



## FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

Period covered: 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

### Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA .....	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE) .....	5
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	12
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS .....	19
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS) .....	23
6. RISKS .....	25
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION .....	29
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS .....	31
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	32
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING .....	36
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES .....	37
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT .....	38
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE .....	39

## 1. Basic Project Data

### General Information

<b>Region:</b>	Central Africa
<b>Country (ies):</b>	Republic of Cameroon
<b>Project Title:</b>	Sustainable Forest Management under the Authority of Cameroonian Councils
<b>FAO Project Symbol:</b>	GCP/CMR/033/GFF
<b>GEF ID:</b>	4800
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	Multi-focal Areas
<b>Project Executing Partners:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)</li> <li>- MonitorTrust</li> <li>- Organization for Conservation and Development (OCD)</li> <li>- Ministry of Forests and Wildlife (MINFOF) of Cameroon</li> <li>- Ministry of the Environment, Nature Protection and Sustainable Development (MINEPDED) of Cameroon</li> <li>- Cameroon Association of Council forests (ACFCAM)</li> </ul>
<b>Project Duration (years):</b>	07 years
<b>Project coordinates:</b>	<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

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

<b>Project Implementation End Date/NTE<sup>1</sup>:</b>	01-Mar-2019
<b>Revised project implementation end date (if approved) <sup>2</sup></b>	31-Dec-2022

### Funding

<b>GEF Grant Amount (USD):</b>	3,573,333
<b>Total Co-financing amount<sup>3</sup>:</b>	17,850,000 USD
<b>Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD):</b>	3,209,776 USD
<b>Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD)<sup>4</sup>:</b>	3,197,401 USD
<b>Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023<sup>5</sup></b>	5,085,044 USD

### M&E Milestones

<b>Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:</b>	29 December 2022
<b>Expected Mid-term Review date<sup>6</sup>:</b>	June 2019
<b>Actual Mid-term review date (when it is done):</b>	February 2020
<b>Expected Terminal Evaluation Date<sup>7</sup>:</b>	April 2022
<b>Tracking tools/Core indicators updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)</b>	Yes. Tracking tools had been updated before Project Terminal Evaluation

### Overall ratings

<b>Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):</b>	Moderately Satisfactory
<b>Overall implementation progress rating:</b>	Moderately Satisfactory
<b>Overall risk rating:</b>	Low

### ESS risk classification

<b>Current ESS Risk classification:</b>	Low
---	-----

### Status

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

<sup>1</sup> As per FPMIS

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

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

<sup>4</sup> The amount should show the values included in the financial statements generated by IMIS.

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

<sup>6</sup> The Mid-Term Review (MTR) should take place after the 2<sup>nd</sup> 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.

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

**Project Contacts**

<b>Contact</b>	<b>Name, Title, Division/Institution</b>	<b>E-mail</b>
<b>Project Coordinator (PC)</b>	Armand Asseng Zé/FAOCM	Armand.AssengZe@fao.org
<b>Budget Holder</b>	Mravili Athman, FAOR/FAOCM	Athman.Mravili@fao.org
<b>GEF Operational Focal Point (GEF OFP)</b>	Haman Unusa, MINEPDED	hamanunusa@yahoo.fr
<b>Lead Technical Officer</b>	Mbairamadji Jérémie/FAOSFC	Jeremie.Mbairamadji@fao.org
<b>GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)</b>	Kuena Morebotsane/OCB	Kuena.morebotsane@fao.org

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

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators <sup>8</sup>	Baseline	Mid-term Target <sup>9</sup>	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress <sup>10</sup> since project start Level at 30 June 2023	Progress rating <sup>11</sup>
<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</p>	<p><b>Outcome 1:</b> 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. Those documents have been printed and distributed to stakeholders</p> <p>- A consultant data based specialist was recruited and the biodiversity and carbon database has been set up within the CIDE of MINEPDED. The database administration guide and user manual have been developed.</p> <p>MINFOF and MINEPDED have each designated focal points for monitoring this database.</p> <p>A project team mission was undertaken to: (i) test the operation of the database; ii) carry out a diagnosis of the equipment and the electrical power supply system and</p>	<p><b>S</b></p>

<sup>8</sup> This is taken from the approved results framework of the project.

<sup>9</sup> 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.

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

<sup>11</sup> 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>livelihoods of local communities by promoting sustainable income generating activities.</p>						<p>internet connection; iii) identify IT needs for the proper functioning of this application.</p> <p>Representatives of municipalities, central administrators of MINFOF and MINEPDED and technical administrators of the server have been trained in the management, use and administration of this biodiversity and carbon database. This training took place from November 14 to 18, 2022 in Ebolowa in the South region.</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.</p> <p>21 computers and accessory equipment (GPS, external hard drive), motorcycles were delivered to all 21 councils targeted by the project.</p> <p>This equipment will enable municipalities to strengthen the sustainable management and monitoring of their council forests, the monitoring of the carbon and biodiversity database.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						<p>- Biodiversity inventories were carried out in 13 council forests. The data collected will be used to feed the biodiversity database. Forest carbon inventories were carried out in 15 council forests: Between 50 tC/ha and 500 tC/ha (average of 300 tC/ha) of carbon were analyzed and estimated in these council forests. The reports of all these inventories are available, they have been printed and published.</p> <p>- The designation and zoning of biodiversity sites are completed in 9 council forests. These activities contributed 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 9 council forests. 189 municipal staff were trained in forest carbon inventory and monitoring. 150 people in total (36 women and 114 men) were trained on sustainable forest management and forest monitoring. These activities will contribute to Sustainable Forest Management of 321 144 ha of council forest.</p> <p>- 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>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

	<p><b>Outcome 2:</b> 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>	<p>- 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).</p> <p>- The training modules on biodiversity management and forest monitoring have been developed and trainings conducted.</p> <p>- The restructuring of 21 council forestry units (CFC) and 85 peasant – forest committees (CPF) completed.</p> <p>- 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</p> <p>- 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 (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 trained in the</p>	<p><b>S</b></p>
--	---	--	--	--	---	---	-----------------



						<p>revision and implementation of management plans.                  21 kits each consisting of a rickshaw, watering can, sprayer, wheelbarrow, nursery bags, machetes, shovels, pickaxes, bags; tarps were delivered to all 21 councils targeted by the project.                  This equipment will enable municipalities to strengthen the valorization of non-timber forest products (NTFPs)</p>	
	<p><b>Outcome 3:</b> 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The assessment of existing accounting and carbon monitoring systems, in the region, completed.</li> <li>- Adapted carbon accounting and monitoring system for the council forests developed.</li> <li>- Field test for the adapted carbon accounting and monitoring system for the council forests completed.</li> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- Data collection for carbon accounting were carried out in 15 council forests out of 17 targeted by the project. All those reports have been delivered at the end of December 2022.</li> </ul>	<p><b>S</b></p>

	<p><b>Outcome 4:</b> 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><b>MU</b></p>
	<p><b>Outcome 5:</b> 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&amp;E activities implemented according to the M&amp;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&amp;E activities implemented according to the M&amp;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>- 5 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>- Project final workshop organized at the end of December 2022</p> <p>- All the reports have been printed, published and distributed to stakeholders</p>	<p><b>S</b></p>

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

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<b>Outcome 4:</b> Forest degradation reduced through restoration and reforestation of 56,200 ha of degraded forests.	Collect current data on restoration and reforestation from MINFOF and MINEPDED	PMU	End of December 2022

### 3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outcomes and Outputs <sup>12</sup>	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements <sup>13</sup> (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance <sup>14</sup> in delivering outputs
<b>Outcome 1.1:</b> 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.	The biodiversity and carbon database has been developed within the CIDE of MINEPDED.	The database administration guide and user manual have been developed.
<b>Output 1.1.1:</b> Database of biodiversity in the council forests established	Generic indicator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1 operational software system installed on the 23 desktops to be distributed to municipalities, MINFOF and MINEPDED</li> <li>- At least 21 CFC staff trained in the use of biodiversity databases</li> <li>-An operational database containing biodiversity data at the level of each of the 21 councils targeted by the project.</li> </ul>	The development of the database completed.	<p>The biodiversity and carbon data base is operational. Its field testing is completed and the link with the main server established.</p> <p>Representatives of municipalities, central</p>

<sup>12</sup> Outputs as described in the project Logframe or in any approved project revision.

<sup>13</sup> 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)

<sup>14</sup> Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

				administrators of MINFOF and MINEPDED and technical administrators of the server have been trained in the management, use and administration of this biodiversity and carbon database.
<b>Output 1.1.2:</b> Forest management plans, integrating biodiversity conservation, developed and implemented	17 Forest management plans, integrating biodiversity conservation, developed and implemented by the end of year 3	- 17 revised management plans (including biodiversity report and biodiversity management plan) available	<p>-Biodiversity inventories were carried out in 13 council forests. The data collected will be used to feed the biodiversity database. Forest carbon inventories were carried out in 15 council forests: Between 50 tC/ha and 500 tC/ha (average of 300 tC/ha) of carbon were analyzed and estimated in these council forests. The reports of all these inventories are available, they have been printed and published.</p> <p>- Implementation of activities related to the revision of management plans are completed in 9 council forests. 189 municipal staff were trained in forest carbon inventory and monitoring. 150 people in total (36 women and 114 men) were trained on sustainable forest management and forest monitoring.</p>	Three LoAs partners (IUCN, OCD, Monitor trust) improved the forest inventories and revised forest management plans.

<p><b>Output 1.1.3:</b> 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reports on selection of biodiversity conservation site available for the 17 council forests targeted by the project</li> <li>- 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</li> <li>- 34 indicative panels of sites (17 for biodiversity and 17 for carbon (17) designed for the 17 council forests targeted by the project</li> <li>- Reports on the zoning of the council forests available and the limits materialized on the ground in the 17 CFs targeted by the project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The maps and zoning for three council forests (Minta, Nanga – Eboko and Ndikiniméki) submitted by the partner OCD have been reviewed by the project national expert in charge of forest management and validated by the project LTO.</li> </ul>	<p>The activities have been made by two other partners: i) IUCN for three council forests Dimako, Gari-Gombo and Yokadouma) and ii) Monitor trust for three council forests Djoum, Oveng and Mvangan.</p>
<p><b>Outcome 2.1:</b> 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>The training reports of staff of Council Forestry Unit and local forest officers in the review and implementation of management plans for 17 council forests targeted by the project have been printed and published.</p>	<p>After the MA&amp;D trainings, 21 kits each consisting of a rickshaw, watering can, sprayer, wheelbarrow, nursery bags, machetes, shovels, pickaxes, bags; tarps were delivered to all 21 councils targeted by the project. This equipment will enable municipalities to strengthen the valorization of non-timber forest products (NTFPs)</p>
<p><b>Output 2.1.1:</b> Technical guidance and standards for</p>	<p>Technical guidance and standards for SFM and</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>N/A</p>	

SFM and biodiversity conservation in conservation sites developed and disseminated in the council forests.	biodiversity conservation in conservation sites are available			
<b>Output 2.1.2:</b> 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	85 groups of beneficiaries formed from Existing Forests peasants committee (FPC) and 170 local community leaders have gained skills on alternative livelihoods activities	- At least 21 Business Development Projects (PDE) based on Non-Timber Forest Products (NTFPs) are implemented in the municipalities targeted by the project		After the MA&D trainings, 21 kits each consisting of a rickshaw, watering can, sprayer, wheelbarrow, nursery bags, machetes, shovels, pickaxes, bags; tarps were delivered to all 21 councils targeted by the project. This equipment will enable municipalities to strengthen the valorization of non-timber forest products (NTFPs)
<b>Output 2.1.3:</b> 85 council staff selected from 17 existing council forests units (CFU) trained in the development and implementation	85 council staff selected from the 17 existing council forests units (CFU) have the skill to implement forest	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.	The 102 people trained, supported the revision and implementation of management plans.	The reports of management plans in 9 council forests have been printed and submitted to MINFOF for validation.

of forest management plans.	management plans			
<b>Outcome 3.1:</b> 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.	The analysis of soil and litter samples completed	The carbon related reports have been finalized, printed and published.
<b>Output 3.1.1:</b> Database concerning the carbon in the council forests created	An accounting and carbon monitoring systems adapted to council forests and tested exist	Completed	N/A	
<b>Output 3.1.2:</b> 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	Completed	N/A	Completed



	management			
<b>Outcome 4.1:</b> 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)
<b>Output 4.1.1:</b> 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)
<b>Outcome 5.1:</b> Project managed and monitored effectively and efficiently and best practices and lessons learned disseminated	The project is managed effectively and efficiently	Good practices and lessons learned from the project are capitalized		-The last meeting of the project steering committee was held in December 2022.  -Good practices and lessons learned from the project have been shared
<b>Output 5.1.1:</b> M&E plan implemented and mid-term and final evaluations completed	The M&E plan is effectively implemented	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Elaboration of technical sheets, and poster for each technical component</li> <li>- Biodiversity and carbon guidelines are edited and published.</li> <li>- The technical reports within the framework of the project of the project are edited and printed and</li> </ul>	- All the reports have been printed, published and distributed to stakeholders	-The report of project final evaluation was reviewed.

		officially submitted to MINFOF, MINEPDED and the Communes. - A video report on the results and achievements of the project carried out.		- A video report on the results and achievements of the project produced
--	--	--	--	--

## 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 been met.

During this reporting period:

- Biodiversity and carbon database has been set up within the CIDE of MINEPDED. The database administration guide and user manual have been developed.
- Representatives of municipalities, central administrators of MINFOF and MINEPDED and technical administrators of the server have been trained in the management, use and administration of this biodiversity and carbon database.
- 21 computers and accessory equipment (GPS, external hard drive), motorcycles were delivered to all 21 councils targeted by the project.
- Computers and accessory equipment gave to municipalities will enable them to strengthen the sustainable management and monitoring of their council forests, the monitoring of the carbon and biodiversity database.
- Forest carbon inventories were carried out in 15 council forests
- 189 municipal staff were trained in forest carbon inventory and monitoring. 150 people in total (36 women and 114 men) were trained on sustainable forest management and forest monitoring.

**Challenge:** During the period covered by the report, the field trip to repeat the exercise of filling in biodiversity and carbon data collection sheets was not regular, due to the end of the project

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, 21 kits each consisting of a rickshaw, watering can, sprayer, wheelbarrow, nursery bags, machetes, shovels, pickaxes, bags; tarps were delivered to all 21 councils targeted by the project. This equipment will enable municipalities to strengthen the valorization of non-timber forest products (NTFPs).

**Challenge :** The distribution of the kits was greatly appreciated by the municipalities, but the monitoring of their use by the NWFP groups was not carried out because of the end of the project.

#### 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.

The analysis of soil and litter samples completed. The carbon related reports have been finalized, printed and published.

**Challenge:** The main challenge was to finalize the consultants' reports because the soil analysis results taken from the council forests took a long delay at the laboratory.

#### 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. The component 4 is under co-financing and FAO has no control on the reports to be produced by these two ministries co-financing reforestation activities.

#### Component 5: Monitoring and evaluation and information dissemination.

During the reporting period, the final evaluation of the project completed. The last meeting of the project steering committee was organized. Good practices and lessons learned from the project have been shared. A video report on the results and achievements of the project produced. All the reports have been printed, published and distributed to stakeholders.

**Challenge:** Difficulty for team in agreeing with the Administration on the date of the last project steering committee.

### **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.

	<b>FY2023 Development Objective rating<sup>15</sup></b>	<b>FY2023 Implementation Progress rating<sup>16</sup></b>	<b>Comments/reasons<sup>17</sup> justifying the ratings for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period</b>
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	The project team, reinforced by technical experts, focused on: (i) the finalization of council forest management activities, including the development of the carbon and biodiversity database; (ii) the monitoring and verification of its management activities by MINFOF; (iii) the finalization of the of the development of revised development plans; (iv) the printing and submission of revised management plans to MINFOF for approval. This work, which focused on 09 communal forests, has had a positive impact on the municipalities targeted by the project.
<b>Budget Holder</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	The current implementation status of this project shows that the project implementation rate is about 87%. The no cost project extension granted for 6 months (July-December 2022) allowed to finalize several activities that were not carried out before.
<b>GEF Operational Focal Point<sup>18</sup></b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	All Mayors involved in the project and present at the last project steering committee meeting expressed their satisfaction with the results of the project. With the end of the project, it is important to see the capitalization of its results and achievements as well as the exit strategy of the project.
<b>Lead Technical Officer<sup>19</sup></b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>S</b>	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

<sup>15</sup> **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.

<sup>16</sup> **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.

<sup>17</sup> Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

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

<sup>19</sup> The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

			together with the new model of collaboration agreed with MINFOF consisting of involving foresters from MINFOF in the monitoring of activities in the field made it possible to finalize management activities in 09 council forests and to increase the rate of implementation of project activities.
<b>FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>MS</b>	Project implementation has ended. Ratings in line with findings of the final evaluation.

## 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
<b>ESS 1: Natural Resource Management</b>				
	NA			
<b>ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats</b>				
	NA			
<b>ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture</b>				
	NA			
<b>ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture</b>				
	NA			
<b>ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management</b>				
	NA			
<b>ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement</b>				
	NA			
<b>ESS 7: Decent Work</b>				
	NA			
<b>ESS 8: Gender Equality</b>				
	NA			
<b>ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage</b>				
	NA			
<b>New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY</b>				
	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 <sup>20</sup> . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low	Still valid.

<b><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></b>
Nothing to flag.

---

<sup>20</sup> **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 <sup>21</sup>	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	During field activity monitoring missions, the project team observed the presence of traps to capture wild animals near and in biodiversity conservation sites. Exchanges with the staff of the council forests took place to protect this biodiversity.		
2	Forest fires, pests and diseases	Low	Y	The reviewed forest management plans includes measures to address forest fires, pests and diseases. Trainings for FTUs and FPCs addressed also these specific threats		

---

<sup>21</sup> 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 <sup>21</sup>	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
3	Delay in the transfer of funds from co-financing partners	Medium	Y	Co-financing partners will be part of the project steering committee.	Meeting of the project steering committee organized in December 2022	
4	Poor co-ordination between ministries (MINEPDED, MINFOF) and agencies (CTFC/ACFCAM) and other stakeholders	Medium	Y	Regular meetings between ministries, partners and mayors of the council forests concerned by the project have been organized to facilitate the implementation of activities	Those meeting have been organized through the PSC, PTCM and the Stakeholder Committees	
5	Changes in political circumstances and govt. priorities	Medium	Y	The project team was reassured of the commitment of all stakeholders until the end of the project	Actors and stakeholders of the project have exchanged with the project team during the supervision missions of activities leaded by the LTO.	

	Type of risk	Risk rating <sup>21</sup>	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	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 the supervision missions of led by the LTO.  Awareness meetings have been organized at the council level for the populations living near the communal forests targeted by the project	
7	Lack of adherence to the management plans and continued illegal utilization of forest products	Medium	Y	Key stakeholders have been involved in formulating the management plans.	Awareness meetings have been organized at the commune level for the populations living near the communal forests targeted by the project.	
8	Limited support and implementation capacity in the councils	Medium	Y	Progress of capacity development activities at the council level have been regularly monitored by the PSC.		

	Type of risk	Risk rating <sup>21</sup>	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
9	Delay in FAO administrative procedures in procurement and/or purchasing goods and services.	Medium	N	The purchase plan developed under the supervision of the budget holder allowed 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 completed.	

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

FY2022 rating	FY2023 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Moderate	Low	Almost all remaining activities were completed 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>
<b>Recommendation 1:</b> 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
<b>Recommendation 2:</b> 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
<b>Recommendation 3:</b> 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
<b>Recommendation 4:</b> 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><b>Recommendation 5:</b> 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><b>Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please describe</b></p>	<p>Yes the project developed an Exit Strategy. In this project exit strategy, the participants in the closing workshop of the project set up 4 thematic groups to reflect on the following themes of the post-project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Theme 1: What would be the objectives, duration, thematic areas and components of a phase 2 project proposal as well as the possible funding options and the funding mobilization strategy to be put in place?</li> <li>• Theme 2: What would be the institutional model to consider for a phase 2 project proposal?</li> <li>• Theme 3: What strategy should be put in place to ensure the reforestation of degraded areas, the management and monitoring of council forest development inventories after the end of the project ?</li> <li>• Theme 4: Biodiversity and carbon monitoring and database after project completion.</li> </ul> <p>The findings of these working groups are captured in the project exit document.</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 Guidelines<sup>22</sup>. 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	N/A		
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			

<sup>22</sup> 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 <u>during this reporting period</u> .			
Stakeholder name	Role in project execution	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
<b>Government Institutions</b>			
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) and other staff organized field missions to monitor management activities. Ministry of Forest and Wildlife led the final project steering committee.</p> <p>Also MINFOF participated in the field mission to: (i) test the operation of the database on biodiversity and carbon in the council forests; ii) carry out a diagnosis of the equipment and the electrical power supply system and internet connection; iii) identify IT needs for the proper functioning of this application.</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)	The biodiversity and carbon database has been set up within the CIDE of Ministry of Environment, Protection of Nature and Sustainable Development (MINEPDED)	Maintain in close collaboration with MINFOF the functioning of database on biodiversity in the council forests after project closure.
<b>Non-Government organizations (NGOs)</b>			
ACFCAM/CTFC	Institutional partner. Council Association, participation in decision making during planning workshops and meetings of the steering committee of the project. Also	ACFCAM/CTFC and councils forests have been involved in all activities related to the revision of management plans and biodiversity and carbon database	Maintain data collection in council forests for the functioning of database on biodiversity and carbon after project closure.



	implement some project activities		
CamEco	Co-financing partner. Observers during planning workshops and meetings of the steering committee of the project. Also implement some project activities	CamEco had made good contributions on best practices and lessons learnt during	Difficulties to disseminated best practices after project closure.
IITA	International organization, consultation/observers during planning workshops and meetings of the steering committee of the project. Also implement some project activities.	IITA produced the results of the analysis of litter and soil samples collected during field trip in 9 council forests. This allowed to finalize reports on carbon inventories	Continue to produce results of 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 acknowledged receipt of the final project evaluation report	
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 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	Meetings have been organized for the task force put in place between GIZ and FAO	Continue the good collaboration between GIZ and FAO

	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.		
C2D-PSFE	Bilateral organization, consultation/observers during planning workshops and meetings of the steering committee of the project	Project team have been supported with the advises of C2D-PSFE about the activities on the revision of management plans of council forests.	Continue to follow up results since this project is closed
PNDP	Local government programme, participation in decision making during planning workshops and meetings of the steering committee of the project.	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.	Continue the capitalization of the results and lessons learnt of PNDP.
FEICOM	Local government programme, participation in decision making during planning workshops and meetings of the steering committee of the project.	Meetings have been organized for the task force put in place between FEICOM and FAO	Continue the good collaboration between FEICOM and FAO
<b>Private sector entities</b>			
<b>Others[1]</b>			
<b>New stakeholders identified/engaged</b>			
International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)	Officially International Union for Conservation of	IUCN finalized the revision of the the management plans of 03	Continue the good collaboration between IUCN and FAO


[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.

	<p>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".</p>	<p>council forests (Dimako, Gari-Gombo and Yokadouma)</p>	

## 10. Gender Mainstreaming

<b>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.</b>		
<b>Category</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period</b>
Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.	<b>NO</b>	
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	<b>YES</b>	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"> <li>• Training on carbon inventories</li> <li>• Training on biodiversity inventories</li> </ul>
Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):		The following output of the project is expected to contribute to gender equality: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Output 1.1.2 Forest management plans, integrating biodiversity conservation, developed and implemented</li> </ul>
a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources	<b>YES</b>	Trainings on biodiversity and carbon inventories, sustainable forest management and forest monitoring, mainly targeted men but women, young and indigenous people in communities living around council forests were also involved
b) improving women's participation and decision making	<b>YES</b>	During all the trainings
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	<b>YES</b>	Groups of women of the council forests beneficiaries of this GEF project were trained on Market analysis and development approach which empowered them to develop sustainable income generating activities based on sustainable use and commercialisation of non-wood forest products gathered from their surrounding forests.
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	<b>YES</b>	FAO ensures that the list of participants for each activity also includes women, men, youth and the disabled
Staff with gender expertise	<b>YES</b>	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	<b>NO</b>	

## 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 has been recruited. The consultant produced documents on lessons learned and good practices. He also produced the report on the exit strategy and promotion of the results and achievements of the project.
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 biodiversity inventories carried out in the communal forests made it possible to know the potential of the resource in the natural environment, to identify the sites of conservation and protection of biodiversity and to contribute to the revision of the management plans. The photos below show the traps set by populations to capture wildlife species and an example of a species seen during inventories. 
Please provide links to related website, social media account	<a href="http://www.fao.org/cameroun/actualites/detail-events/fr/c/1273777/">http://www.fao.org/cameroun/actualites/detail-events/fr/c/1273777/</a> <a href="https://twitter.com/FAOCameroun/status/1219260648229679104">https://twitter.com/FAOCameroun/status/1219260648229679104</a>
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	- All the reports have been printed, published and distributed to stakeholders - A video report on the results and achievements of the project produced
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, indigenous peoples were involved in training on sustainable forest management and forest monitoring.

### 13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing <sup>23</sup>	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 057USD	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
	<b>TOTAL</b>		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**  
**NA**

<sup>23</sup> 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

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

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

<b>Risk rating.</b> 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:	
<b>High Risk (H)</b>	There is a probability of greater than <b>75%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
<b>Substantial Risk (S)</b>	There is a probability of between <b>51%</b> and <b>75%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face substantial risks
<b>Moderate Risk (M)</b>	There is a probability of between <b>26%</b> and <b>50%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only moderate risk.
<b>Low Risk (L)</b>	There is a probability of up to <b>25%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only low risks.