

# GEF - PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (PIR)

Document Generated by: GEF Coordination Office CO

At: 2024-08-23 08:05:04

---

## Table of contents

1 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION .....	3
1.1 Project Details .....	3
1.2 Project Description .....	4
1.3 Project Contacts.....	4
2 Overview of Project Status.....	6
2.1 UNEP PoW & UN.....	6
2.2. GEF Core and Sub Indicators .....	6
2.3. Implementation Status and Risks .....	7
2.4 Co Finance .....	8
2.5. Stakeholder .....	8
2.6. Gender .....	9
2.7. ESSM .....	9
2.8. KM/Learning.....	10
2.9. Stories .....	10
3 Performance.....	11
3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project outcomes .....	11
3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of outputs (Implementation Progress) .....	16
4 Risks.....	20
4.1 Table A. Project management Risk .....	20
4.2 Table B. Risk-log.....	20
4.3 Table C. Outstanding Moderate, Significant, and High risks.....	24
5 Amendment - GeoSpatial.....	30
5.1 Table A: Listing of all Minor Amendment (TM).....	30
5.2 Table B: History of project revisions and/or extensions (TM) .....	30

**UNEP GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2024**  
Reporting from 1 July 2023 to 30 June 2024

## 1 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

### 1.1 Project Details

<b>GEF ID:</b> 10314	<b>Umoja WBS:</b> SB-17747
<b>SMA IPMR ID:</b> 84782	<b>Grant ID:</b> S1-32GFL-000710
<b>Project Short Title:</b> Grand Kivu & Lac Tele -Tumba	
<b>Project Title:</b> Community-based forested landscape management in the Grand Kivu and Lake Tele-Tumba	
<b>Duration months planned:</b>	60
<b>Duration months age:</b>	34
<b>Project Type:</b>	Full Sized Project (FSP)
<b>Parent Programme if child project:</b>	10208
<b>Project Scope:</b>	National
<b>Region:</b>	Africa
<b>Countries:</b>	Congo, Democratic Republic of the
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	Biodiversity
<b>GEF financing amount:</b>	\$ 13,761,468.00
<b>Co-financing amount:</b>	\$ 76,532,813.00
<b>Date of CEO Endorsement/Approval:</b>	2021-06-18
<b>UNEP Project Approval Date:</b>	2021-08-27
<b>Start of Implementation (PCA entering into force):</b>	2021-09-24
<b>Date of Inception Workshop, if available:</b>	2022-03-03
<b>Date of First Disbursement:</b>	2022-01-08
<b>Total disbursement as of 30 June 2024:</b>	\$ 1,371,000.00
<b>Total expenditure as of 30 June:</b>	\$ 1,000,000.00

<b>Midterm undertaken?:</b>	No
<b>Actual Mid-Term Date, if taken:</b>	
<b>Expected Mid-Term Date, if not taken:</b>	2024-03-31
<b>Completion Date Planned - Original PCA:</b>	2027-06-30
<b>Completion Date Revised - Current PCA:</b>	2026-06-30
<b>Expected Terminal Evaluation Date:</b>	2026-06-30
<b>Expected Financial Closure Date:</b>	2026-12-31

## 1.2 Project Description

The objective of the project is to extend and improve forest and peatland landscapes through the management of natural resources in the two targeted transboundary landscapes. In particular: Grand Kivu and Télé-Tumba Lakes. It is structured around four components for a period of five (5) years namely: Component 1: Mainstreaming Integrated Land use Planning (ILP) for conservation and sustainable development. This component will support the achievement of sustainable development through the implementation of integrated land use planning and zoning plans. Component 2: Ensuring Biodiversity conservation and carbon sequestration in forest landscapes. This component will support the participatory approach to forest management planning and implementation, and will contribute to a 600,000 ha increase in the conservation area under good management practices for the management of 400,000 ha of forests including peatlands in the landscape of Lake Tumba and for the management of 200,000 ha in Greater Kivu, thereby supporting enhanced protection of biodiversity, better management of environmental resources, improvements in ecosystem services. Component 3: Promoting effective sustainable land use in priority landscape. This component includes strategic actions designed to achieve the implementation of climate-smart natural resources use and management within the IPLCs. In total, at least 75 sustainable climate-smart projects will be supported in each of the project areas on agroforestry production, animal husbandry, transformation and commercialization of products from sustainable natural resources extraction and use in both project sites. Component 4: Improving capacity, knowledge management and trans-boundary collaboration. This component will be implemented in coordination with the Regional Project, which will develop a Knowledge component for the overall Congo Basin impact program. This component will allow organization of a system and platforms for documenting and sharing best practices and lessons learned peatland landscapes, biodiversity, and inland marine biodiversity areas in the project locations of Lac Tumba Landscape and the North Kivu region, and to ensure that these are made available for use in other conservation and production forests and peatlands in the rest of the DRC and the Congo Basin Region in general. The executing agency is the Ministry of the Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD) in collaboration with local and international NGOs i.e. WWF, Jane Goodal, REPALEF...

## 1.3 Project Contacts

<b>Division(s) Implementing the project</b>	Ecosystems Division
---	---------------------

<b>Name of co-implementing Agency</b>	
<b>Executing Agency (ies)</b>	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development
<b>names of Other Project Partners</b>	WWF, REPALEF, Jane Goodall, Rain Forest Alliance Plan/OCDD, ICCN, Ministry of Land Management, Universities, Civil Society/NGO and the Private Sector. Environnent, Land Management, Customer Affairs, Land tenure, Agriculture, Plan Rural Development, Fishery and breeding
<b>UNEP Portfolio Manager(s)</b>	Johan Robinson
<b>UNEP Task Manager(s)</b>	Andre Toham
<b>UNEP Budget/Finance Officer</b>	Paul Vrontamitis
<b>UNEP Support Assistants</b>	Eric Mugo
<b>Manager/Representative</b>	MITONGA KASULU Danely
<b>Project Manager</b>	ILUNGA MUNENG John
<b>Finance Manager</b>	KALOMBO KAYEMBE Prosper
<b>Communications Lead, if relevant</b>	BOMBULA MALASSAY Jean Claude

## 2 Overview of Project Status

### 2.1 UNEP PoW & UN

<b>UNEP Current Subprogramme(s):</b>	Thematic: Climate action subprogramme,Thematic: Nature action subprogramme
<b>UNEP previous Subprogramme(s):</b>	
<b>PoW Indicator(s):</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Climate: (i) Number of national, subnational and private-sector actors that adopt climate change mitigation and/or adaptation and disaster risk reduction strategies and policies with UNEP support.</li> <li>• Climate: (iv) Positive shift in public opinion, attitudes and actions in support of climate action as a result of UNEP action</li> <li>• Climate: (v) Positive shift among private sector actors in support of climate action as a result of UNEP engagement.</li> <li>• Nature: (i) Number of national or subnational entities that, with UNEP support, adopt integrated approaches to address environmental and social issues and/or tools for valuing, monitoring and sustainably managing biodiversity.</li> </ul>
<b>UNSDCF/UNDAF linkages</b>	Inclusive economic growth, agriculture development, capture of demographic growth dividend, protection and sustainable management of natural resources,
<b>Link to relevant SDG Goals</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goal 1: End poverty in all its forms everywhere</li> <li>• Goal 2: End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture</li> <li>• Goal 3: Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages</li> <li>• Goal 5: Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls</li> <li>• Goal 12: Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns</li> <li>• Goal 15: Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss</li> </ul>
<b>Link to relevant SDG Targets:</b>	

### 2.2. GEF Core and Sub Indicators

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

Indicators	Targets - Expected Value			Materialized to date
	Mid-term	End-of-project	Total Target	
1- Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and		2,762,968	2,762,968	

Indicators	Targets - Expected Value			Materialized to date
	Mid-term	End-of-project	Total Target	
sustainable use				
3.1- Area of degraded agricultural lands under restoration	270	500	500	
4.1- Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity	300	700	700	
6- Greenhouse gas emissions mitigated	4,600,000	8,182,184	8,182,184	
11- People benefitting from GEF-financed investments	30,000 F 27, 000 M	65,000 F and 55, 000 M	65,000 F and 55, 000 M	

Implementation Status 2023: 3rd PIR

### 2.3. Implementation Status and Risks

	PIR#	Rating towards outcomes (section 3.1)	Rating towards outputs (section 3.2)	Risk rating (section 4.2)
FY 2024	3rd PIR	U	U	H
FY 2023	2nd PIR	MU	MU	M
FY 2022	1st PIR	MU	MU	L
FY 2021				
FY 2020				
FY 2019				
FY 2018				
FY 2017				
FY 2016				
FY 2015				

#### Summary of status

The Implementing Agency (UNEP) has observed slow technical progress on the ground. The rate of expenditure of project funds used relative to project progress, has raised the risk profile of the project. Furthermore, UNEP has not accepted expenditure reports and an audit submitted by the partner since project inception. As a result, UNEP is carrying out an independent audit of the project, through the HACT (Harmonised Approach to Cash Transfers) framework, before project activities resume.

## 2.4 Co Finance

<b>Planned Co-finance:</b>	\$ 76,532,813
<b>Actual to date:</b>	
<b>Progress</b>	<p><b>Justify progress in terms of materialization of expected co-finance. State any relevant challenges:</b></p> <p>The Project did not make any progress in securing co-financing contributions from partners. This is a result of the stagnation in project progress and inaction from the Project Management Unit (PMU) to mobilise co-finance most of which is pledged in-kind.</p>

## 2.5. Stakeholder

<b>Date of project steering committee meeting</b>	
<b>Stakeholder engagement (will be uploaded to GEF Portal)</b>	<p>The project management unit hold sessions with WWF, Jane Goodall Institute (JGI), Rainforest Alliance, and UNIKIN to harmonize memoranda, the terms of reference and contracts. Only the REPALEF contract approved and three (3) deliverables are produced: Identification of customary and village lands in the project sites; Obtaining CLIPs accompanied by consultations with local communities and indigenous peoples; State of play of the existing on: CFCL approved, Initiatives in progress and the situation of Simple Management Plans (PSG)</p>



## 2.6. Gender

<b>Does the project have a gender action plan?</b>	Yes
<b>Gender mainstreaming (will be uploaded to GEF Portal):</b>	The Project Gender action plan include key gender issues such as (i) making the project framework gender sensitive, including specific gender sensitive indicators; (ii) translating legal instrument in support of women consideration in development action; (iii) Gender mainstreaming in local and provincial development plan; (iv) Development of Provincial Gender legal instrument; (v) Capacity building targeting gender mainstreaming; (vi) providing support to women and youths activities; (vii) Sentization on violence against women; (viii) Creation of provincial committee on gender; (xi) Women and youth governance structures. These Gender issues have not been addressed, because the project implementation in the ground is yet to be started.

## 2.7. ESSM

<b>Moderate/High risk projects (in terms of Environmental and social safeguards)</b>	<b>Was the project classified as moderate/high risk CEO Endorsement/Approval Stage?</b> No <b>If yes, what specific safeguard risks were identified in the SRIF/ESERN?</b>
<b>New social and/or environmental risks</b>	<b>Have any new social and/or environmental risks been identified during the reporting period?</b> No <b>If yes, describe the new risks or changes?</b>
<b>Complaints and grievances related to social and/or environmental impacts</b>	<b>Has the project received complaints related to social and/or environmental impacts (actual or potential) during the reporting period?</b> No <b>If yes, please describe the complaint(s) or grievance(s) in detail, including the status, significance, who was involved and what actions were taken?</b>
<b>Environmental and social safeguards management</b>	Repalef conducted consultations with stakeholders in the three provinces of the DRC (North Kivu, South Kivu and Grand Equateur) to make an inventory of secured land for IPLCs, including Indigenous Peoples' and Community Conserved Territories and Areas (ICCA), Community Forest Committees (CFC), Community Protected Areas (CPA). Repalef also took the opportunity of this visit to: (i) identify the customary lands and the respective villages of the territory of the target area of the project; (ii) sensitize communities on project

	<p>activities; obtain Free, prior and inform consent from IPLCs on the implementation of project activities; (iii) Collect basic information on each territory; (iv) Analyze existing Local Development Plans by integrating the CLIP approach; (v) Support communities in the development of Simple Management Plans; (vi) Organize workshops to validate and share results with stakeholders. The status of securing forest lands for IPLCS can be summarized as follows:- in the province of North Kivu, territories of Walikale and Lubero: there are provisionally twenty-one secure CFCLs (Concessions Forestières des Communautés Locales) with a total area of 486,146.25 ha. - The province of Grand Equateur contains nineteen CFCLs with a total area of 365,530 ha. - The province of Mai-Ndombe precisely in the territory of Kiri exists provisionally four CFCL with a total area of 28,758 hectares;- With regard to the analysis and review of the land use planning policy document, REPALF presented its observations in documents entitled "REPALF advocacy note on the land use planning reform and the advocacy on the analysis of the legal and regulatory framework for land in the Democratic Republic of Congo"; these two documents were submitted for appropriation to CONAREF (La Commission Nationale de la Réforme Foncière) and the Ministry of Territorial Planning.</p>
--	---

## 2.8. KM/Learning

<b>Knowledge activities and products</b>	Four project participated in the training organized by the Regional Coordination project of the Congo Basin sustainable landscape Impact program. The workshop aim to share information and results of the methodology for designing an Integrated Transboundary Land Use Planning and management (ILUMP).
<b>Main learning during the period</b>	No learning to be shared during this period

## 2.9. Stories

<b>Stories to be shared</b>	No stories to be shared during this period
-----------------------------	--

### 3 Performance

#### 3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project outcomes

Project Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
Objective: To scale up and improve forest landscapes through community-based natural resources management in targeted transboundary landscapes.	1. Area of landscapes under participatory conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity	None	25000 hectares	25000 hectares	0%	This activity has not yet started on the ground.	U
	2. Number of institutional staff members having strengthened capacities with regard to in-situ conservation and sustainable use of peatlands, forest and biodiversity (30% women)	None	At least 180 (with a male to female ration of 1:1)	At least 350 (with a male to female ration of 1:1)	0%	No activity is deployed on the ground.	U
	3. Number of communities (COLO and PA) with provincial by-laws that can enable them to enjoy the rights to land and use the resources granted to them by legislation	Under-representation of indigenous people and local communities in land tenure policy and regulatory frameworks	Draft policy, regulatory and strategic framework on indigenous people and local community land tenure and resources user rights completed and under review	Draft policy, regulatory and strategic framework on indigenous people and local community land tenure and resources user rights submitted to the Provincial Government	8%	21 communities (COLO and PA) identified by REPALF having provincial by-laws allowing them to enjoy land rights and use their resources. These are: -Walikale 16; - Lubero 1; - Bikoro 3; - Kiri 1.However, the communities (COLO and PA) initiatives on land and resource use rights are not yet effective in Kabare, Kalehe and Lukolela in the project intervention sites.	MS

Project Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
Outcome 1.1. Three provincial governments (Ecuador, North Kivu and South Kivu) have indicative zoning plans 1.2. Legislation on land tenure and rights of use of resources of indigenous peoples and local communities enacted at the national level	4. At what level do institutional capacities need to be strengthened to enable integrated land use planning, management and monitoring of peatlands and protected forest areas compared to the UNDP scorecard?	Institutional capacity for integrated land use planning, peatland and forest area management and monitoring is limited. The UNDP scorecard will be prepared during the start-up phase of the project	Average increase of institutional capacity as measured by a 5- point increase in UNDP's Capacity Development Scorecard from baseline values	Average increase of institutional capacity as measured by 20 points in UNDP's Capacity Development Scorecard from baseline values	0	No activity deployed on the ground	U
	5. What gender policies and measures are in place to compensate for the lack of awareness, capacity and commitment to conservation, sustainable land use and equitable sharing of the benefits of Natural Resources	Gender based policies and practices not adequately addressed due to lack of awareness, capacity and commitment	At least 3 policy/ planning frameworks (one in the Lac Tele; and 2 in Grand Kivu) are implemented at the provincial level that are gender responsive in	At least 3 regulatory frameworks (one in the Lac Tele; and 2 in Grand Kivu) are implemented at the provincial level that are gender responsive in	0%	No activity deployed on the ground.	U

Project Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
			responsive in relation to conservation, sustainable use, and equitable access to and benefit sharing of natural resources	relation to conservation, sustainable use, and equitable access to and benefit sharing of natural resources			
Outcome 2: 400,000 ha of conservation areas (other than national PA) in the targeted landscape targeted have an efficient management in order to ensure the protection of the habitat of vulnerable species, the promotion of ecosystem services and the improvement of their connectivity.	6. Hectares of land under improved management in the project targeted landscapes	None	At least 200,000 hectares of peatland and forest area in the Lac Tumba Landscape; and at least 300,000 hectares of forests in Grand Kivu is under protection	At least 400,000 hectares of peatland and forest area in the Lac Tumba Landscape; and at least 600,000 hectares of forests in Grand Kivu is under protection	0%	No activity is deployed in the field.	U
	7. Improved understanding among key stakeholder groups of the value of peatlands and forest, and the importance of in situ conservation, as indicated by	None	Provisional mid-term targets:(a) Increase of at least 20% percentage	Provisional end targets: (a) Increase of at least 30% percentage points (b)	0%	No activity is deployed in the field.	U

Project Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
	results of knowledge, attitude and practices (KAP) surveys (disaggregated by women and youth), among the following stakeholder groups: (a) Provincial governmental stakeholders; (b) Local governmental stakeholders; (c) Farmers; (d) Agricultural associations and enterprises;		points(b) Increase of at least 30% percentage points (c) Increase of at least 50% percentage points (d) Increase of at least 20% percentage points	Increase of at least 30% percentage points (c) Increase of at least 50% percentage points (d) Increase of at least 350% percentage points			
Outcome 3: 25% of IPLCs in priority areas implement climate smart best practices with regard to land use	8. Number of climate smart production and land use best practices adopted by local communities and indigenous peoples (disaggregated by	There are no climate smart production practices in the project locations	At least 70 climate smart production and land use best practices adopted by local communities and indigenous peoples (with at least 25 coming from the Lac Tumba Landscape)	At least 125 climate-smart production and land use best practices adopted by local communities and indigenous peoples (with at least 60 coming from the Lac Tumba Landscape)	0%	The WWF contract is signed. Funds not yet transferred to the partner. Because the project is undergoing an audit, due to some observed irregularities in funds transferred to the EA.	U
	9. Number of business plans (micro-projects) supported	None	At least 2500 farmers (with	At least 6000 farmers (with	0%	The WWF contract is signed. Funds not yet transferred to the partner. Because	U

Project Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
	by the project (disaggregated by sex, individual or joint initiative group and Indigenous or non-Indigenous group)		at least 35% from the Lac Tumba Landscape)	at least 35% from the Lac Tumba Landscape)		the project is undergoing an audit, due to some observed irregularities in funds transferred to the EA. Activities will resume after the audit is completed	
4.1. Three DRC provinces have the capacity to monitor wildlife trafficking, land use change, SDG progress in priority areas.	10. Database/GIS set up to manage and share consolidated information	No such database exists	Four Geodatabases exist (1 centralized at national level, and 3 at provincial level)	Geodatabases are populated with existing secondary data as well as data derived from project intervention.	0%	The UNIKIN contract has been signed. Fund not yet transfer to the partner, because the project currently undergoing an audit, due to some observed irregularities in the funds transferred to the EA.	U
4.2. The Governance structure (under current treaty) improves transboundary coordination and actions against wildlife trafficking.	11. How to assess the capacity to monitor wildlife trafficking, land use change and progress on the SDGs compared to the UNDP scorecard?	Capacities for monitoring wildlife trafficking, land use changes and SDGs of forests and peatland landscapes is limited - the baseline value as measured by UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard will	Average increase of institutional capacity as measured by a 7- point increase in UNDP's Capacity Development Scorecard from baseline values	Average increase of institutional capacity as measured by 25 points in UNDP's Capacity Development Scorecard from baseline values	0%	The OCDD/ PLAN is signed. Funds not yet transferred to the partner. Because the project is undergoing an audit, due to some observed irregularities in funds transferred to the EA. Activities will resume after the audit is completed	U

Project Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
		be established during project inception					
	12. What mechanism will be put in place for enhanced cross-border cooperation leading to more effective approaches to the conservation and sustainable use of peatlands and forest landscapes, as well as to measures against wildlife trafficking?	There is no formalized transboundary cooperation initiatives in the Lac Tumba and the Grand Kivu landscapes	At least one Transboundary Coordination Committee established and providing advisory support to the project on transboundary cooperation in the management of forests and peatland landscapes and resources	Through the efforts of the Transboundary Coordination Committee, at least five coordination meetings are organized to support transboundary cooperation in the management of forests and peatland landscapes and resources	0%	The JGI contract is signed. Funds not yet transferred to the partner. Because the project is undergoing an audit, due to some observed irregularities in funds transferred to the EA. Activities will resume after the audit is completed	U

### 3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of outputs (Implementation Progress)

Component	Output/Activity	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of previous reporting period (%)	Implementation status as of current reporting period (%)	Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	Progress Rating
1	Output 1.1.1 The methodologies on the Land Use Plan (ILP) are defined within the framework of the national guidelines and are based	Second semester	20%	5%	Stakeholders working on the forestry sector, in securing community rights and	U



Component	Output/Activity	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of previous reporting period (%)	Implementation status as of current reporting period (%)	Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	Progress Rating
	on the CLIP	of the 2024 PTBA			rural development at different levels have capitalized on REPALEF's experiences on CLIP	
1 integration of land use planning models for conservation and sustainable development	Output 1.1.1 The methodologies on the Land Use Plan (ILP) are defined within the framework of the national guidelines and are based on the CLIP	Second semester of the 2024 PTBA	20%	5%	Stakeholders working on the forestry sector, in securing community rights and rural development at different levels have capitalized on REPALEF's experiences on CLIP	U
	Output 1.1.2. Land Use Plan (API) information collected with the participation of all partners (IPLC, local and government entities, FAO, WWF, etc.) is consolidated and available in a single database.	Second semester of the 2024 PTBA	5%	8%	Georeferenced CFCL data are updated and available at the MEDD level	U
	Output 1.1.3: The proposed Zoning Plan for Community Natural Resource Management (CBRM) in priority conservation areas is integrated into the indicative provincial ILP and land rights are recognized to communities on customary lands	Second semester of the 2024 PTBA	2,5%	2,5%	The results of the Integrated Land Use Planning Methodology are supported in the Three-Year Sangha Complex (TNS), TRIDOM, LTLT and the Mount Alen and Crystal Mountains landscapes. The results of the Integrated Land Use Planning Methodology are supported in the Three-Year Sangha Complex (TNS), TRIDOM, LTLT and the Mount Alen and Crystal Mountains landscapes.	
2 Ensuring biodiversity conservation and carbon sequestration in forest landscapes	2.1.1. Effective measures and type of priority conservation areas (e.g. ICCA, CFC, CPA, etc.) to meet biodiversity conservation national priorities are defined under participatory process	Second semester of the 2024 PTBA	3%	1%	The information on participatory mapping will allow a deeper analysis of the current use of space and the related rules.	U
	Output 2.1.2. More than 600,000 ha of priority conservation areas (other than national protected areas) are identified and integrated into the provincial PUP	Second semester of the 2024	5%	3,3%	Peatland areas are identified in the province of Equateur for their community security of ecosystems.	U

Component	Output/Activity	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of previous reporting period (%)	Implementation status as of current reporting period (%)	Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	Progress Rating
		PTBA				
	Output 2.1.3. At least 600,000 ha of priority conservation areas are managed using best practice approaches that protect wildlife population, ecosystem services and lead to improved connectivity.	Second semester of the 2024 PTBA	6%	1,6%	Synergy approaches are enhanced for best practice connectivity with project implementing partners including FAO.	U
3 Promotion of sustainable land management in priority landscapes	Output 3.1.1 At least 100 climate-smart sustainable projects (agroforestry production, livestock, processing and marketing) are supported under IPLC management with active integration of women and the commitment of private partners	Second semester of the 2024 PTBA	2%	0%	This output has not started due to the late establishment of the Steering Committee and the slowness of UNEP for non-objection. It is delayed for the 2024 AWPB.	U
	Output 3.1.2. Investments derived from results-based payment for ecosystem services contracts are secured by the project and applied to restore, improve carbon stock and biodiversity in at least 500,000 ha of IPLCP land	Second semester of the 2024 PTBA	4%	1,2%	Community capacities at the LTLT landscape level are strengthened on the National Payment for Environmental Services Program	U
	Output 3.1.3. The capacities of the Local IPL Development Committees in terms of elaboration, implementation, good climate practices and project monitoring are strengthened.	Second semester of the 2024 PTBA	8%	0%	Mbandaka Antenna participated at a learning workshop on ; • Data collection using the KoboCollect tool/application from August 15 to 17, 2023. • Collection of georeferenced data in private reforestation concessions across the city of Mbandaka, with the Reforestation Directorate team of the MEDD General Secretariat, from August 16 to 20, 2023.	U
4 Capacity building, knowledge management and cross-	Outcome 4.1.1: Four integrated GIS/database systems (3 at the provincial level and 1 at the national level) set up to manage and share consolidated information	Second semester of the 2024 PTBA	8%	0%	This output has not started due to the late establishment of the Steering Committee and the slowness of UNEP in providing non-objection. It is delayed to the 2024 AWPB.	U

Component	Output/Activity	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of previous reporting period (%)	Implementation status as of current reporting period (%)	Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	Progress Rating
border collaboration	Outcome 4.1.2 : Progress towards the SDGs in the project area monitored using the SDG Monitoring Tool for Rural Development (developed by MRD)	Second semester of the 2024 PTBA	1,2%	0%	This output has not started due to the late establishment of the Steering Committee and the slowness of UNEP in providing non-objection. It is delayed to the 2024 AWPB.	U
	Output. 4.2.1 : Lessons learned on effective conservation approaches in line with Outputs 2.1.1 and 2.1.3 are consolidated and shared among national and regional stakeholders	Second semester of the 2024 PTBA	5%	0%	This output has not started due to the late establishment of the Steering Committee and the slowness of UNEP in providing non-objection. It is delayed to the 2024 AWPB.	U
	Output. 4.2.2 : Project lessons learned and communications are documented and shared at local, national and regional levels.	Second semester of the 2024 PTBA	0%	100%	Capacity building of PMU held from July 10-14th 2023 by UNEP on GEF procedures	S
	Output. 4.2.3 : Multi-stakeholder cross-border initiatives (set up by the previous project) on the monitoring and enforcement of trade regulations, biodiversity monitoring, development of financial mechanisms are improved and strengthened	Second semester of the 2024 PTBA	4%	0%	This output has not started due to the late establishment of the Steering Committee and the slowness of UNEP in providing non-objection. It is delayed for the 2024 AWPB.	U

The Task Manager will decide on the relevant level of disaggregation (i.e. either at the output or activity level).

## 4 Risks

### 4.1 Table A. Project management Risk

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

Risk Factor	EA Rating	TM Rating
1 Management structure - Roles and responsibilities	Low	Moderate
2 Governance structure - Oversight	High	High
3 Implementation schedule	Low	High
4 Budget	Substantial	Substantial
5 Financial Management	Moderate	Substantial
6 Reporting	Moderate	Moderate
7 Capacity to deliver	Low	Moderate

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

### 4.2 Table B. Risk-log

#### Implementation Status (Current PIR)

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

Risks	Risk affecting: Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	Current PIR	Δ	Justification
Risk 1. National and local authorities may not consider peatlands important	Outcomes 1-2Outputs 2.1.2	L	L	L	L				=	The PMU is not in a position to provide an accurate assessment of this risk. as the project did not operate for the past 18 months.

Risks	Risk affecting: Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	Current PIR	Δ	Justification
Risk 3 Conflict between transboundary stakeholders impede the achievement of project goals	Outcomes 4.2 Output 4.2.1	L	L	L	L				=	The PMU is not in a position to provide an accurate assessment of this risk. as the project did not operate for the past 18 months.
Risk 4. Indigenous communities' lack of commitment	Outcomes 1.2 Output 11.2.	L	L	L	L				=	The PMU is not in a position to provide an accurate assessment of this risk. as the project did not operate for the past 18 months.
Risk 5 Difficulties in reconciling different stakeholder agendas. interests and positions may limit meaningful participation – especially the private sector	Outcomes 11 Output 11.1	L	L	L	L				=	The PMU is not in a position to provide an accurate assessment of this risk. as the project did not operate for the past 18 months.
Risk 6 Commercial agriculture enterprises do not engage meaningfully in the sustainable use of natural resources and biodiversity protection.	Outcomes 3.1 Output 3.1.1	M	M	M	M				=	The PMU is not in a position to provide an accurate assessment of this risk. as the project did not operate for the past 18 months.
Risk 7 Insufficient political will and capacity to improve biodiversity conservation and sustainable land management.	Outcomes 4.2 Output 4.2.1	M	M	M	M				=	The PMU is not in a position to provide an accurate assessment of this risk. as the project did not operate for the past 18 months.
Risk 8 Mechanisms of incentives for native vegetation conservation and recovery are not implemented	Outcomes 2.1 Output 2.1.1 Outcomes 2.1..2 Output 2.1.3	L	L	L	L				=	This risk will be mitigated by the project through several actions. Some incentives have already been studied and discussed with the stakeholders from the pilot areas throughout the preparation of the project. Furthermore. additional consultations with local stakeholders will be held to determine which incentives are the

Risks	Risk affecting: Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	Current PIR	Δ	Justification
										most viable and accepted. Finally, the reasons why some incentive mechanisms implemented in the region have or have not worked will be assessed
Risk 9 Existing programmes and projects may be duplicated	Outcomes 2.1 Output 2.1.2	M	M	M	M				=	The PMU is not in a position to provide an accurate assessment of this risk, as the project did not operate for the past 18 months.
Risk 10 Stakeholders of the pilot areas do not engage in project's activities	Outcomes 4.2 Output 4.2.1	L	L	L	L				=	The PMU is not in a position to provide an accurate assessment of this risk, as the project did not operate for the 18 months.
Risk 11 The rural landowners do not improve biodiversity conservation in their properties	Outcomes 2.1 Output 2.1.3	M	M	M	M				=	The PMU is not in a position to provide an accurate assessment of this risk, as the project did not operate for the past 18 months.
Risk 12 Low replicability, sustainability and amplification of the project	Outcomes 4.2 Output 4.2.1	L	L	L	L				=	The PMU is not in a position to provide an accurate assessment of this risk, as the project did not operate for the past 18 months.
Risk 13 Climate Change and extreme weather events affect negatively the project implementation. SLM, SFM and native	Outcomes 3.1 Output 3.1.1	H	H	H	H				=	The PMU is not in a position to provide an accurate assessment of this risk, as the project did not operate for the 18 months.
Risk 14 Local and regional authorities fail to assume their roles in ensuring the participatory management of resources at the productive landscape level and the	Outcomes 3.1 Output 3.1.1 Outcome 3.1.1	L	L	L	L				=	The PMU is not in a position to provide an accurate assessment of this risk, as the project did not operate for the past 18 months.

Risks	Risk affecting: Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	Current PIR	Δ	Justification
regulatory support										
Risk 15 Climate change may increase the threats to peatlands and tropical forests. This may be due to new invasions of exotic species that are more resistant to new climate conditions. through droughts that increases the likelihood of fires. flooding and increase stress of native populations.	Outcomes 3.1.1 Output 3.1.2	M	M	M	M				=	The PMU is not in a position to provide an accurate assessment of this risk. as the project did not operate for the past 18 months.
Risk 16 Continuous granting of mining permits and licenses	Outcomes 3.1 Output 3.1.2	M	M	M	M				=	The PMU is not in a position to provide an accurate assessment of this risk. as the project did not operate for the past 18 months.
Risk 17 Corona virus interrupts the smooth implementation of project activities		M	M	M	M				=	The impact of corona virus in sub-Saharan Africa has not been as bad as it has been in many parts of the world. This project will adhere to all governmental efforts at reducing the spread of the virus among populations both in the project area and beyond. These measures in recent months have not been as stringent as they were in the beginning months of the pandemic
Risk 18 The security situation deteriorates. hampering project activities and effortsThe security situation deteriorates. hampering project activities and efforts	Outcomes 4.2 Output 4.2.3	M	M	M	M				=	The PMU is not in a position to provide an accurate assessment of this risk. as the project did not operate for the past 18 months.
Risk 19 Land Right	Outcomes 1.2 Output 1.1.3	M	M	M	M				=	The PMU is not in a position to provide an accurate assessment of

Risks	Risk affecting: Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	Current PIR	Δ	Justification
										this risk. as the project did not operate for the past 18 months.
Risk 2. Local communities and stakeholders from key sectors do not adopt the proposed good practices and voluntary sustainable management measures	Outcomes 3 Output 3.1	M	M	M	M				=	The PMU is not in a position to provide an accurate assessment of this risk. as the project did not operate for the past 18 months.
		M	M	M	M				=	The consolidated risk is moderate, because despite the fact that the risk profile of the project has been raised, UNEP is carrying out an independent audit of the project, through the HACT (Harmonised Approach to Cash Transfers) framework, to address the outstanding technical and operational issues, before project activities resume

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

Additional mitigation measures for the next periods

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	What	When	By Whom
Risk 2 Local communities and stakeholders from key sectors do not adopt the proposed good practices and voluntary sustainable	Project inception in the areas of intervention in 2022	None	Project Audit ongoing	August 2024	UNEP



<b>Risk</b>	<b>Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.)</b>	<b>Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period</b>	<b>What</b>	<b>When</b>	<b>By Whom</b>
management measures					
Risk 6 Commercial agriculture enterprises do not engage meaningfully in the sustainable use of natural resources and biodiversity protection	None	None	Project Audit ongoing	August 2024	UNEP
Risk 7 "Insufficient political will and capacity to improve biodiversity conservation and sustainable landmanagement"	None	None	Project Audit ongoing	August 2024	UNEP
Risk 9 Existing programmes and projects may be duplicated	None	None	Project Audit ongoing	August 2024	UNEP
Risk 11 The rural landowners do not improve biodiversity conservation in them properties	None	None	Project audit ongoing	August 2024	UNEP
RISK 13 Climate Change and extreme weather events affect negatively the project implementation. SLM. SFM and native	None	None	Project Audit ongoing	August 2024	UNEP
RISK 15 Climate change may increase the threats to peatlands and tropical forests. This may be due to	None	None	Project Audit ongoing	August 2024	UNEP

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	What	When	By Whom
new invasions of exotic species that are more resistant to new climate conditions. through droughts that increases the likelihood of fires. flooding and increase stress of native populations.					
RISK 16 Continuous granting of mining permits and licenses	None	None	project ongoing	August 2024	UNEP
RISK 17 Corona virus interrupts the smooth implementation of project activities	None	None	Project audit ongoing	August 2024	UNEP
RISK 18 The security situation deteriorates. hampering project activities and efforts	None	None	project audit ongoing	August 2024	UNEP
RISK 19 Land Right: Throughout the country. there are competing demands for access to and control of land	None	None	Project audit ongoing	August 2024	UNEP
2 Governance structure - Oversight	Online Meeting with the PMU to address Project Management challenges (issues with subcontracts.	UNEP conducted a supervisory mission in Kinshasa between 10-14 July 2023. focusing on	To address this compliance issue. UNEP. in line with clause 38 of the PCA. commissioned an	August 2024	UNEP

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	What	When	By Whom
	budget management. etc.) . Task Manager mission to Kinshasa to provide support to project startup.	training and problem-solving. with the aim of enhancing the executing agency project team's compliance with UNEP GEF technical and financial standards.	independent audit of the project which should commence in July 2024 2024		
4 Budget	Online Meeting with the PMU to address Project Management challenges (issues with sub contracts. budget management. etc.) . Task Manager mission to Kinshasa to provide support to project startup.	UNEP conducted a supervisory mission in Kinshasa between 10-14 July 2023. focusing on training and problem-solving. with the aim of enhancing the executing agency project team's compliance with UNEP GEF technical and financial standards.	To address this compliance issue. UNEP. in line with clause 38 of the PCA. commissioned an independent audit of the project which should commence in July 2024 2024	August 2024	UNEP
5 Financial Management	Online Meeting with the PMU to address Project Management challenges (issues with sub contracts. budget management. etc.) . Task Manager mission to Kinshasa to provide support to project startup.	UNEP conducted a supervisory mission in Kinshasa between 10-14 July 2023. focusing on training and problem-solving. with the aim of enhancing the executing agency project team's compliance with UNEP GEF technical and financial	To address this compliance issue. UNEP. in line with clause 38 of the PCA. commissioned an independent audit of the project which should commence in July 2024 2024	August 2024	UNEP

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	What	When	By Whom
		standards.			
6 Reporting	Online Meeting with the PMU to address Project Management challenges (issues with sub contracts. budget management. etc.) . Task Manager mission to Kinshasa to provide support to project startup.	UNEP conducted a supervisory mission in Kinshasa between 10-14 July 2023. focusing on training and problem-solving. with the aim of enhancing the executing agency project team's compliance with UNEP GEF technical and financial standards.	To address this compliance issue. UNEP. in line with clause 38 of the PCA. commissioned an independent audit of the project which should commence in July 2024 2024	August 2024	UNEP
1. Management structure - Roles and responsibilities	Online Meeting with the PMU to address Project Management challenges (issues with sub contracts. budget management. etc.) . Task Manager mission to Kinshasa to provide support to project startup.	UNEP conducted a supervisory mission in Kinshasa between 10-14 July 2023. focusing on training and problem-solving. with the aim of enhancing the executing agency project team's compliance with UNEP GEF technical and financial standards.	To address this compliance issue. UNEP. in line with clause 38 of the PCA. commissioned an independent audit of the project which should commence in July 2024 2024	August 2024	UNEP
3 Implementation schedule	Online Meeting with the PMU to address Project Management challenges (issues with sub contracts. budget management. etc.) .	UNEP conducted a supervisory mission in Kinshasa between 10-14 July 2023. focusing on training and problem-	To address this compliance issue. UNEP. in line with clause 38 of the PCA. commissioned an independent audit of the	August 2024	UNEP

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	What	When	By Whom
	Task Manager mission to Kinshasa to provide support to project startup.	solving. with the aim of enhancing the executing agency project team's compliance with UNEP GEF technical and financial standards.	project which should commence in July 2024 2024		
7 Capacity to deliver	Online Meeting with the PMU to address Project Management challenges (issues with sub contracts. budget management. etc.) . Task Manager mission to Kinshasa to provide support to project startup.	UNEP conducted a supervisory mission in Kinshasa between 10-14 July 2023. focusing on training and problem-solving. with the aim of enhancing the executing agency project team's compliance with UNEP GEF technical and financial standards.	To address this compliance issue. UNEP. in line with clause 38 of the PCA. commissioned an independent audit of the project which should commence in July 2024 2024	August 2024	UNEP

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

## 5 Amendment - GeoSpatial

### Project Minor Amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines. Please tick each category for which a change occurred in the fiscal year of reporting and provide a description of the change that occurred in the textbox. You may attach supporting document as appropriate

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

Minor Amendments	Changes
Results Framework:	No
Components and Cost:	No
Institutional and implementation arrangements:	No
Financial Management:	No
Implementation Schedule:	
Executing Entity:	No
Executing Entity Category:	No
Minor project objective change:	No
Safeguards:	No
Risk analysis:	No
Increase of GEF financing up to 5%:	No
Location of project activity:	No
Other:	No

Minor amendments

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

Version	Type	Signed/Approved by UNEP	Entry Into Force (last signature Date)	Agreement Expiry Date	Main changes introduced in this revision

Version	Type	Signed/Approved by UNEP	Entry Into Force (last signature Date)	Agreement Expiry Date	Main changes introduced in this revision

GEO Location Information:

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

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	GEO Name ID	Location Description	Activity Description
The Virunga corridor	-0.0649884	29.5107708		The Landscape is centered on the central moat of the Albertine Rift occupied by Lake Edward (916 m. 2.240 km <sup>2</sup> ) and vast plains that extend between 680 and 1.450 m above sea level. Its western boundary stretches along the steep eastern slope of the Mitumba mountain range that forms the western bulge of the rift. To the northeast, it includes the western slope of the Ruwenzori horst with its active glaciers whose summit rises to 5.119 m and whose very steep relief	The main land use is conservation (52%); About 80% of the land outside the national parks is used for permanent agriculture. Industrial crops include coffee, tea, cocoa. With the exception of fishing in Lake Edward, there are no protected areas with extractive activities and there are no forest concessions.

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	GEO Name ID	Location Description	Activity Description
				includes many ancient glacial valleys. To the south, on the border between the DRC and Rwanda, it includes Virunga, a series of eight central volcanoes surrounded by countless weedy volcanoes that emerge from a vast lava plateau.	
The Corridor Maiko National Park	-0.3999984	27.5666644		The Landscape is located in the east of the Democratic Republic of Congo. It covers 67.121 km <sup>2</sup> and includes the Kahuzi-Biega and Maiko National Parks as well as the Tayna Nature Reserve. All protected areas represent 27.4% of the Landscape.	Outside protected areas, most of the land is not earmarked for any particular use. There are no formal forest concessions in the Landscape, but artisanal logging has long existed around some villages.
Paysage Lacs Télé-Tumba	1.1895	17.2293		The Télé-Tumba Landscape is located in the center of the Congolese Cuvette and centered on the Télé lakes in the Republic of Congo. Tumba and Mai-Ndombe in RDC.	On a landscape scale, 3.5% of the area (440.000 ha) is occupied by the Community reserve. The rest (12.644.000 ha) is made of parts without zoning. In the eastern part there is the small scientific reserve of Mabali (1.900 ha or 0.02% of the eastern part of the landscape).



Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	GEO Name ID	Location Description	Activity Description
Kahuzi Biega National Park	-1.96326	28.018609		The Landscape is located in the east of the Democratic Republic of Congo. It covers 67.121 km <sup>2</sup> and includes the Kahuzi-Biega and Maiko National Parks as well as the Tayna Nature Reserve. All protected areas represent 27.4% of the Landscape.	Outside protected areas. most of the land is not earmarked for any particular use. There are no formal forest concessions in the Landscape. but artisanal logging has long existed around some villages.

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

[Annex any linked geospatial file]