



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



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 Environment, Nature Protection and Sustainable Development (MINEPDED), Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife (MINFOF), Technical Center for Council Forests (CTFC)
Project Size (FSP/MSP):	FSP
Project Duration:	4 years

Milestone Dates:

Date of Entry into GEF Work Programme (MM/DD/YYYY):	04/13/2012
GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	01/15/2015
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	06/01/2015
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	03/01/2019
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	02/29/2020
Actual Implementation End Date³:	

Funding

PPG/PDF Amount (if any) (USDm)	62,800
GEF Grant Amount (USD):	3,573,333
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	17,850,000
Total Project Cost:	21,423,333

¹ as per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

³ Actual date at which project implementation ends/closes operationally -- only for projects that have ended.

⁴ This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	916,995
Total estimated co-financing as of June 30, 2019⁵	3,998,200

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	February 23, 2019
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	Started in June 2019 – ongoing
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	No
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	Yes
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual⁶:	
Tracking tools required⁷	Yes
Tracking tools date	

Ratings⁸

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes:	U
Overall implementation progress rating:	U
Overall risk rating:	High

Status

Implementation Status (1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):	3 rd PIR
--	---------------------

⁵ Please see Section 7 of this report where you are asked to provide updated co-financing estimates. Use the total from this Section and insert here.

⁷ Please note that the Tracking Tools are required at mid-term and closure. At mid-term tracking tools are not mandatory for Medium Sized projects = < 2M USD.

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Nguembou Kamgang Charlemagne	charlemagne.nguemboukamgang@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Mbairamadjì Jérémie	Jeremie.Mbairamadjì@fao.org
Budget Holder	Mravili Athman, FAOR	Athman.Mravili@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division	Kuena Morebotsane, TCID	Kuena.morebotsane@fao.org

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁹	Baseline level	Mid-term target ¹⁰	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ¹¹
Objective¹²	1. Area of council forests covered by forest management plans that integrate biodiversity conservation and SFM practices	1. Council forests targeted by the project do not have management plans integrating biodiversity conservation and they neither have information and data on the biodiversity richness of these forests nor on their carbon stocks		1. At least 449,425 ha of council forests (80% of total area targeted) implementing forest management plans. Conservation sites covering a total of 56,200 ha established by project mid-term. (10% of total area targeted)	- Criteria and indicators for designation of conservation sites, assessment and monitoring of biodiversity in the council forests have been developed.	U
	2. Degraded forest area under restoration.	2. Large areas in the council forests are severely degraded.		2. 56,200 ha of degraded council forest under restoration/enriched (10% of total targeted area).	1942 ha of council forests under restoration/enriched	U
	3. Total amount of carbon sequestered and emissions avoided.	3. Zero. No estimate on the status of carbon in the council forests in Cameroon exists.		3. Carbon stocks in the council forest (561 825 ha) will be assessed and monitored. The total carbon benefit of the project for the four years is 23,349,330 tons CO2. The per hectare,		U

⁹ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

¹⁰ 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.

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

¹² Applicable only for projects with objective level indicators.

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁹	Baseline level	Mid-term target ¹⁰	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ¹¹
				Mitigation potential during project cycle is 10.4 tCO ₂		
	Number of people (M/F) participating in sustainable income generating activities implemented (% increase in income against baseline).	Baseline to be determined during the development of management plans.		Target to be determined during the development of management plans.	- 63 participants from 21 council forests have been trained on FAO's Approach on Market Analysis and Development (21 have been further trained as facilitators). - 1050 members of Forest Committee trained to the Cycle 1 of Market Analysis and Development approach in 21 councils targeted by the project.	MS
Outcome 1: Increased forest area managed for sustainable use, biodiversity conservation and enhancement in unprotected ecological zones.	Area under sustainable management and reduction in biodiversity loss.	Council forests do not effectively integrate biodiversity conservation into their management	561,825 ha of council forests with management plans approved by MINFOF, integrating biodiversity conservation	561,825 ha under sustainable management and biodiversity loss reduced in the council forests	Technical guidelines for sustainable management of council forest including biodiversity conservation drafted and adapted to council forests.	U
Outcome 2: Strengthened capacity of selected councils to manage	% increase in the capacity score	Poor capacity at the level of council forests in implementing SFM	Creation of Forest Protection Committees (85) completed.	%increase in the capacity score. Training of 170 local	- 63 participants from 21 council forests have been trained on FAO's	MS

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁹	Baseline level	Mid-term target ¹⁰	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ¹¹
council forests and conservation sites		and biodiversity conservation	Training initiated. 170 local community stakeholders trained on activities related to ecotourism, NTFP collection and processing and hunting.	stakeholders in SFM and alternatives forest income generating activities (NTFP, hunting, ecotourism)	Approach on Market Analysis and Development (21 have been further trained as facilitators). - Training modules on biodiversity management and forest monitoring developed. - 85 persons (staff of Council Forestry Unit, members of Forest Committee and head of forestry and wildlife station) trained to SFM and monitoring.	
Outcome 3: Council forest staff and functional technical unit have the tools and skills necessary to monitor and manage carbon stocks in the council forests	85 x2 staff of FPC and FTU are suitable to monitor and manage carbon stocks in the council forest by the end of the project	Lack of capacity and tools to enhance, monitor and account forest carbon in the council forests. No carbon accounting and monitoring system		% improvement in the capacity score as a result of training of FTUs and FPCs in forest carbon management. Carbon accounting and monitoring system fully operational.	- Assessment of existing accounting and carbon monitoring systems, in the region, completed. - .Adapted carbon accounting and monitoring system for the council forests developed. - Field test for the adapted carbon accounting and monitoring system for the	U

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁹	Baseline level	Mid-term target ¹⁰	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ¹¹
					council forests completed.	
Outcome 4: Forest degradation reduced through restoration and reforestation of 56,200 ha of degraded forests	56 200 ha of council forests under restoration by the end of the project	Large areas in the council forests have been severely degraded	28 100 ha of council forests under restoration	56 200 ha of council forests under restoration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1,942 ha of degraded fallow/arid savanna and degraded forests areas are under rehabilitation/reforestation and 181,400 trees planted by MINFOF and MINEPDED in 2016. - 1416.7 ha reforested and 564 800 trees planted for the year 2017. 	U
Outcome 5: Project managed and monitored effectively and efficiently and best practices and lessons learned disseminated	<p>M&E activities implemented according to the M&E plan (throughout project implementation)</p> <p>Best practices and lessons learnt captured and disseminated for future use by the end of the project</p>	Nil	Mid-term evaluation findings used to refine/improve project design.	Best practices and lessons learnt captured and disseminated for future use.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All due project progress reports drafted. - M&E manual and operationalization plan available. - Mid – term evaluation of the project in progress. 	MS

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating ¹³

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Biodiversity conservation sites in the councils forests are managed sustainably	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establishment and designation of conservation sites. - Inventory of biodiversity in the 17 council forest targeted by the project. - Creation and update of a database on biodiversity 	Project Management Team, Partners, Consultants	Second semester of the year 2019 (or at the end of the mid – term evaluation of the project).
Strengthened capacity of selected councils to manage council forests and conservation sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local communities (170) trained on activities related to ecotourism, NTFP collection and processing and hunting (Cycle 2 of MA&D approach). - Support to the application of technologies adapted to the implementation of the projects of development of forest enterprises. 	Project Management Team, Partners, Consultants	Second semester of the year 2019 (or at the end of the mid – term evaluation of the project).
Council forest staff and functional technical unit have the tools and skills necessary to monitor and manage carbon stocks in the council forests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identification and training of FTUs and FPCs in forest carbon management. - Inventory and characterization of carbon in the 17 council forest targeted by the project.. 	Project Management Team, Partners, Consultants	Second semester of the year 2019 (or at the end of the mid – term evaluation of the project).
Forest degradation reduced through restoration and reforestation of 56,200 ha of degraded forests	increase the surfaces of restored forests	Government	Throughout the year
Project managed and monitored effectively and efficiently and best practices and lessons learned disseminated	Implementation of the M&E system for the project	Project Management Team	Throughout the year

¹³ To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs ¹⁴	Expected completion date ¹⁵	Achievements at each PIR ¹⁶					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁷ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
Output 1.1.1 Database of biodiversity in the council forests established	Q4 Y1	<i>Criteria and indicators for designation of conservation sites, assessment and monitoring of biodiversity in the council forests developed.</i>	<i>Recruitment of partners and consultants to carry out mapping of sites and biodiversity inventories finalized</i>				25 %	<i>Due to the fact that all activities related to forest management must be carried out at the same time, the biodiversity inventory data that must be used to feed the database are not yet available.</i>
Output 1.1.2 Forest management plans, integrating biodiversity conservation, developed and implemented	Q4 Y4	<i>Baseline studies for the revision of management plans carried out within the 17 council's forests targeted by the project</i>	<i>Recruitment of partners and consultants to carry out mapping and delimitation of councils into three blocks in progress.</i>	<i>Socio – economic studies updated for the 17 council forests targeted by the project.</i>			25 %	<i>The budget was not allocated to the forest inventories and other activities required for the revision of the development plans. Therefore this activity could not be completed.</i>

¹⁴ Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

¹⁵ As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

¹⁶ Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

¹⁷ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

Output 1.1.3 56,200 ha of conservation sites formally designated within the council forests	Q4 Y4		<i>Recruitment of partners and consultant for establishment of conservation sites in council forests and development of monitoring plan of important biodiversity component in progress.</i>	<i>Recruitment of partners and consultant finalized.</i>			25 %	<i>All activities related to forest management must be carried out at the same time. Therefore this activity could not be completed.</i>
Output 2.1.1 Technical guidance and standards for SFM and biodiversity conservation in conservation sites developed and disseminated in the council forests	Q3 Y2	<i>Technical guidance and standards for SFM and biodiversity conservation in conservation sites developed</i>	<i>Recruitment of a consultant in charge of communication (drafting and edition of technical sheets) in progress.</i>				75 %	
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	Q4 Y2	63 participants from 21 council forests have been trained on FAO's Approach on Market Analysis and Development (21 have been further trained as facilitators).	- Criteria of selection of members of Forest Committees and local stakeholders (1050 persons) developed and validated by FAO - Recruitment of trainers in progress. - Development	- Training of 1050 members of Forest Committee to Cycle 1 of Market Analysis and Development (M.A. & D) approach.			50 %	<i>This activity was not fully conducted because of the budget under - estimate in the 2017 workplan.</i>

			<i>of course contents in progress.</i>					
Output 2.1.3 17 functional technical units (FTU) established and 85 council staff trained in the development and implementation of forest management plans.	Q2 Y2	- <i>The diagnostic study of the 17 communal forestry Units and existing Forest – Committees completed.</i>		Staff appointed in Council Forestry Unit for the 17 council forests targeted by the project.			75 %	
Output 3.1.1 Existing accounting and carbon monitoring systems adapted to council forests and tested	Q4 Y4	- <i>Assessment of existing accounting and carbon monitoring systems, in the region, completed</i> - <i>Adapted carbon accounting and monitoring system for the council forests developed</i>	- <i>Field tests of carbon accounting and monitoring system in progress.</i> - <i>Technical guidelines for measurement, monitoring and sustainable management of carbon developed and update in progress.</i>	- <i>Field tests of carbon accounting and monitoring system completed.</i> - <i>Technical guidelines for measurement, monitoring and sustainable management of carbon developed and update</i>			75 %	

				<i>completed</i>				
Output 3.1.2 85 forest protection committees (FPC) and 34 Functional technical unit (FTU) staff trained in forest carbon management	Q4 Y2						0 %	<i>This activity will be included in the news to sign between FAO and project partners</i>
Output 4.1.1 Reforestation and restoration of 56,200 ha in the council forests (10% of total council forests targeted by the project)	Q4 Y4	<i>1,942 ha of degraded fallow/arid savanna and degraded forests areas rehabilitated, reforested and restored</i>		<i>1,416,7 ha of degraded fallow/arid savanna and degraded forests areas rehabilitated, reforested and restored</i>			14 %	
Output 5.1.1: M&E plan implemented and mid-term and final evaluations completed	Q4 Y4	<i>All reports prepared</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The draft of project M&E manual under review by the consultant recruited. - 2 project progress reports drafted - Holding of an extraordinary session of the project steering committee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - M&E manual and operationalisation plan completed. - Data for monitoring and evaluation system of the project collected in 10 council forests. 			75 %	<i>- Allocate the necessary budget for the implementation of the project M & E system.</i>

				<i>- Holding of the 3rd ordinary session of the project steering committee</i>				
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

Main significant results:

- Council Forestry Unit and Forest – Peasant Committees established in the 17 council forests targeted by the project.
- Staff of council forestry unit and members of Forest – Peasant Committee trained to the sustainable and monitoring of the 17 council forests targeted by the project.
- 1050 members of Forest – Peasant Committee trained to Cycle 1 of Market analysis and Development approach (M.A.& D).
- Socio – economics studies updated for the 17 council forests targeted by the project as part of the revision of the management plans.
- System of carbon accounting system adapted to council forests developed and tested.
- Technical guidance and standards for measure, monitoring and sustainable carbon management in the council forests available.
- M&E manual and operationalization plan of the manual drafted and implemented.

Major challenges:

- The major challenges in implementing the project for the reporting period are related to (i) the budget under-estimated in the work plan and (ii) the non-allocation of budget to activities related to the revision of council forest management plans. Considering that all activities related to forest management must be carried out at the same time, the budget constraints did allow implementing activities on the field. A budget revision is needed for both the 2019 work plan and the project document.

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating ¹⁸	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating ¹⁹	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	U	U	<i>The rating can be explained by the fact that, In the 2017 workplan, the budget of key activities was under – estimated (Training in MA&D approach, Revision of management plans). In the 2019 workplan, budget was not allocated to activities related revision of management plans. When considering that all the activities related to forest management need to be conducted together, the budget constraints did not allowed implementing activities.</i>
Budget Holder	U	U	<i>The rating can be explained by the fact that several activities in the 2017 and 2019 workplans have not been carried out. This is because of inadequate budget estimates during the last planning workshops and sessions of the project steering committees. The mid - term evaluation of the project has just been initiated and it is very likely that the implementation of the recommendations resulting from this evaluation will help to remove the blockages and achieve the main expected results.</i>
Lead Technical Officer²⁰	U	U	<i>In this specific case, the budget allocation should not be held responsible of the poor implementation performance reflected in the overall rating of Unsatisfactory. A number of core activities planned in the PTAB for the reporting period should have been implemented within the limits of the 2017 approved work plan and allocated budget which unfortunately was not the case.</i>

¹⁸ **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁹ **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

²⁰ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

GEF Funding Liaison Officer	U	U	<i>A mid-term review of this project is ongoing. What is concerning is that the action plan proposed to address the unsatisfactory proposed is the same as the one proposed in the previous year. With findings and recommendations of the mid-term review, we must collectively, working with partners put this project back on track.</i>
------------------------------------	----------	----------	---

3. Risks

Environmental and Social Safeguards (Under the responsibility of the LTO)

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ²¹ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low	No adverse environmental and social impacts foreseen.

Risk ratings

RISK TABLE
<i>The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation. The <u>Notes</u> column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, as relevant. The “Notes” column has one section for the BH and PMU and one for the LTO.</i>

	Risks ²²	Original rating in ProDoc	BH rating now	LTO ²³ rating now	Notes from the BH and/or Project Management Unit
--	---------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	---------------------------------	--

²¹ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

²² Risk ratings will assess the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risks 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 and/or the project may face substantial risks); **Modest Risk (M)** - There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/ or the project may face only modest risks.); **Low Risk (L)** - There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/ or the project may face only modest risks.) **Please add any new risk not initially foreseen in the Project Document.**

²³ LTO = Lead Technical Officer - The LTO will consult the Budget Holder, the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

	Risks ²²	Original rating in ProDoc	BH rating now	LTO ²³ rating now	Notes from the BH and/or 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	Low	Low	
2	Forest fires, pests and diseases	Low	Low	Low	Two council forests are regularly exposed to bush fire (Yoko and Nanga - Eboko) set by the pastoralists for pasture. However, the areas concerned are restrained and so far the local populations are able to circumcise the fires. The capacities of staff of Council Forestry Unit have been strengthened in bushfire management.
3	Delay in the transfer of funds from co-financing partners	Medium	Medium	Medium	The delays in the implementation of the project activities by some partners are the consequence of difficulty in mobilizing the counterpart of co-financing by these partners. To solve this issue, the financial situation of the partners will now be part of the selection criteria of the partners.
4	Poor co-ordination between ministries (MINEPDED, MINFOF) and agencies (CTFC/ ACFCAM) and other stakeholders	Medium	Medium	Medium	Difficulty related to misunderstanding of terms of LoAs can lead to poor coordination of the project. A training session on GEF procedures was organized for project partners. The main recommendations of this training are included in the report of the steering committee available to all partners.
5	Changes in political circumstances and govt. priorities	Low	Low	Low	The municipal elections will probably take place during the second half of the year 2019 and could lead to changes at the head of some Municipalities. In order to ensure the continuity in the implementation of project activities, collaboration will be strengthened with Head of Council Forestry Unit, CTFC (which is the technical body of ACFCAM) and MINFOF (which ensures tutorship in the management of communal forests). Sensitive activities (zoning and inventories) in council forests will be carried out by involving these partners.

	Risks²²	Original rating in ProDoc	BH rating now	LTO²³ rating now	Notes from the BH and/or Project Management Unit
6	Lack of interest or non-participation of the local communities in the project activities	Medium	Medium	Medium	Local communities living around council forests mostly complain that they do not benefit from the logging. In order to make these populations adhere to the implementation of the project activities, sensitization sessions will be organized to inform these populations of the direct and indirect benefits linked to the implementation of the project before the start of field activities.
7	Lack of adherence to the management plans and continued illegal utilization of forest products	Medium	Medium	Medium	Due to the fact that logging activities in many council forests are assigned to subcontractors, which report only to the mayors, it is possible that the revised management plans will not be respected by these subcontractors. During the training of members Forest –Committees in forest monitoring, a focus will be on the establishment of the early alert system so that competent authorities can be quickly seized in case of illegal activities.

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

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Medium	Medium	Reflecting the fact implementation and delivery of results has been unsatisfactory.

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, since the Project Document signature²⁴

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Objective	No	
Project Outcomes	No	
Project Outputs/Activities/Inputs	No	

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

If the duration of the project, the project work schedule, or the timing of any key events such as project start up, evaluations or closing date, have been adjusted since project approval please explain the changes and the reasons for these changes. The Budget Holder may decide, in consultation with the GEF Unit, to request the adjustment of the EOD-NTE in FPMIS to the actual start of operations providing a sound justification.

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	The project was extended to end by February 29, 2020.
Project evaluation	The mid-term evaluation started in June 2019 and is in progress.

5. Gender Mainstreaming

Is the project applying a gender sensitive approach? How? Please briefly explain.

Gender mainstreaming strategy of the project is to be established. A consultant should be recruited for the purpose.

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

Are Indigenous Peoples involved in the project? How? Please briefly explain.

Project activities do not specifically involve or target indigenous peoples. However, those may be directly or indirectly concerned by some activities. The training on the Market Analysis and Development Approach will include NTFP collectors who are generally indigenous peoples 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.

7. Stakeholders Engagement

Please list (i) all stakeholders engaged in the project and specify whether any new stakeholders have been identified/engaged; (ii) briefly describe stakeholders' engagement events, specifying time, date stakeholders engaged, purpose (information, consultation, participation in decision making, etc.) and outcomes. If a Stakeholder Engagement Plan was prepared please report on the progress in its implementation.

- MINFOF: National Government, National coordination of the project, participation in decision making during the last planning workshop (22 Feb. 2019) and steering committee of the project (23 Feb. 2019).
- MINEPDED: National government, National coordination of the project, participation in decision making during the last planning workshop (22 Feb. 2019) and steering committee of the project (23 Feb. 2019).
- ACFCAM/CTFC: Council Association, participation in decision making during the last planning workshop (22 Feb. 2019) and steering committee of the project (23 Feb. 2019).
- CamEco: NGO, consultation, during the last planning workshop (22 Feb. 2019) and steering committee of the project (23 Feb. 2019).
- IITA: International organization, consultation, during the last planning workshop (22 Feb. 2019) and steering committee of the project (23 Feb. 2019).
- ICRAF: International organization, consultation, during the last planning workshop (22 Feb. 2019) and steering committee of the project (23 Feb. 2019).
- GIZ: Bilateral organization, participation in decision making during the last planning workshop (22 Feb. 2019) and steering committee of the project (23 Feb. 2019).
- PNDP: Local government programme, participation in decision making during the last planning workshop (22 Feb. 2019) and steering committee of the project (23 Feb. 2019).
- FEICOM: Local government programme, participation in decision making during the last planning workshop (22 Feb. 2019) and steering committee of the project (23 Feb. 2019).

8. Co-Financing Table

Materialized Co-financing – Mandatory for projects that are completing the Mid-term review or ending operations within this reporting period (June 2017-june 2018). Recommended for all projects.

Sources of Co-financing ²⁵	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing ²⁶	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019- Highly recommended but not mandatory	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team) Mandatory for projects that has completed an MTR or closure	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project (or Actual Amount Materialized at Closing) Highly recommended but not mandatory
National Government	MINFOF	In-Kind	5,000,000 USD	2 268 200 USD		5,000,000 USD
	MINEPDED	In-Kind	4,500,000 USD	1 730 000 USD		4,500,000 USD
International Organization	FAO	Grant	1,050,000 USD			1,050,000 USD
	FAO	In-kind	400,000 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	3,998,200 USD		17,850,000 USD

Explain “Other Sources of Co-financing”: _____

²⁵ 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, Other.

²⁶ Type of Co-financing may include: Grant, Soft Loan, Hard Loan, Guarantee, In-Kind, Other.

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