---	------------------

						<p>Management of 321 144 ha of council forest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 4 council forests targeted by the project are conducted in collaboration with GIZ/ProFE to mutualize effort and avoid duplication. Some activities are conducted by GIZ and others by FAO and these activities complement each other contributing together to the revision of forest management plans of the forest where FAO and GIZ have activities. 	
	<p>Outcome 2: Strengthened capacity of selected councils to manage council forests and conservation sites.</p>	<p>85 groups formed from existing FPCs and 17 CFUs have the skills needed to manage council forests and conservation sites</p>	<p>0 dozens Poor capacity, organization and technical direction at the level of council forests in implementing SFM and biodiversity conservation.</p>		<p>170 local stakeholders trained in SFM and alternatives forest income generating activities (NTPF, hunting, ecotourism) and able to implement forest management plans</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 23 participants (17M/6F) from 21 councils have been trained (training of trainers) on FAO’s Approach on Market Analysis and Development. Among these participants, 21 (15M/6F) have been further trained as facilitators/trainers). - The training modules on biodiversity management and forest monitoring have been developed and trainings conducted. - The restructuring of 21 council forestry units (CFC) and 85 peasant – forest committees (CPF) completed. - The trainings in forest monitoring and biodiversity conservation completed for 34 staff of council forestry units, 85 members of peasant – forest committees and 17 forestry and wildlife officers posted at local level - The training on alternative income generating activities based on forest products through the Market Analysis and Development (MAD) was conducted throughout out the council forests targeted by the project and overall 1 050 people 	<p>S</p>

						<p>(444M/556F) were trained in cycle 1 of MAD approach in 21 councils from October 2018 to March 2019. The second cycle training of the MAD approach has been conducted for rural populations, members of the peasant – forest committees living around the council forests. 700 people among the targeted 1050 living in 14 councils have benefitted from this training.</p> <p>- In addition, a total of 102 people (staff of Council forestry Unit and local forestry and wildlife officers were trained in the revision and implementation of management plans.</p>	
	<p>Outcome 3: Council forest staff and Council forest units (CFU) have the tools and skills necessary to monitor and manage carbon stocks in the council forests</p>	<p>Council forest staff and Council forest units (CFU) have the tools and skills necessary to monitor and manage carbon stocks in the council forests</p>	<p>0 units Lack of capacity and tools to enhance, monitor and account forest carbon in the council forests No carbon accounting and monitoring system</p>		<p>1 units Lack of capacity and tools to enhance, monitor and account forest carbon in the council forests No carbon accounting and monitoring system</p>	<p>- The assessment of existing accounting and carbon monitoring systems, in the region, completed.</p> <p>- Adapted carbon accounting and monitoring system for the council forests developed.</p> <p>- Field test for the adapted carbon accounting and monitoring system for the council forests completed.</p> <p>- Staff of Council Forestry Unit and members of Peasant – Forest committee trained to carbon management and monitoring in 15 council forests out of 17 targeted by the project.</p> <p>- Data collection for carbon accounting were carried out in 15 council forests out of 17 targeted by the project. The reports are expected to be delivered by end of July 2022.</p>	<p>S</p>

	<p>Outcome 4: Forest degradation reduced through restoration and reforestation of 56200 ha of degraded forests</p>	<p>56,200 ha of degraded forests in the councils forest are reforested and restored</p>	<p>0 ha Large areas in the council forests have been severely degraded</p>		<p>56 ha Large areas in the council forests have been severely degraded</p>	<p>- 3,358.7 ha of degraded fallow/arid savannah and degraded forests areas are under rehabilitation/ reforestation and 181,400 trees planted by MINFOF and MINEPDED in since the beginning of the project.</p> <p>- 11 352 ha of council forests under restauration.</p> <p>- According to the report submitted by MINFOF in September 2020, a total of 463 ha have been reforested corresponding to 220,000 trees planted.</p>	<p>MU</p>
	<p>Outcome 5: Project managed and monitored effectively and efficiently and best practices and lessons learned disseminated.</p>	<p>The project is managed effectively and efficiently</p>	<p>0 units M&E activities implemented according to the M&E plan (throughout project implementation), and mid-term evaluation findings used to refine/improve project design. Best practices and lessons learnt captured and disseminated for future use</p>		<p>1 units M&E activities implemented according to the M&E plan (throughout project implementation), and mid-term evaluation findings used to refine/improve project design. Best practices and lessons learnt captured and disseminated for future use</p>	<p>- 4 project steering committee meetings organized</p> <p>- A monitoring - evaluation plan and its operationalization plan developed</p> <p>- Project activity supervision missions in the field were regularly organized.</p> <p>- Meetings organized with co-financing partners were held regularly.</p> <p>- a communication plan and tools developed and distributed</p>	<p>MS</p>

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

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<p>Outcome 1: Increased forest area managed for sustainable use, biodiversity conservation and enhancement in unprotected ecological zones.</p>	<p>A new model of collaboration was agreed between FAO and the Ministry of forest and wildlife where by technical officers of MINFOF are involved in the field verification of activities conducted in the council forests related to the revision of forest management plans and their compliance with forest laws prior to their approval by the MINOF. In the technical team of the project was strengthened with the recruitment of a national expert forest management, a national expert forest biodiversity and a national expert forest carbon tasked to support and technically coordinate project activities related to forest inventories, forest management plans.</p>	<p>BH/LTO/PMU</p>	<p>Mid July 2022</p>
<p>Outcome 4: Forest degradation reduced through restoration and reforestation of 56,200 ha of degraded forests.</p>	<p>The project team has undertaken to collect data directly from the communal forestry units to complement the data from MINFOF and MINEPDED</p>	<p>PMU</p>	<p>Mid July 2022</p>
<p>Outcome 5: Project managed and monitored effectively and efficiently and best practices and lessons learned disseminated.</p>	<p>A consultant in charge of capitalization on good practices and lessons learned is currently being recruited. In collaboration with the communication focal, he will develop documents and technical sheets on good practices and lessons learned from the project. The technical experts of the project unit under the supervision of the LTO are working on the publication of at least one technical paper based of key findings of the project to be widely disseminated.</p>	<p>PMU/LTO/Consultant</p>	<p>Mid July 2022</p>

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: Increased forest area managed for sustainable use, biodiversity conservation and enhancement in unprotected ecological zones	56,200 ha of council forests effectively integrate biodiversity conservation into their management by the end of year 3.	The biodiversity database is operational and management plans integrating biodiversity conservation have been validated by MINFOF for 17 council forests.	Biodiversity inventories carried out in 15 council forests. A consultant recruited and the database under development.	The forest biodiversity data is under development
Output 1.1.1: Database of biodiversity in the council forests established	Generic indicator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 operational software system installed on the 23 desktops to be distributed to municipalities, MINFOF and MINEPDED - At least 21 CFC staff trained in the use of biodiversity databases -An operational database containing biodiversity data at the level of each of the 21 councils targeted by the project. 	A consultant recruited. The development of the database ongoing.	The biodiversity data base will be operational after field testing is completed and the link with the main server established..

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.

<p>Output 1.1.2: Forest management plans, integrating biodiversity conservation, developed and implemented</p>	<p>17 Forest management plans, integrating biodiversity conservation, developed and implemented by the end of year 3</p>	<p>- 17 revised management plans (including biodiversity report and biodiversity management plan) available</p>	<p>- Management inventories completed in 7 councils forests. - Draft (V.0) of revised management plan developed for 3 council forests.</p>	<p>Three LoAs partners (IUCN, OCD, Monitor trust) are working in the field to improve the forest inventories and revised forest management rate.</p>
<p>Output 1.1.3: 56,200 ha of conservation sites formally designated within the council forests</p>	<p>56,200 ha of conservation sites in the council forests are identified, delimited and materialized</p>	<p>- Reports on selection of biodiversity conservation site available for the 17 council forests targeted by the project - Topographic maps (digital version; and 17 folders with shapefiles of GIS data on the mapping of biodiversity sites available for the 17 council forests targeted by the project - 34 indicative panels of sites (17 for biodiversity and 17 for carbon (17) designed for the 17 council forests targeted by the project - Reports on the zoning of the council forests available and the limits materialized on the ground in the 17 CFs targeted by the project.</p>	<p>- The partner OCD has submitted draft of maps and zoning for three council forests (Minta, Nanga – Eboko and Ndikiniméki). These reports are under first technical review of the project national expert in charge of forest management prior to the final review and validation by the by the project LTO.</p>	<p>The activities are underway by two other partners (IUCN and Monitor trust).</p>
<p>Outcome 2.1: Strengthened capacity of selected councils to manage council forests and conservation sites</p>	<p>85 groups formed from existing FPCs and 17 CFUs have the skills needed to manage council forests and conservation sites</p>	<p>Small enterprises based on non-timber forest products are created and operational and the staff of CFC and members of CPF have been trained in the review and implementation of management plans for the 17 council forests targeted by the project</p>	<p>Staff of Council Forestry Unit and local forest officers were trained in the review and implementation of management plans for 17 council forests targeted by the project.</p>	<p>During field mission conducted by FAO team it was observed in all the groups met none of them has started implementing the Enterprise development plan (EDP) so that FAO can top up with light processing</p>

				equipment or other start up non-financial support as required by FAO MA&D approach. In these conditions there is no basis to provide a startup support to SME that does not yet exist in the council forests after the MA&D trainings.
Output 2.1.1: Technical guidance and standards for SFM and biodiversity conservation in conservation sites developed and disseminated in the council forests.	Technical guidance and standards for SFM and biodiversity conservation in conservation sites are available	Completed	N/A	
Output 2.1.2: 85 local forest protection committees (FPCs) established and trained, and 170 local community leaders/change	85 groups of beneficiaries formed from Existing Forests peasants committee (FPC) and 170 local community	- At least 21 Business Development Projects (PDE) based on Non-Timber Forest Products (NTFPs) are implemented in the municipalities targeted by the project		During FAO team field visit to the field, it was observed that none of the groups trained in MAD has started the implementation of their enterprise development plan (EDP produced so

agents from the villages in/around the council forests trained in alternative livelihoods	leaders have gained skills on alternative livelihoods activities			that FAO can come in and top up with light processing equipment or other non-financial support to get their enterprise to the next level.
Output 2.1.3: 85 council staff selected from 17 existing council forests units (CFU) trained in the development and implementation of forest management plans.	85 council staff selected from the 17 existing council forests units (CFU) have the skill to implement forest management plans	At least 6 people per council forest (5 CFC staff and a Head of Forestry Station) trained in the review and implementation of management plans.	A total of 102 people selected from the 17 communal forests targeted by the project trained in the revision and implementation of management plans.	Trainings were successfully completed and those trained ready to support the revision and implementation of management plans.
Outcome 3.1: Council forest staff and Council forest units (CFU) have the tools and skills necessary to monitor and manage carbon stocks in the council forests	Council forest staff and Council forest units (CFU) have the tools and skills necessary to monitor and manage carbon stocks in the council forests	Carbon accounting completed in the 17 council forests targeted by the project.	Data collection for carbon accounting completed in 15 councils forests. Staff of CFC and members of CPF trained in carbon management and forest monitoring	The analysis of soil and litter samples experienced a long delay and this has affected the finalization of carbon related reports.
Output 3.1.1: Database concerning the	An accounting and carbon monitoring	Completed	N/A	

carbon in the council forests created	systems adapted to council forests and tested exist			
Output 3.1.2: 85 forest peasants committees (FPC) and 34 Council Forests Units (CFU) staff trained in forest carbon management	85 groups formed from existing forest peasants committees (FPC) and 34 Council Forests Units (CFU) staff have the skills in forest carbon management	- 34 CFCs trained in carbon management and forest monitoring and a training report available. - 85 CPF members trained in carbon management and forest monitoring and a training report available.	34 CFC staff and 85 member of CPF trained in carbon management and forest monitoring	Training completed and those trained ready to perform carbon management and forest monitoring
Outcome 4.1: Forest degradation reduced through restoration and reforestation of 56200 ha of degraded forests	56,200 ha of degraded forests in the councils forest are reforested and restored	The areas of communal forests under reforestation/restoration are increased.		Lack of information to inform this result (co – financing)
Output 4.1.1: Reforestation and restoration of 56200 ha in the council forests (10% of total council forests targeted by the project)	56200 ha in the council forests are effectively reforested and restored	At least 11 000 ha of forests/arid areas reforested/restored and annual reports from MINFOF and MINEPDED on reforestation and forest restoration activities available		MINFOF and MINEPDED have not yet submitted their reforestation/restoration reports for the reporting period. (co – financing)

<p>Outcome 5.1: Project managed and monitored effectively and efficiently and best practices and lessons learned disseminated</p>	<p>The project is managed effectively and efficiently</p>	<p>Good practices and lessons learned from the project are capitalized</p>		<p>The last meeting of the project steering committee was held in September 2020. Slight changes brought to the project team has improved the project management and monitoring of project activities.</p>
<p>Output 5.1.1: M&E plan implemented and mid-term and final evaluations completed</p>	<p>The M&E plan is effectively implemented</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Elaboration of technical sheets, and poster for each technical component - Biodiversity and carbon guidelines are edited and published. - The technical reports within the framework of the project of the project are edited and printed and officially submitted to MINFOF, MINEPDED and the Communes. - A video report on the results and achievements of the project carried out. 	<p>Biodiversity and carbon guidelines and others technical project documents edited.</p>	<p>The project mid-term evaluation was conducted.</p>

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.

Component 1: Establishment of Council forests for sustainable forest management and biodiversity conservation

The outputs under this component are (i) the establishment of a database of biodiversity in the council forests, (ii) the revision and implementation of forest management plans to integrate biodiversity conservation (561 825 ha under SFM) and (iii) the formal designation of 56,200 ha of conservation sites within the council forests. The targets for these outputs have not yet been met.

During this reporting period, the recruitment process for a database development expert has been finalized and the consultant have submitted a first version of the database. Biodiversity inventories were carried out in 15 FCs out of the 17 targeted by the project. The drafts of the revised management plans of 9 council forests are being produced by the partners. 4 council forests targeted by the project are the subject of collaboration between the GEF/FAO project and GIZ.ProFE. The management inventory activities were carried out in these forests by the GIZ/ProFE project, which was to provide the FAO with the data for the revision of the management plans. These data are still awaited.

Challenge: During the period covered by the report, calls for events for the recruitment more partners in addition the three LoA partners (IUCN, OCD, Monitor trust) to add loAs and improve the implementation rate in the councils forest was unsuccessful.

Component 2: Capacity Building to strengthen biodiversity conservation and SFM in Council Forests

The outputs under this component are: (i) the development and dissemination of Technical guidance and standards for SFM and biodiversity conservation in conservation sites (ii) the establishment and training of 85 local forest protection committees (FPCs) and the training in alternative livelihoods of 170 local community leaders/change agents from the villages in/around the council forests (iii) the establishment of 17 functional technical units (FTU)and the training of 85 council staff in the development and implementation of forest management plans.

During the period concerned, 102 staff members of the communal forestry units and head of the forestry station were trained in the revision and implementation of management plans. As a result, all the training/capacity building activities of this component of the project have been fully carried out.

Challenge : The last phase of ADM training which consists of supporting / providing support (financial, equipment) to MAD trainees for the start-up of small businesses based on non-timber forest products (NTFPs) was not carried out because the review of NWFP-based enterprise development projects that were produced were not realistic and this was confirmed during the field visits conducted later by FAO team where it was observed that none of the group trained in MAD was able to start their enterprise so that FAO can come in to top up with light processing equipment or other non-financial support to get the enterprise to the next level as required by FAO MAD approach.

Component 3: Capacity building for the management of forest carbon

The outputs under this component are: (i) the adaptation to council forests and testing of existing accounting and carbon monitoring systems (ii) the training in forest carbon management of 85 forest protection committees (FPC) and 34 Functional technical unit (FTU) staff.

Training on forest carbon monitoring and management was completed for the 17 council forests targeted by the project. Data collection for carbon accounting carried out for 15 council forests out of 17 targeted by the project.

Challenge: The analysis of soil collected from the council forests by the consultants took a long delay at the laboratory and that affected the delivery of the reports of these consultants.

Component 4: Ecosystem restoration and enhancement of carbon stocks (Co-financing)

The output under this component is the reforestation and restoration of 56,200 ha in the council forests (10% of total council forests targeted by the project).

Challenge: No reports received from MINFOF and MINEPDED on reforestation/restoration activities carried out by these ministries during the reporting period.

Component 5: Monitoring and evaluation and information dissemination.

During the reporting period, the final evaluation of the project started. The field data collection phase completed. During the trip, 5 council forests were visited. Interviews with stakeholders by the evaluation team are continuing. A supervision mission led by the project LTO and the project team visited 14 council forests out of the 17 targeted by the project.

Challenge: Difficulty for team in charge of final evaluation to meet with certain project stakeholders.

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	MS	S	Several calls for applications and calls for expressions of interest were published but were sometimes unsuccessful and/or the applicants were not sufficiently qualified to implement the activities, in particular on forest management and carbon accounting. As a result, these activities are not yet carried out in some communal forests targeted by the project. 4 council forests targeted by the project are the subject of collaboration between the GEF/FAO project and GIZ.ProFE. The management inventory activities were carried out in these forests by the GIZ/ProFE project, which was to provide the FAO with the data for the revision of the management plans. These data are still awaited.
Budget Holder	MS	S	The current implementation status of this project shows that the project implementation rate is about 70% - reason why an extension of 6 months (July-December 2022) was requested and granted in order to complete the gaps. The project unit's technical capacity was strengthened with additional technical experts. An additional staff was brought tasked to assume the operational and partnership coordination activities of the project leaving technical experts to focus on technical tasks. This contributed to significant improvements in implementation.

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

GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁸	S	S	Progress has been registered project activity implementation during this reporting period. However, much remains to be done on forest management and carbon accounting. These activities are yet to be implemented in some communal forests targeted by the project. Also, the project closure process is already launched and it may not be possible to complete these activities by the end of the project cycle.
Lead Technical Officer¹⁹	MS	MS	The changes brought to strengthen the project unit technical capacity with first hand national experts (carbon, biodiversity, forest management) and also with a colleague tasked to assist the project on logistical and operational aspects together with the new model of collaboration agreed with MINFOF consisting of involving foresters from MINFOF in the field verification of the compliance of activities implemented by the project in the council forests with forest law prior to the approval of the revised forest management plans by MINFOF are good indicators towards successful implementation of the project few activities remaining.
FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	MS	MS	As the project moves towards its closure, the project team needs to prepare with partners, an exit strategy that takes into account the findings and recommendations of the terminal evaluation – under finalization. There is also need to prioritize documentation and sharing of knowledge and lessons with partners and relevant initiatives that could contribute to the continuation and scaling-up of project results.

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.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

Under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

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

Social & Environmental Risk Impacts identified at CEO Endorsement	Expected mitigation measures	Actions taken during this FY	Remaining measures to be taken	Responsibility
ESS 1: Natural Resource Management				
	NA			
ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats				
	NA			
ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
	NA			
ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
	NA			
ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management				
	NA			
ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement				
	NA			
ESS 7: Decent Work				
	NA			
ESS 8: Gender Equality				
	NA			
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage				
	NA			
New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY				
	NA			

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

Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)	Current ESS risk classification Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ²⁰ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low	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>
Nothing to flag.

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

6. Risks

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

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	Climate change impacts (e.g. changes in the water regime, longer and hotter dry seasons, increased incidence of fires etc.)	Low	Y	Monitor impacts on biodiversity as part of conservation area monitoring; Management measures will be adopted to minimize the incidence of forest fires; Potential links between climate driven changes and other anthropogenic disturbances will be identified and measures to reduce these will be included in the forest management plans.		

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	Forest fires, pests and diseases	Low	Y	Counter measures will be adopted in forest management plans to address forest fires, pests and diseases; Occurrence of such events will be recorded in monitoring activities and preventive actions will be improved; Trainings for FTUs and FPCs will address these specific threats and actions to be undertaken		
3	Delay in the transfer of funds from co-financing partners	Medium	Y	Co-financing partners will be part of the project steering committee. Any short-fall in co-financing will be brought to the attention of the PSC for action to be taken	No meeting of the project steering committee since September 2020	

4	<p>Poor co-ordination between ministries (MINEPDED, MINFOF) and agencies (CTFC/ACFCAM) and other stakeholders</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Organize regular meetings between ministries and agencies concerned by the project to avoid misunderstanding or lack of information on the project. This will be through the PSC, PTCM and the Stakeholder Committees</p>	<p>There is already a framework for joint meetings between the technical coordination and the national coordination of the project. Similarly, there is a meeting framework with the implementing partners of the project. A framework for collaboration between co-financing partners (GIZ, PFSE C2D2, FEICOM, PNDP, CTFC, etc.) will be set up. In addition to the project focal points at MINFOF and MINEPDED level, it will be necessary to identify within these institutions focal points who will be formally designated and will meet at least once a quarter and / or in time of need to make a contribution and capitalize on the interventions.</p>	
---	---	---------------	----------	--	--	--

	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
					Regular meeting held with partners, especially the GIZ / ProFE project, in charge of management activities in 4 of the 17 council forests targeted by the project.	

	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
5	Changes in political circumstances and govt. priorities	Medium	Y	Broad stakeholder engagement throughout the project preparation and the continuation of this engagement during the implementation will ensure continued political support for the project	<p>An information and awareness meeting is planned and should bring together the forest administration, municipal executives (including the new elected mayors) and staff from the council forestry units in all the councils targeted by the project.</p> <p>Actors and stakeholders of the project have exchanged with the project team during a recent supervision mission of project activities in the field led by the LTO.</p>	

	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
6	Lack of interest or non-participation of the local communities in the project activities	Medium	Y	Awareness activities and education materials on the link between ensuring SFM and biodiversity conservation in the council forests and the improvement of livelihoods of the communities. Continued recognition of the rights of the local population for traditional collection of forest products in the council forests for their subsistence. Continued engagement of the local communities through the Stakeholder Committees and Forest Protection Committees, and capacity building activities.	Actors and stakeholders of the project have exchanged with the project team during a recent supervision mission of project activities in the field led by the LTO. Awareness meetings will be organized at the council level for the populations living near the communal forests targeted by the project	

	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
7	Lack of adherence to the management plans and continued illegal utilization of forest products	Medium	Y	Key stakeholders will be involved in formulating the management plans. Measures to prevent illegal logging of wood and non-wood forest products in the council forests and continuous forest surveillance will be an integral part of the management plans and the forest protection activities.	<p>Staff of council forestry unit are involved of the implementation of project activities and are invited to project meetings.</p> <p>An information and awareness meeting is planned and should bring together the forest administration, municipal executives and staff from the communal forestry units in all the communes targeted by the project. Awareness meetings will be also organized at the commune level for the populations living near the communal forests targeted by the project.</p>	

	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
8	Limited support and implementation capacity in the councils	Medium	Y	Progress of capacity development activities at the council level will be regularly monitored by the PSC. During the project preparation, council staff and other stakeholders were engaged, and with their buy-in and continued engagement during implementation, timely corrective measures will be taken in case of any concerns.		
9	Delay in FAO administrative procedures in procurement and/or purchasing goods and services.	Medium	N	The budget holder has instructed an annual planning of the purchase of goods and services for the project. The purchase plan developed will allow the administration to anticipate the payments and purchases necessary for the implementation of the project.	Annual planning of the purchase of good and service for the project drafted.	

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

FY2021 rating	FY2022 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Moderate	Moderate	There is less than 6 months left before the end of the project. FAO Cameroon to ensure delivery of all activities within this period.

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 1: FAO, through the Country Representation and in collaboration with the Government, must restore a climate of trust and collaboration between the various project partners, especially between the Project Management Unit, the Project National Coordination, ACFCAM, the implementing and co-financing partners.	N/A
Recommendation 2: FAO, in consultation with the GEF, should carry out a budget revision allowing the implementation of the planned management plans. If this revision cannot be decided and effective one year before the end of the project, proceed with an extension of the project to achieve the results.	N/A
Recommendation 3: The steering committee, in consultation with the FAO, must take certain decisions, notably concerning the proposed budget revision (recommendation n ° 2) in order to ensure the results of the project.	N/A
Recommendation 4: FAO must improve its system and internal processes for managing this project, giving particular importance to the creation of a	N/A

<p>healthy, collaborative and non-confrontational working environment.</p>	
<p>Recommendation 5: FAO must, through the PMU, capitalize on all the achievements of the project, put them in synergy with the interventions of other partners on CF and disseminate them to sensitize and support political decision-makers, municipal officials, forest operators and beneficiaries in a perspective of sustainability of achievements.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please describe</p>	<p>No</p>

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	N/A		
Components and cost	N/A		
Institutional and implementation arrangements	N/A		
Financial management	N/A		
Implementation schedule	No cost extension	31 December 2022	FAO
Executing Entity	N/A		
Executing Entity Category	N/A		
Minor project objective change	N/A		
Safeguards	N/A		
Risk analysis	N/A		
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%	N/A		
Co-financing	N/A		
Location of project activity	N/A		
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 Forest and Wildlife (MINFOF)	National coordination of the project, participation in decision making during planning workshops and meetings of the steering committee of the project. Also involve in monitoring of project activities on the field.	<p>Ministry of Forest and Wildlife through the national coordination (CNP) supported the project in the reflection of the strategy for monitoring the work of the development plans for council forests integrating biodiversity conservation. In this support, MINFOF had proposed a LoA containing the project monitoring activities. In the end, it was agreed that it would be better to develop ToRs instead of a LoA for MINFOF missions to monitor management activities.</p> <p>Also MINFOF supported project activity to create and update a database on biodiversity in the council forests</p>	<p>Approve by MINFOF all management plans revised by the project</p> <p>Maintain the functioning of database on biodiversity in the council forests after project closure.</p>
Ministry of Environment, Protection of Nature and Sustainable Development (MINEPDED)	National coordination of the project, participation in decision making during planning workshops and meetings of the steering committee of the project)	<p>Cameroon's biodiversity focal point is based at Ministry of Environment, Protection of Nature and Sustainable Development. Government services in charge of carbon inventories are also based in this ministry. Reason why MINEPDED via its department of conservation and management of natural resources had exchanged with project team on the activity to create and update a database on biodiversity in the council forests as well as the carbon carbon inventories in council forests</p>	<p>Maintain in close collaboration with MINFOF the functioning of database on biodiversity in the council forests after project closure.</p>
Non-Government organizations (NGOs)			

ACFCAM/CTFC	Institutional partner. Council Association, participation in decision making during planning workshops and meetings of the steering committee of the project. Also implement some project activities	ACFCAM/CTFC had exchanged with project team on the possibility to participate at vacancy announcement (VA) launched for the implementation of project activities	Difficulties to agree to participate at vacancy announcement (VA) launched for the implementation of activities when we are partner in project document
CamEco	Co-financing partner. Observers during planning workshops and meetings of the steering committee of the project. Also implement some project activities	CamEco had exchanged with project team on the possibility to participate at vacancy announcement (VA) launched for the implementation of project activities	Difficulties to agree to participate at vacancy announcement (VA) launched for the implementation of activities when we are partner in project document
IITA	International organization, consultation/observers during planning workshops and meetings of the steering committee of the project. Also implement some project activities.	IITA supported project team for the analysis of litter and soil samples collected during field trip in 9 council forests.	Continue to support project team for the analysis of litter and soil samples in remaining council forests.
ICRAF	International organization, consultation/observers during planning workshops and meetings of the steering committee of the project. Also implement some project activities	ICRAF had exchanged with project team on the possibility to participate at vacancy announcement (VA) launched for the implementation of project activities	Difficulties to agree to participate at vacancy announcement (VA) launched for the implementation of activities when we are partner in project document
GIZ/ProFE	Bilateral organization, participation in decision making during planning workshops and meetings of the steering committee of the project. In order to capitalize on the interventions and promote synergy, a collaboration framework has been	GIZ/ProFE had working sessions with FAO to see how to share activities of revision of management plans and NTFP in council forests where both partners are present. A task force between GIZ and FAO have been put in place for their activities	Continue the good collaboration between GIZ and FAO

	<p>established with the GIZ/Forest - Environment Project (GIZ/ProFE). This project implements the same activities in 4 council forests targeted by the FAO/GEF project. Within the framework of this collaboration, GIZ is responsible for carrying out forest inventories that will allow the FAO-GEF project to draft management plans for the 4 councils.</p>		
C2D-PSFE	<p>Bilateral organization, consultation/observers during planning workshops and meetings of the steering committee of the project</p>	<p>C2D-PSFE supported the project team by providing information on the costs to carry out the activities on the revision of management plans of council forests.</p>	<p>Capitalize C2D-PSFE results since this project is closed</p>
PNDP	<p>Local government programme, participation in decision making during planning workshops and meetings of the steering committee of the project.</p>	<p>PNDP is the Cameroon government entity which support the development of councils. PNDP advice project team on how to work in good manner with councils.</p>	<p>Capitalize the results and lessons learnt of PNDP on how to work in good manner with councils.</p>
FEICOM	<p>Local government programme, participation in decision making during planning workshops and meetings of the steering committee of the project.</p>	<p>FEICOM is also another the Cameroon government entity which support the development of councils. FEICOM and FAO had signed an agreement with the point in collaboration on the council forest, conservation and management of natural resources</p> <p>A task force between FEICOM and FAO have been put in place for their activities</p>	<p>Continue the good collaboration between FEICOM and FAO</p>
Private sector entities			

Others[1]			
New stakeholders identified/engaged			
International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)	Officially International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources is an international organization working in the field of nature conservation and sustainable use of natural resources. It is involved in data gathering and analysis, research, field projects, advocacy, and education. IUCN's mission is to "influence, encourage and assist societies throughout the world to conserve nature and to ensure that any use of natural resources is equitable and ecologically sustainable".	IUCN had signed a LoA with FAO to revise the management plans of 03 council forests (Dimako, Gari-Gombo and Yokadouma)	Finalize the revision of the the management plans of 03 council forests (Dimako, Gari-Gombo and Yokadouma).

[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) during this reporting period.

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.	NO	
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	YES	For the following trainings, measures have been taken to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training in SFM and alternatives forest income generating activities (NFTP) • Training in the development and implementation of forest management plans • Training on carbon inventories • Training on biodiversity inventories
Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):		The following outputs of the project are expected to contribute to gender equality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Output 2.1.2 85 local forest protection committees (FPCs) established and trained, and 170 local community leaders/change agents from the villages in/around the council forests trained in alternative livelihoods • Output 2.1.3 17 functional technical units (FTU) established and 85 council staff trained in the development and implementation of forest management plans.
a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources	YES	Training on alternative income generating activities based on forest products through the Market Analysis and Development (MAD) approach mainly targeting women and young people in communities living around council forests.
b) improving women's participation and decision making	YES	During all the trainings
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	YES	Training on alternative income generating activities based on forest products through the

		Market Analysis and Development (MAD) approach mainly targeting women and young people in communities living around council forests.
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	YES	FAO ensures that the list of participants for each activity also includes women, men, youth and the disabled
Staff with gender expertise	YES	During the implementation of project activities, the team regularly discusses with the Gender Focal Point of the office on the consideration of the gender aspect.
Any other good practices on gender	YES	The harvesting, storage and sale of NTFPs by the group of women and men of the council forest of Minta.

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.	A consultant for the capitalization of good practices and lessons learned is being recruited. As the project has an extension until December 2022, the consultant will have time to produce documents on lessons learned and good practices.
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.	A communication plan was developed for the project, and many communication activities were carried out.(television, twitter, web site, etc)
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.	the project just start the implimlmentation of enterprise development plan and will present in the next PIR a human-interest story
Please provide links to related website, social media account	http://www.fao.org/cameroun/actualites/detail-events/fr/c/1273777/ https://twitter.com/FAOCameroun/status/1219260648229679104
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	The consultant in charge of communication of the project has produced a series of communication documents and tools. This included leaflets, roll ups, presentation brochures meant to put more visibility on the project. We equally produced posters shared in the various localities where this project is being implemented
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's Name and contact details	Communication focal point : Aissatou Vamoulke Email : Aissatou.Vamoulke@fao.org

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.

If applicable, please describe the process and current status of on-going/completed, legitimate consultations to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with the indigenous communities.

Do indigenous peoples and or local communities have an active participation in the project activities? If yes, briefly describe how.

The project document did not specifically target indigenous peoples. However, those may be directly or indirectly concerned by some activities. The training on the Market Analysis and Development Approach includes NTFP collectors who are generally indigenous peoples (Baka Pygmies) in the project implementation areas. Similarly, it is planned the involvement of indigenous peoples during the selection of persons to be trained for the monitoring of council forests.

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
National Government	MINFOF	In-Kind	5,000,000 USD	2 661 057 USD	2 661 057 USD	5,000,000 USD
	MINEPDED	In-Kind	4,500,000 USD	1 730 000 USD	1 730 000 USD	4,500,000 USD
International Organization	FAO	Grant	1,050,000 USD	285 414 USD	285 414 USD	1,050,000 USD
	FAO	In-kind	400,000 USD	408 573 USD	408 573 USD	400,000 USD
Civil Society Organization	Cameroon Ecology	In-kind	3,500,000 USD			3,500,000 USD
Local Government program	PNDP	In-kind	1,500,000 USD			1,500,000 USD
Bilateral Aid Agency	GIZ	In-kind	1,900,000 USD			1,900,000 USD
	TOTAL		17,850,000 USD	5,085,044 USD	5,085,044 USD	17,850,000 USD

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

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.

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development Objectives Rating. A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”
Satisfactory (S)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives)
Unsatisfactory (U)	Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits)
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

Implementation Progress Rating. A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project’s components and activities is in compliance with the project’s approved implementation plan.	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as “good practice
Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

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