FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report
2023 – Revised Template
Period covered: 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

Table of contents

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Central Africa
Country (ies):	Equatorial Guinea
Project Title:	Promoting Community-Based Forestry for Climate Change Mitigation and Sustainable Livelihoods in Equatorial Guinea.
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/EQG/018/GFF
GEF ID:	10034
GEF Focal Area(s):	Climate Change
Project Executing Partners:	• Ministry of Forest and Environment (New denomination) • National Institute of Environmental Conservation (INCOMA) • National Institute for Forestry Development and Management of the Protected Areas System (INDEFOR-AP) • National Institute of Agricultural Promotion of Equatorial Guinea (INPAGE)
Initial project duration (years):	4 years (01/07/2021 to 30/06/2026)
Project coordinates: *This section should be completed ONLY by:* a) *Projects with 1st PIR;* b) *In case the geographic coverage of project activities has changed since last reporting period.*	See Annex 2

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	May 28, 2021
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD:	December 01, 2021
Project Implementation End Date/NTE[1]:	Nov 30, 2026
Revised project implementation End date (if approved)	NA

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	5 329 455 USD
Total Co-financing amount (USD)[2]:	12 941 133 USD
Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD):	245,660 USD
Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD)[3]:	230,467 USD
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023[4]	2,567,974 USD

---

[1] As pe r FPMIS

[2] This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO Document/Project Document.

[3] The amount should show the values included in the financial statements generated by IMIS.

[4] Please refer to the Section 13 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

M&E Milestones

Date of Last Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	25 January 2023
Expected Mid-term Review date[5]:	January 2025
Actual Mid-term review date (if already completed):	NA
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date[6]:	01 June 2026
Tracking tools (TT)/Core indicators (CI) updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	NA

Overall ratings

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

ESS risk classification

Current ESS Risk classification:	Low

Status

Implementation Status *(1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):*	1st PIR

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Coordinator (PC)/CTA	Hernandez Ramirez, Juan Carlos	Juan.HernandezRamirez@fao.org
Budget Holder (BH)	Hernani Coelho Da Silva/ FAOR	Hernani.CoelhoDaSilva@fao.org
GEF Operational Focal Point (GEF OFP)	Antonio Micha Ondo	amicha_antonio@yahoo.fr
Lead Technical Officer (LTO)	Jeremie Mbairamadji / FAO SFC LTO Marieke Sandker / FAO NFO HQ Officer	jeremie.mbairamadji@fao.org marieke.sandker@fao.org
GEF Technical Officer, GTO	Kuena Morebotsane, FAO OCB	Kuena.morebotsane@fao.org

---

[5] The Mid-Term Review (MTR) should take place after the 2nd PIR, around half-point between EOD and NTE. The MTR report in English should be submitted to the GEF Secretariat within 4 years of the CEO Endorsement date.
[6] The Terminal Evaluation date should be discussed with OED 6 months before the project's NTE date.

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

Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.							
Project or Development Objective	**Outcomes**	**Outcome indicators[7]**	**Baseline**	**Mid-term Target[8]**	**End-of-project Target**	**Cumulative progress[9] since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023**	**Progress rating[10]**
To conserve and enhance forest carbon stocks and promote sustainable livelihoods through a community-based sustainable model of forest and land management	**Outcome 1:** Strengthened legal and policy framework to enable the conservation, sustainable management and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in communal forests.	Degree of support to community-based forest management, taking into account gender dimensions, in revised legal texts and policy documents.	Preliminary analyses done under the development of the REDD+ National Investment Plan: • Law 1/1997 on forests • Law 7/2003 on environment • Law 4/2009 on land tenure • PNAF 2000	3 Amendment proposals undergoing consultations	3 Amendments submitted and undergoing approval by responsible authorities.	A support process has started with key institutions namely INCOMA and INDEFOR-AP. Stakeholder consultation processes were initiated and the first draft of amendments to the Forestry Law 1/1997 and the Environment Law 7/2003 are being prepared. The consultation of the National Forestry Action Plan (PNAF) 2024 is being prepared. 20% cumulative level of achievement	S
	Outcome 2: Improved	**Indicator 2.1.** Systematized	None	1 Accessible information	1	The geographic information module was finalized and the	S

---

[7] This is taken from the approved results framework of the project.

[8] 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.

[9] Please report on results obtained in terms of Global Environmental Benefits and Socio-economic co-benefits as well.

[10] 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). Refer to Annex 1.

institutional capacity and knowledge to support community-based sustainable forest and land management within the REDD+ framework.	information and knowledge on forests available to facilitate strategic planning and decision making of institutions.		system with the compilation of relevant data.		system model is being developed with inter-institutional collaboration agreements for the supply and maintenance of updated data. 15% cumulative level of achievement	
	Indicator 2.2. Number of staff and students (gender disaggregated) trained and effectively supporting implementation of community-based sustainable land and forest management	None	> 4 students (at least 50% women) >20 of staff from key institutions with enhanced capacities and effectively supporting implementation of activities.	> 10 students (at least 50% women) >50 of staff trained and effectively supporting implementation.	2 students (both women) and 8 staff (2 women) were trained on community-based sustainable forest management and had improved their capacities in sustainable forest management. 18% cumulative level of achievement	S
	Indicator 2.3. Strategy to promote community-based forest and land management, based on learning from model cases.	None	0	1 Validated national strategy.	The strategy focused on environmental carbon services and biodiversity with good agro-silvicultural practices in development under REDD+ 10% cumulative level of achievement	S
Outcome 3: Communal and national forests and lands under sustainable, gender responsive, management generating climate change mitigation	**Indicator 3.1.** Area of communal forests under sustainable management	0	Sustainable forest management plan for communal forests	Sustainable forest management plans under implementation. At least 11,200 ha of communal forests managed sustainably.	Sustainable forest management plans procedures and methodologies in development aligned with legal amendments of forest Law 1/1997 and Environmental Law 7/2004	S

and socio-economic benefits.					Two pilot areas with 1.500 ha of communal forest under sustainable management complying with forest management plans.	
	Indicator 3.2 Forest degradation in targeted communal forests versus average in communal forests in the country.	To be determined through Trends Earth, Roadless or Global Forest Change (GFC)		Degradation decreased (comparison with other communal forests)	Degradation baseline in construction for pilot areas	S
	Indicator 3.3. Number of climate-friendly land/forest enterprises and initiatives, generating sustainable income.	0	> 6	> 6	Two initiatives in development and agreements with owners	S
	Indicator 3.4 Developed technical capacity of selected small coffee producers (women and men).	10 (INPAGE estimations)	>100 smallholders trained (target 50% women)	>100 smallholders trained	LoA under preparation with INPAGE for the implementation of this activity.	S
	Indicator 3.5 Number of women coconut oil organizations empowered.	0	10 organizations	10 organizations	12-woman groups identified and the social partner	S
Outcome 4: Project implementation and results monitored, evaluated and disseminated for national scaling-up.	**Indicator 4.1.** Project management unit effectively manages and supervises results.	0	1 Functioning Project Management Unit	1 Project management unit effectively manages and supervises results	In progress 20%	S
	Indicator 4.2. Project is effectively monitored and evaluated.	0	1 Project is effectively monitored and evaluated.	1	In progress 20%	S
	Indicator 4.3. Project results effectively disseminated to all relevant stakeholders.	0	0	1 Implemented communication plan	In progress 20%	S

| | | Indicator 4.1. Project management unit effectively manages and supervises results. | 0 | 1 Functioning Project Management Unit | 1 Project management unit effectively manages and supervises results | In progress 20% | S |

Measures taken to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings on Section 2

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outcomes and Outputs[11]	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements[12] (please DO NOT repeat results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance[13] in delivering outputs
Outcome 1: **Strengthened legal and policy framework to enable the conservation, sustainable management and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in communal forests.**	Degree of support to community-based forest management, taking into account gender dimensions, in revised legal texts and policy documents.	Consultations and draft documents in elaboration.	One public consultation and first draft document under review (Forest Law 1997/1 and Environmental Law 4/2007)	A restructuring of the public administration led to a delay in the implementation of actions on the ground as the partner institutions changed their structure and attributions.
Output 1.1 Amendments to the legal framework and policy instruments (i.e. Forest Law, Land Ownership Law, PNAF) to enable sustainable community-based forest management developed and submitted to the Government for adoption	Number of amendments developed and summited	0	An amendment package of two legal framework and policy instruments under review	The restructuring of MAGBOMA led to a delay in implementation due to changes in its structure and attributions.
Outcome 2: **Improved institutional capacity and knowledge to support community-based sustainable forest and land management within the REDD+ framework.**	Improved institutional capacity and knowledge to support community-based sustainable forest and land management within the REDD+ framework.	0	The information system and development of capacities are in progress.	

---

[11] Outputs as described in the project Logframe or in any approved project revision.

[12] 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)

[13] Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

Output 2.1 Information and knowledge system for planning and decision making on land and forest management.	Accessible information system with the compilation of relevant data	0	The general design of the system started, and the geographic information module was 80% completed.	
Output 2.2 Comprehensive capacity development programme for community-based sustainable forest management implemented - (engaging INCOMA, INDEFOR, INPAGE, UNGE and ECAs).	Number of staff and students (gender disaggregated) trained and effectively supporting implementation of community-based sustainable land and forest management	0	10 Staff and 2 students in training	Achieved more than expected annual target
Output 2.3 National strategy developed to promote community-based sustainable forest and land management.	Validated national strategy	0	The report is planned to be drafted in the second semester of 2025	
Outcome 3: **Communal and national forests and lands under sustainable, gender responsive, management generating climate change mitigation and socio-economic benefits.**	Sustainable forest management plan for communal	0	Strategy and activities in progress	
Output 3.1 A replicable model of community sustainable land and forest management designed and implemented.	Sustainable forest management plans under implementation	0	At least 3,200 ha of communal forests developing sustainably management plans	
Output 3.2 Climate-smart agroforestry enterprises supported on production and value chain development.	Identification and promotion of climate friendly small-scale enterprises, initiatives and partnerships.	0	Coffee, coconut, ovens and agroforestry under identification	The restructuring of MAGBOMA led to a delay in implementation due to changes in its structure and attributions.
Outcome 4: **Project implementation and results monitored, evaluated and**	Project management unit effectively manages and supervises results	1	Project Management Unit integrated and functionally.	

disseminated for national scaling-up.				
Output 4.1 Results-based M&E system designed and implemented; midterm and final evaluations conducted; and project results disseminated through a communication plan.	Project is effectively monitored and evaluated.	0	Project Management Unit integrated and functionally, engaging with the national partners	

4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

Please provide a summary paragraph on progress, challenges and outcomes of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR (max 400 words)

The project activities are being developed in all its components. In Outcome 1, draft amendments to the Forestry Law 1/1997 and the Environmental Law 4/2007 have already been prepared and reviewed by the Ministry of Forestry. The Protected Areas Law was also added, given the relevant linkage. In Outcome 2, the integration of available information has begun, and the integral structure of the Information System is under design. The Geographic Information Module is 80% completed. In Outcome 3, the technical sub-team was integrated with staff designated by the partner institutions. Work has also begun on the design of sustainable forest management plans, including the definition of management objectives, forest management techniques, the development of methodologies and training for the institutional technical staff involved. At the same time, social appropriation work has begun.

In terms of institutional participation, it was necessary to advance the capacity building work planned with the National University of Equatorial Guinea (Outcome 2) due to the short periods of academic activity in the country and the lack of collaborators in the continental region.
It should be noted that there is a serious lack of technical and managerial staff in national institutions and the low quality of university training is reflected in the staff of the partner institutions. It is also necessary to highlight the lack of financial and material contribution from the governmental sector for the operational implementation of the activities during the reported period.

A relevant element is the change in the governmental structure, in which the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Forestry and Environment underwent a substantial modification in organizational attributions, which has seriously slowed down the work given the still prevailing lack of definition in various matters and powers of its officials and community members are participating in the entire process.

It is an important reconsideration to implement the OPIM mechanism, given that the institutions and their personnel do not have the training, technical and particularly managerial capacities required. In this case, the recommendation is to maintain the current setting of the management of the project by the Project Management Unit for the next two years and gradually make a transition by to government institutions prepared to take the technical lead of the project implementation, thus seeking to reduce the risk of non-compliance with the objectives set. It is necessary for the government counterpart to make the financial and in-kind investments required for the execution of activities.

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.

	FY2023 Development Objective rating[14]	FY2023 Implementation Progress rating[15]	Comments/reasons[16] justifying the ratings for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator/CTA	S	S	The Project Management Unit has been able to establish the members of the technical sub-team and to provide support to the partner institutions INCOMA and INDEFOR. The capacities of the institutional personnel are very limited, but significant progress has been made in the training of skills for the development of forest management plans and inventories. At the same time, training in administrative and management skills is being provided to institutional members. There have been significant delays due to suspensions caused by an electoral process, government restructuring, and the health contingency caused by the Marburg virus It is necessary to adjust the original project budget to adjust it to a scenario more in line with reality, as well as to reschedule several activities since it will not be possible to implement them on the date foreseen in the ProDoc. It is suggested that the OPIM mechanism be postponed for at least 24 months more, since the partner institutions do not have the technical and management capacities to fully implement it. A process of gradual transition of the project actions will be carried out starting in year two.
Budget Holder	S	S	The Project has presented a moderate delay in the planned due to challenges out of control related to the government restructuration, the democratic elections period and the lack of financial support by government. However, a progress has been made in almost programmed activities especially in Outputs 1 and 3. It to acknowledge project governance roll-out and coordination meetings with government counterpart to address project challenges, ensuring that project get on track and the remaining activities to be completed by the end of this year. It is considered necessary to temporarily postpone the transfer of the OPIM mechanism and to maintain FAO's leadership in order to meet the planned objectives and to develop and improve the institutional management and technical capacities of the staff of these institutions.

---

[14] **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.

[15] **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.

[16] Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence.

GEF Operational Focal Point[17]	HS	HS	The project is still in its initial phase of implementation. The FAO national office has made significant efforts to advance in the implementation of the activities, but budget adjustments are required to make the ProDoc fit reality. It should be noted that to date coordination has been maintained between the Project Management Unit and INCOMA, as well as monitoring by the National FAO Office.
Lead Technical Officer[18]	S	MS	Considering the lack of technical and managerial capacity in national institutions of the country that will be taken the lead of this project implementation through OPIM setting hence, the need to build and prepare these institutions by the project unit to that important responsibility and also that activities related to improvement of legal texts on forest and environment achieved so far are not easy to conduct as they involve different institutions out of the project control, the overall achievements of this project during the PIR reporting period is satisfactory.
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	S	MS	It is recommended that the Budget Holder engages the Senior Regional Operational Partnership Officer (FAO Regional Office for Africa) and OPIM team (FAO Project Support Division) for support to prepare the partners for OPIM.

---

[17] In case the GEF OFP didn't provide his/her comments, please explain the reason.
[18] The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

This section is under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

Please describe the progress made to comply 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. Please indicate if new risks have emerged during this FY.

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

In case the project did not include an ESM Plan **at CEO endorsement stage, please indicate:**

Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)	Current ESS risk classification Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid[19]. If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low	Low

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.
NO

---

[19] **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit (Esm-unit@fao.org) should be contacted. The project shall prepare or amend an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) or other ESS instruments and management tools based on the new risk classification (please refer to page 13 https://www.fao.org/3/cb9870en/cb9870en.pdf)

6. Risks

The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified during the 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[20]	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	Certain national development policies in conflict with REDD+ aims.	Moderate	Y	Efforts to establish a REDD+ mechanism in Equatorial Guinea, supported by FAO, seek to ensure that the country adopts an economic development path that does not exacerbate pressures on forests, and supports its conservation and sustainable management.	A REDD+ National Investment Plan has been developed and validated. This was supported by FAO with an allocation of 150,000 USD from the Technical Cooperation Programme	

---

[20] Risk ratings means a rating of 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[20]	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
2	Insufficient technical capabilities of national personnel or lack of interest to carry out project activities	Moderate	Y	Outputs 2.2 and 3.1. involve actions to mitigate this risk, including training of trainers to improve the scope of capacity development efforts. In addition, the planned budget for training is adequate so that capacities are developed in a comprehensive and exhaustive manner, to ensure sustainability	The capacity building of the national technical personnel was planned, and the training activities are followed to address this risk	It is necessary to increase the budget amount to improve capacities and provide appropriate equipment and materials
3	Limited or no uptake of project outcomes.	High	Y	Outputs 1.1., 2.1., 2.2, 3.1 and 3.2 involve actions to mitigate this risk.	All interested parties are involved in the development of the activities, ensuring that they validate the results of the project but are not	
4	Social and/or political instability.	High	Y	Follow relevant FAO/UN protocols if the stable political situation in the country changes and civil disturbances occur.	Constant monitoring of the political situation in the country is carried out by the UNCT, including FAO, and UNDSS	
5	Availability of co-financing amounts indicated at ProDoc	High	NO	Adaptive management measures will be triggered to ensure the project is able to deliver expected results despite the lack of materialization of co-financing.	Given the lack of co-financing in terms of vehicles provided by the government to cover transportation needs for field activities, the project assessed relevant alternatives and adopted appropriate solutions in terms of their cost-effectiveness and best value for money.	

	Type of risk	Risk rating[20]	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
6	Use of cash in field missions related to mission expenses at local level where there is no access to electronic payment systems	High	N	Cash management is limited to project team who receive instructions on eligible concepts for mission expenses at field level.	A detailed list of items eligible for mission spending at the field level is prepared at each mission and those responsible for cash management are instructed on its use	

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

FY2022 rating	FY2023 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Low	Medium	The lack of co-financing and external events in the country are negatively affecting the implementation of the activities foreseen in the project due to the departure of the project.

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 during this Fiscal Year
Recommendation 1:	
Recommendation 2:	
Recommendation 3:	
Recommendation….	
Recommendation…..	

Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please summarize	

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[21]. 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			
Components and cost			
Institutional and implementation arrangements			
Financial management			
Implementation schedule			
Executing Entity			
Executing Entity Category			
Minor project objective change			
Safeguards			
Risk analysis			
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%			
Co-financing	Government co-financing did not materialize, making field work difficult, hence the need to revise the budget to cover the costs of transportation, Internet services, local transportation and contingencies for field work, while ensuring the basic technical interventions of the project.	Since project started	
Location of project activity			
Other minor project amendment (define)			

---

21 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	Type of partnership	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
Government institutions			
INCOMA	Key institution for the coordination and execution of activities.	Constant participation in activities and in the steering committee	None
INDEFOR-AP	Key partner for the coordination and execution of activities; in particular, those related to components 2 and 3 of the project.	Constant participation in project activities and in the steering committee. The institution provides personnel to carry out field work.	None
INPAGE	Key partner for the coordination and execution of activities; in particular, those related to component 3 of the project.	Participation the steering committee	None
NGOs[22]			
Several NGOs	Share the project results	NGOs were involved in various activities conducted by the project including consultations and workshops	None
Private sector entities			
Forest industry of the country	Share the project results and apply a survey about the siatuation of the forest industry in the country.	Participation in project launch event	None
Others[23]			
UNGE	Training students on field data collection will be coordinated with UNGE, seeking for its involvement. The participation of female advanced students of the Environmental Sciences carrier will also be coordinated, motivating them to develop a career in this field.	Participation of 2 students who have completed their studies in training events and in the Community Forest Management methodologies design and field work	

---

[22] Non-government organizations

[23] 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

Local communities	Be informed about the FCB process and accompany the field activities as local guides, and as technical communitarian agents for forest management	Participation in 3 communities field work	Most communities in the continental region speak Fang, so it is important that at least one crew member speaks Fang to facilitate rapprochement and communication. On the other hand, a very formal permitting process is required to access the communities.
New stakeholders identified			

10.Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on Gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable) <u>during this reporting period.</u>

Category	Yes/No	Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period.
Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.	Yes	The recommendations of the gender analysis conducted during the design stage continue to inform project implementation, efforts were made to the extent possible to capture the gender perspective in reports, ensure gender balance in Project trainings and events, and adopt gender-sensitive data collection protocols.
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes	Progress was made in terms of supporting women participation into decision making.
Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):		
a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources	Yes	Outcomes 2.2, 3.1, 3.2 involve achievement of women participation
b) improving women's participation and decision making	Yes	Efforts have been made to involve a greater number of women in the training events and in the technical activities of the project so that in the future they have the necessary tools to make decisions to improve the management of the country's forest
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	Yes	Outcomes 2.2, 3.1, 3.2 involve achievement of women participation
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	Yes	In training events and other activities, participation is disaggregated by gender
Staff with gender expertise	No	Only the CTA has training in gender
Any other good practices on gender	No	

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.	Yes, project's products focus on the generation of national knowledge and capabilities
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges **this year**.	The project has not developed a communication strategy yet, but in part of the M&E activities. Additionally the FAO Country office has a communication strategy that supports the dissemination and visibility of the activities of all the projects under implementation.
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.	
Please provide links to related website, social media account	https://www.fao.org/guinea-ecuatorial/recursos/es/ https://www.silvahn.com/BibliografiaINFGE/app_Login/ https://www.silvahn.com/infguineaecuatorial/app_Login/
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	In the website https://www.silvahn.com/BibliografiaINFGE/app_Login/ There is a list of publications related with the AFOLU sector. In the website https://www.silvahn.com/infguineaecuatorial/app_Login/ there is a picture collection
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's name and contact details	Antonio Micha Ondo +240 555 356149

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, describe the process and current status of ongoing or completed legitimate consultations to obtain the free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) of indigenous communities.

Are indigenous peoples or local communities actively participating in project activities? If yes, briefly describe how.

Sustainable Management of Community Forests requires many field activities in both biophysical and socioeconomic aspects, so it is necessary to have the authorization and consent of local communities to access forest areas. Generally, before starting measurement activities, meetings are held with community leaders, who are informed about the activities to be carried out and their importance for the government and the country in general. Local guides and tree species identifiers from the communities are hired to accompany the field work. Socioeconomic surveys are conducted with focus groups in which both men and women participate.

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing[24]	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing[25]	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2023	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
Government	INCOMA INDEFOR-AP+ INPAGE	In kind		66,545 USD		66,545 USD
Donor Agency	GCF	Grant		300,000[26] USD		300,000 USD
Recipient Government	MAGBOMA	Grant	8,000,000	0 USD		8,000,000 USD
Recipient Government	MAGBOMA	In-kind	3,000,000	1500 USD		3,000,000 USD
GEF Agency	FAO (UTF)	Grant	641,133	899,929[27] USD		899,929 USD
GEF Agency	FAO (CAFI)	Grant	1,200,000	1,200,000[28] USD		1,200,000 USD
GEF Agency	FAO (TCP)	Grant	100,000	100,000[29] USD		100,000 USD
	TOTAL		12,941,133	2,567,974 USD		13,566,474 USD

[24]Sources of Co-financing may include: GEF Agency, Donor Agency, Recipient Country Government, Private Sector, Civil Society Organization, Beneficiaries, Other.

[25]Grant, Loan, Equity Investment, Guarantee, In-Kind, Public Investment, Other (please refer to the *Guidelines on co-financing* for definitions

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_FI_GN_01_Cofinancing_Guidelines_2018.pdf

26 Resilient Recovery Rapid Readiness Support in Equatorial Guinea

27 Strengthening of the agricultural research and extension service of Equatorial Guinea

[28] Assessment of deforestation and forest degradation and related direct drivers using SEPAL

[29] Formulation support of the National Plan of Territorial Planning of Equatorial Guinea

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

At the time of project formulation, the government, through INDEFOR and INCOMA, identified their contribution with office facilities, staff time, vehicles and other aspects as a co-financing to carry out project activities. However, after two years the counterpart does not have vehicles in good condition, many of them are damaged and it does not have funds to repair. The Project counterpart has taken steps to acquire three new vehicles, but their acquisition is uncertain and may take a long time for government to allocate resources for INCOMA and INDEFOR for vehicles acquisition.

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

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

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

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

Annex 2.

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 & Activity Description
Bisobinam	569693.76 N 1.209305	133672.77 E 9.626446	WGS 84 / UTM 32 Decimals Degrees	Design and implementation of a replicable model of sustainable community forest and land management.
Atom-Kukumanko	728719.33 N 1.311586	145063.87 E 11.055534	WGS 84 / UTM 32 Decimals Degrees	Design and implementation of a replicable model of sustainable community forest and land management. (in prospective)
Mbini	567815.52 N 1.56429	172911.3 E 9.609655	WGS 84 / UTM 32 Decimals Degrees	Selection of women's groups for the promotion of improved ovens to reduce fuelwood demand
Bata	590547.50 N 1.820585	201250.45 E 9.814108	WGS 84 / UTM 32 Decimals Degrees	Establishment of a coordination and technical sub-team responsible for implementation of field activities and collaboration with communities. Implementation of a comprehensive capacity building program for sustainable community land and forest management. Information and knowledge system for land and forest management planning and decision making.
Malabo	470646.07 N 3.757709	415350.12 E 8.73564	WGS 84 / UTM 32 Decimals Degrees	Amendments to the legal framework and policy instruments (i.e., Forestry Law, Land Ownership Law, PNAF) to enable community-based sustainable forest management developed and submitted to the Government for adoption.

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