

## FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

### 2022 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022

## Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA .....	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE) .....	4
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	8
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS .....	14
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS) .....	17
6. RISKS .....	19
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION .....	26
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS .....	28
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	29
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING .....	31
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES .....	33
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT .....	38
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE .....	39

## 1. Basic Project Data

### General Information

<b>Region:</b>	West Africa (RAF)
<b>Country (ies):</b>	The Gambia
<b>Project Title:</b>	Community-based Sustainable Dryland Forest Management
<b>FAO Project Symbol:</b>	GCP/GAM/031/GFF
<b>GEF ID:</b>	5406
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	Land Degradation (LD)
<b>Project Executing Partners:</b>	Department of Forestry
<b>Project Duration (years):</b>	6-years
<b>Project coordinates:</b>	<i>Provided separately</i>

### Project Dates

<b>GEF CEO Endorsement Date:</b>	09 <sup>th</sup> May 2016
<b>Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :</b>	25 <sup>th</sup> October 2016
<b>Project Implementation End Date/NTE<sup>1</sup>:</b>	24 <sup>th</sup> September 2021
<b>Revised project implementation end date (if approved) <sup>2</sup></b>	31 <sup>th</sup> December 2022

### Funding

<b>GEF Grant Amount (USD):</b>	USD 3,066,347
<b>Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc<sup>3</sup>:</b>	USD 12,718,100
<b>Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2022 (USD)<sup>4</sup>:</b>	USD 2,708,638
<b>Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2022<sup>5</sup></b>	USD 10,713,000

<sup>1</sup> As per FPMIS

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

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

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

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

**M&E Milestones**

<b>Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:</b>	28 December 2021
<b>Expected Mid-term Review date<sup>6</sup>:</b>	N/A (MTR already done)
<b>Actual Mid-term review date (when it is done):</b>	February 2020
<b>Expected Terminal Evaluation Date<sup>7</sup>:</b>	<b><i>September 2022</i></b>
<b>Tracking tools/Core indicators updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)</b>	<b><i>YES</i></b>

**Overall ratings**

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

**ESS risk classification**

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

**Status**

<b>Implementation Status (1<sup>st</sup> PIR, 2<sup>nd</sup> PIR, etc. Final PIR):</b>	5 <sup>th</sup> (Final PIR)
--	-----------------------------

**Project Contacts**

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	Sambou Nget	<a href="mailto:Sambou.Nget@fao.org">Sambou.Nget@fao.org</a>
<b>Budget Holder</b>	Moshibudi Rampedi	<a href="mailto:Moshibudi.Rampedi@fao.org">Moshibudi.Rampedi@fao.org</a>
<b>Lead Technical Officer</b>	Patrice Savadogo	<a href="mailto:Patrice.Savadogo@fao.org">Patrice.Savadogo@fao.org</a>
<b>GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	Mohamed Bergigui	<a href="mailto:Mohamed.Bergigui@fao.org">Mohamed.Bergigui@fao.org</a>

<sup>6</sup> The Mid-Term Review (MTR) should take place after the 2<sup>nd</sup> PIR, around half-point between EOD and NTE. The MTR report in English should be submitted to the GEF Secretariat within 4 years of the CEO Endorsement date.

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

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

*(All inputs in this section should be cumulative from project start, not annual)*

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 <sup>8</sup>	Baseline	Mid-term Target <sup>9</sup>	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress <sup>10</sup> since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating <sup>11</sup>
	<b>Outcome 1:</b> Institutions at national and regional level have the capacity to integrate dryland forest management into policies, sectoral planning, and practices	Under LD (LD 2) Tracking Tool Forestry Policy score moved from 4 to 5	Lack of capacities in and understanding of dryland forest management issues within key institutions	30 government staff trained	90 government and non-government institutional stakeholders trained"	90 staff from Government, Non-Government and Community-based Organizations trained on Sustainable Dryland Forest Management. Most of these trained staff are part of the regional Sustainable Land Management (SLM) forums which coordinate and monitor Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR) projects and programmes in the regions.	S
			Forest policy provides very	N/A	A National Dryland	A National Forest Strategy has been developed and the National	S

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

<sup>9</sup> Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework) therefore this column should only be filled when relevant.

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

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

		limited guidance on dryland forest management		Forest Management Strategy developed and the National Forestry Action planned reviewed	Forestry Action Plan reviewed and validated on the 17 & 18 <sup>th</sup> August 2018. These two documents are guiding the operations of the Department of Forestry.	
<b>Outcome 2.1:</b> Community forestry legal ownership strengthened (management plans developed)	Institutional bottlenecks removed resulting in improved JFPM (18 agreements) and efficient and effective transfer of forest ownership to communities (at least 28 gazetted)	CF designation process and progress in JFPM stalled due to institutional limitations and bottlenecks	N/A	18 JFPM Agreements and 28 Gazettes	9 JFPM Agreements signed and 9 JFPM management plans developed. All the 9 JFPM Committees have established community-based forest enterprises on beekeeping and honey production.  20 Community forests on the process of being gazetted (final maps produced and endorsed awaiting the issuing of notices and orders). These forests will be finally handed over to the local communities after the gazette	MS
	Successful application of 18 JFPM plans and 73 management plans	Existing CFs and communities involved in JFPM have very limited capacities and lack adequate technical assistance for implementing SFM	N/A	18 JFPM plans and 73 management plans	9 JFPM plans and 73 CF management plans developed. As a result of these plans, these forest are now managed sustainably by their management Committees	MS

	<b>Outcome 2.2:</b> About 15,000 ha of dryland forests are sustainably managed by local communities	About 15,000 ha of dryland forests are sustainably managed by local communities	Dryland forests in the project area are degraded and are under severe threat from unsustainable resource use patterns	N/A	15,000 ha of dryland forests sustainably managed by local communities	8, 864ha of natural forests under sustainable management by local communities	MS
	<b>Outcome 3.1:</b> Project implementation based on results based management and application of project findings and lessons learned in future operations facilitated.	Project implementation based on results based management and application of project findings and Document lessons learned in future operations.	No Result Based Management (RBM) exists	N/A	RBM in place	M&E frameworks and plan developed  Project communication plan developed; Project fact sheet developed and shared with stakeholders; A project newsletter written and disseminated among stakeholders; A News release on the project prepared and shared through the FAO's website. These developments have increased the visibility of the project nationally but intentionally as well.	S

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

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<b>Outcome 2.1:</b> Community forestry legal ownership strengthened (management plans developed)	To sign an additional 9 Joint Forest Park Management Agreements and to gazette 20 community forests due to for final ownership transfer.	The Department of Forestry with support from the Natural Resources Consulting (NACO)	31 August 2022
<b>Outcome 2.2:</b> About 15,000 ha of dryland forests are sustainably managed by local communities	An additional 9 forest parks with estimated area of 6,000ha will be brought under joint management in 2022 before the end of the project.	Department of Forestry	15 September 2022

### 3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outcomes and Outputs <sup>12</sup>	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements <sup>13</sup> (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance <sup>14</sup> in delivering outputs
<b>Outcome 1.1</b> Institutions at national and regional level have the capacity to integrate dryland forest management into policies, sectoral planning, and practices				
<b>Output 1.1.1</b> Multi-stakeholder regional dryland forest management	Number of staff trained	5 Regional SLM Forum meetings	3 Regional SLM Forum meetings conducted with 75 participants (Female 10 & Male 65) to plan for field monitoring visits to project intervention sites. Itinerary for the field visits was developed.	<b>2 additional meetings. These are planned for end of July 2022.</b>

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

<sup>13</sup> Please use the same unit of measurement of the project indicators as per the approved Implementation Plan or Annual Workplan. Please be concise (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

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



forums created and strengthened		5 field monitoring visits by SLM forum members to project intervention sites	Itinerary developed and sites to be visited determined during the SLM meetings.	<b>5 field monitoring visits scheduled for the month July 2022</b>
<b><u>Outcome 2.1</u></b> Community forestry legal ownership strengthened (management plans developed under Outcome 2.1 will be implemented through Outcome 2.2)				
<b><u>Output 2.1.1</u></b> Regional community forestry task forces created and strengthened	Number of task forces and their capacities	<p>One regional CF task force constituted</p> <p>125 CF task force members trained on forest designation procedures</p>	<p>One additional regional CF taskforce constituted. The regional CF taskforces are now active on bushfire sensitization and promotion of the community forestry concept resulting 17 new communities expressing interest to join the CF program.</p> <p>125 participants (92 male &amp; 33 female) trained on forest designation procedures.</p> <p>Gazetting of 20 community forests is on the way.</p>	Output target achieved.

<b>Output 2.1.2</b> 3251.4 ha of forests under start-up phase advanced to PCFMA stage and 4578.42 ha of forests at PCFMA stage are advanced to CFMA stage	Number of hectares	20 community forests at PCFMA to be assessed and recommended for CFMA	Assessment ongoing	Handing over of 20 CFMAs
	CFMA award	28 community forests (CFs) gazetted	Maps of 20 CFs finalized and submitted to the Department of Lands and Surveys for endorsement.  The coordinates of the remaining CFs are being collected to prepare the final maps.	Other activities on the gazetting process such as notices and orders ongoing.
	PCFMA award	20 PCFMA to be awarded	Ongoing	Activities on track
	3-year management plans	20 preliminary management plans developed	Ongoing	Activities on track
<b>Output 2.1.3</b>	5-year management plans	20 5-year management plans developed/updated	Ongoing	Activities on track
<b>Output 2.1.4</b> 5,749.9 ha of forests brought under Joint Forest Park Management	Number of JFPM agreements and management plans	9 JFPM agreements and 9 JFPM management plans	Ongoing	Activities on track
<b>Outcome 2.2</b> 15,066.84 ha of dryland forests are sustainably managed by local communities				
<b>Output 2.2.1</b> SFM practices implemented - Community forest cover increased by 5% in the project	Number of hectares covered by tree planting	Enrichment planting on 100ha degraded forests	ongoing	Tree planting on degraded forest sites
	Number of ha brought under agroforestry	Agroforestry practised on 100ha of farmlands	120 farmers sensitized on agroforestry resulting to	Output target achieved.

intervention regions - Site suitable agroforestry techniques implemented across 500 ha - Improved bushfire management techniques			100 ha of farmland identified for agroforestry practices.	
<b><u>Output 2.2.3</u></b> Controlled grazing implemented through 10 community grazing agreements in the community forests and efficiency of fuelwood use improved by introduced cooking stoves (2000 households)	Number of grazing agreement	10 agreements	10 agreements obtained and 10 management Committees formed and 5 trained on group governance and financial management.  Groups have created their WhatsApp platform to improve coordination among themselves	5 additional management Committees to be formed and trained.
	Number of improved cooking stoves	2000	Fabrication of the stoves ongoing by a contractor	Distribution of 2000 cook stoves to 100 households.

<b><u>Output 2.2.4</u></b> Community based forest enterprises strengthened (21 enterprises)	Number of enterprise group members trained on simple record keeping.	40 enterprise group members trained on simple record keeping.	40 Participants (Female 16 & Male 24) trained on simple record keeping. Group members now keep record on their activities including materials supplied to them by the project, sales on honey and honey products, expenditures etc.	Output target achieved.
<b><u>Outcome 3.1</u></b> Project implementation based on results based management and application of project findings and lessons learned in future operations facilitated.				
<b><u>Output 3.1.1</u></b> Project monitoring system providing systematic information on progress in meeting project outcomes and output targets	Set project targets and milestones achieved according to Work plan	Project monitoring plan Finalized and 2 PPRs & 1 PIR prepared.	Monitoring plan finalized.  1 PPR and 1 PIR compiled.	Target achieved.

<b><u>Output 3.1.2</u></b>	Project results and lessons Learned documented.	Project facts sheet and project and project newsletter produced	Project factsheet, project newsletter, and news releases prepared and shared with stakeholders	Documentation of lessons learned and best practices.
----------------------------	---	---	--	--

## 4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

**Please provide a summary paragraph on progress, challenges and outcome of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR.**

During the period under review, one additional Community Forest (CF) taskforce committee was created bringing the total regional CF taskforces to five. 125 of the taskforce members (92 male and 33 female) were trained on forest designation procedures. The taskforces are now active in CF conflict resolution, regional bushfire sensitization and management, and promotion of community forestry in the regions. 200 CF and Joint forest Park Management (JFPM) community members were trained on improved dryland forest management, and participatory forest management procedures/processes resulting to more engagements of the CF and JFPM Committees with the Department of Forestry to protect and manage the dryland forests. 100 CF Committee members (69 male and 31 female) were trained on Assisted Natural Regeneration (ANR) practices resulting to the identification of more than 20ha of community forest sites where ANR could be practised. 20 final maps of CFs due for CFMA were prepared and printed out by the Department of Forestry and submitted to the Department of Lands and Surveys for endorsement. This has facilitated the ongoing gazetting process of these community forests. 960 farmers (684 male and 276 female) sensitized on agroforestry practices, trained on the identification of suitable sites for agroforestry and on tree planting in field crops as well as protection of planted seedlings. This has resulted to the identification of more 250ha of farmland as sites for agroforestry practices. 60 beekeeping enterprise group members (36 male and 24 female) received training on simple record keeping which has enabled members to keep record of their sales, expenditures, the quantity of honey harvested, the number of beehives colonized and the time of colonization etc. Beekeeping enterprise groups also received mentoring support from an Implementing Partner in collaboration with the National Beekeepers' Association of The Gambia (NBAG) to harvest their colonized hives. The remaining 3 stock routes or cattle tracks were identified bringing the total to 10 and 5 management Committees for these stock routes formed and trained on basic group and financial management. A story on honey production under the project was also produced by the FAO-Gambia Communications Unit and featured on the FAO homepage/website and translated in the 6 FAO official languages (<https://www.fao.org/fao-stories/article/en/c/1500032/>). A newsletter for the project and a factsheet were also produced, published (<https://www.fao.org/3/cb8975en/cb8975en.pdf>) - (<https://www.fao.org/3/cb8616en/cb8616en.pdf>) and disseminated to stakeholders thus giving much needed visibility to the GEF project both nationally and internationally. Monitoring visits were conducted by the PCU to project implementing sites to gauge the level of progress and to have interphase dialogue with stakeholders to get their perspectives on the project including challenges and recommendations. Project Steering Committee (PSC) and Project Taskforce (PTF) meetings were held at various intervals for approval of the annual budget and to provide technical guidance going forward. Over the reporting period, some challenges were encountered such as delay in the implementation of activities due to the COVID-19 pandemic (detection of the Omicron variant in The Gambia), low participation of farmers during the harvest of their farm produce as well as the parliamentary elections (nominations, campaigns and voting). Some other challenges included, late conclusion of LoAs, late disbursement of funds to Implementing Partners, delay in procurement of materials and signing of contracts and slow implementation of activities by some Implementing Partners.

### **Development Objective (DO) Ratings, Implementation Progress (IP) Ratings and Overall Assessment**

Please note that the overall DO and IP ratings should be substantiated by evidence and progress reported in the Section 2 and Section 3 of the PIR. For DO, the ratings and comments should reflect the overall progress of project results.

	<b>FY2022 Development Objective rating<sup>15</sup></b>	<b>FY2022 Implementation Progress rating<sup>16</sup></b>	<b>Comments/reasons<sup>17</sup> justifying the ratings for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period</b>
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<i>The project has achieved remarkable results during the reporting period including the operationalization of all the 20 community-based forest enterprises and the regional Sustainable Land Management (SLM) forums. The gazettement of 20 community forests is on the way for final handing over to local communities. Capacities of stakeholders on sustainable dryland forest management, Assisted Natural Regeneration (ANR) and agroforestry practices were enhanced. Enrichment planting on over 100ha of degraded forests was carried out and over 100 farmers (of which 8% women) introduced to agroforestry. On monitoring and visibility, the project has finalized the M&amp;E plan and the communication strategy. It has also increased the visibility of the project during the period under review by producing and disseminating the project factsheet, a newsletter and a story on honey production under the project which was featured in the FAO website and translated in all the 6 FAO official languages.</i>
<b>Budget Holder</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<i>Commendable results are recorded for the reporting period. Statements of affirmation were given by stakeholders and implementing partners.</i>

<sup>15</sup> **Development Objectives Rating** – A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.

For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

<sup>16</sup> **Implementation Progress Rating** – A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project's components and activities is in compliance with the projects approved implementation plan. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

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

<b>GEF Operational Focal Point<sup>18</sup></b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<i>In line with the mandate of the national GEF OFP, the project has continued to align (through its objective) to a national priority on promoting sustainable forest and land management initiatives, as well as improves lives and livelihoods of communities impacted by climate change, land degradation, and biodiversity loss. The PMU has continued to engage national stakeholders and promoted policy development through support to the finalization of the draft Agriculture and Natural Resource (ANR) Policy. To ensure stakeholder participation and information, the PMU reports the project activities, achievements and challenges to the ANR working group meetings. On the ground, the project has contributed to increasing the number of protected areas, thus providing the opportunity of future projects to enhance connectivity of adjacent protected areas for the benefit of biodiversity conservation. This outcome will provide a foundation for the GEF Project ID 9772 – on promoting ecosystem services in productive and protected land/seascapes conserved by improved land use and marine spatial planning policies and land/seascape level management in Gambia.</i>
<b>Lead Technical Officer<sup>19</sup></b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<i>Commendable results are recorded for the reporting period. Moreover the reporting period was a very intensive with efforts directed at both consolidating activities and transitioning towards programme exit. Joint quality monitoring meetings were also used to assess the preparedness for exit in terms of building blocks including capacity of famers and stakeholders, linkages for inputs, markets, finance and other services.</i>
<b>FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<i>Exceptional efforts were deployed to ensure the project is on truck to deliver its targets. The momentum needs to be maintained to secure the expected results before project closure, and ensure sustainability through an actionable exit strategy.</i>

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

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



## 5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

*Under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)*

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

N/A

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

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

<b>Initial ESS Risk classification</b> (At project submission)	<b>Current ESS risk classification</b> Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid <sup>20</sup> . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low	The risk classification remains the same

<b><i>Please report if any grievance was received as per FAO and GEF ESS policies. If yes, please indicate how it is being/has been addressed.</i></b>
No

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

## 6. Risks

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

	Type of risk	Risk rating <sup>21</sup>	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	Institutional risk: Difficulties in institutional cooperation between Department of Forestry and other key government institutional partners (National Environment Agency, Department of Parks and Wildlife Management, Department of Agriculture) arising out of changes in political orientation, and intrinsically contradicting institutional targets and priorities	M	Y	<p>The project continues to work closely with the Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR) Working Group and has created five (5) SLM forums in the 5 administrative regions of the country. The SLM forums are under the regional Technical Advisory Committees (TACs). The TAC, which composes of representatives from all sectors (state and non-state) operating in the regions is chaired by the regional governors and serves as a regional multi-sectoral coordination platform. The regional SLM forums established by the project will ensure multi-sectoral coordination at all levels about Agriculture and Natural Resources management issues.</p> <p>The project's steering committee is also comprised of senior members from the partner government and non-government institutions ensuring constant involvement and coordination.</p>	<p>Five multi-stakeholder SLM forums have been formed and members of the forums have been trained on SLM issues including participatory forest ownership transfer, forest governance etc.</p> <p>Regular PSC meetings organized to foster more institutional coordination</p>	Government remains committed to the implementation of the project through the participation of the regional Governors and the Ministry of Environment, Climate Change and Natural Resources. The PSC has always been very supportive in providing advice and guidance to the PMU

	Type of risk	Risk rating <sup>21</sup>	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
2	Political-institutional risk: Difficulties in securing co-financing.	M	Y	The project's participatory design ensures strong government commitment to the initiative. All project partners have expressed their willingness to support the initiative through formal co-financing commitment letters. The PSC and the PCU will continuously follow up on the co-financing commitments and will seek other co-financing sources as some of the co-financing projects have phased out.	Government is still committed to the project and co-financing arrangements have been made with government projects and the Department of Forestry.	The co-financing partners are still committed to their agreements with the project.

---

<sup>21</sup> Risk ratings means a rating of accesses the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High. For more information on ratings and definitions please refer to Annex 1.

	Type of risk	Risk rating <sup>21</sup>	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
3	Social risk: Lack of interest or sense of ownership on the part of local communities	L	Y	The project continues to engage the communities in all the implementation activities and allows the partners and communities to always take the lead.	Livelihood enhancement opportunities (such as beekeeping, tree nursery management, cash-for-work activities etc.) are being strengthened under the project alongside capacity building and awareness raising activities which are enhancing ownership of the project by the stakeholders including local communities.	This risk is low but continues, however the project has already generated interest and ownership among local communities, and can be expected to continue to do so, unless procurement challenges prevent the project from effectively implementing site level activities, which could generate community backlash.

	Type of risk	Risk rating <sup>21</sup>	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
4	Community forests tenure conflict risks: Targeted CFs have conflicts with regards to informal and customary tenure (local communities participating in CF demarcate their customary forests as one of the preliminary steps for formal CF tenure transfer). The conflicts can arise during the demarcation and even later during the Preliminary Community Forestry Management Agreement (PCFMA) stage between neighbouring communities claiming rights over the forests	M	Y	The targeted CFs under the project were chosen keeping in mind the customary tenure conflicts, and the project is facilitating the resolution of some CF management related conflicts.	Project continues to facilitate conflict resolution through consensual negotiation with the support of local authorities. Local natural resources management conventions are also being developed to promote sustainable grazing and management of natural resources, and reduce tension between livestock owners and crop farmers as well as transhumance herders	The project should continue monitoring potential conflicts on tenure over grazing rights not only between local communities but also with livestock herders entering Gambia from northern Senegal.

	Type of risk	Risk rating <sup>21</sup>	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
5	Socio-economic risk: Conflicts between members of Community Forestry Committees (CFCs) and Joint Forest Park Management (JFPM) committees for access to benefits	M	Y	JFPM agreements and CF management plans are generally very clear on equitable and fair sharing of benefits derived through CF and JFPM. CF management plans and JFPM agreements developed through the project will establish clear criteria for benefit sharing. Any conflicts arising would be dealt within through the respective CFCs and JFPM committees.	The Department of Forestry through its regional forestry offices works closely with Community Forestry and Joint Forest Park Management Committees to ensure that agreements on benefit sharing are respected.	Payment of 15% of proceeds accrued from community forest to the National Forestry Fund should be closely monitored by the field staff of the Department of Forestry to avoid non-compliance which could degenerate to conflict between the DoF and the CFCs.
6	Climate contingency risk: Possibility of extreme weather events throughout the time frame of the project, involving significant changes in the project's baseline natural conditions related to agroforestry and forestry	M	N	The plant and tree species used for forest rehabilitation and agroforestry will be chosen considering the known patterns of climate change (for example: in the context of Gambia, the species will be chosen to be resilient to droughts).	Well targeted enrichment planting with reduced scale is being pursued. The project is promoting the use of 1-2-year old seedlings for planting and to avoid late planting of seedlings.	The risk of bushfires and drought impacting forest rehabilitation and other natural resource management activities remains high, and climate change is believed to be increasing this risk over time.



	Type of risk	Risk rating <sup>21</sup>	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
7	Delays in procurement and late conclusion of Letters of Agreement (LoAs) with Implementation Partners (IPs)	M	N	Formulation of a procurement plan and early drafting of Letter of Agreement (LoAs).	The project continues to work closely with Admin to reduce delays in finalizing LoAs and expediting procurement	The PC should continuously follow-up on matter related to LoAs and procurement and to involve FAOR when necessary
8	COVID-19 with its related lock downs and other restrictions could seriously impede implementation of project activities	M	N	Implementing Partners as well as project coordination/management teams to respect COVID-19 restrictions and protocols during implementation of activities.	Careful planning by the coordination/management team/Implementing Partners to utilise the windows between lockdowns to organised field activities by respecting all COVID-19 measures or protocols	All COVID-19 measures and protocols must be strictly respected and adhered to during implementation activities.

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

FY2021 rating	FY2022 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
M	L	COVID-19 cases have dropped in the country and COVID-19 vaccines are now available. This has improved the implementation rate of implementing partners. With the one year No-Cost-Extension, the project also has got more time to achieve its major objectives. Hence there are no major risks and the project is on good course to achieving its main objectives.

## 7. Follow-up on Mid-term review or supervision mission (only for projects that have conducted an MTR)

If the project had an MTR or a supervision mission, please report on how the recommendations were implemented during this fiscal year as indicated in the Management Response or in the supervision mission report.

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented <u>during this Fiscal Year</u>
<b>Recommendation 1:</b> Improve coordination with other on-going and relevant projects	Collaboration with the GEF funded “Adapting Agriculture to Climate Change in The Gambia” continues. During this fiscal year, the two projects have collaborated on the identification of three cattle tracks, establishment of watering points on these tracks and formation of management Committees for the tracks.
<b>Recommendation 3:</b> The PCU team should also develop an overall work plan for the remainder of the project (including any project extension period)	A budget review for the remaining period of the project is about to be finalized.
<b>Recommendation 6:</b> The project team, in partnership with the IPs and stakeholder groups such as the Regional SLM Forums, should produce in the next 12 months a project exit strategy	An exit strategy has been developed and presented to the PSC. The validation of the exit strategy by relevant stakeholders is scheduled for August 2022
<b>Recommendation 7:</b> FAOGM and the PCU need to improve the tracking of project spending and use that information to improve project delivery	Ongoing
<b>Recommendation 12:</b> The Project Steering Committee should meet at least twice / year for the remainder of the project.	Two PSC meetings were held during the reporting period.
<b>Recommendation 13:</b> The project team, with support from the Project Steering Committee, should work to increase the participation of relevant national agencies in the project’s implementation, in particular the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA), the Department of Livestock	The National Agricultural Research Institute (NARI) is now an Implementing Partner to the project focusing on the agroforestry component.

Services (DLS), the Ministry of Energy (MoE), and the Ministry of Lands and Rural Administration (MoLRA)	
<b>Recommendation 14:</b> FAOGM should quickly contract a short-term expert to design and lead project activities for Knowledge Management and Communications.	A UNV communications expert has been attached to the project.
<b>Recommendation 15:</b> FAOGM should support the recently hired Monitoring and Evaluation Officer (shared with the AACC project) to ensure the rapid development of the project M&E plan.	A UNV M&E expert is attached to the project and the project's M&E plan has been developed.

<b>Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please describe</b>	Yes, the project has developed an Exit Strategy. The Strategy was presented to the PSC during its last meeting in December 2021. The PSC has recommended for the validation of the Exit Strategy by relevant stakeholders. The Central Project Coordination Unit (CPCU) of the Ministry of Environment, Climate Change and Natural Resources (MECCNAR) has sent a request to the BH for financial support to hold the validation workshop which is tentatively scheduled for August 2022.
--	---

## 8. Minor project amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines<sup>22</sup>. Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories. And, provide supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

Category of change	Provide a description of the change	Indicate the timing of the change	Approved by
<b>Results framework</b>			
<b>Components and cost</b>	Budget revision	2019	PSC, BH, LTO, FLO
<b>Institutional and implementation arrangements</b>	The National Agricultural Research Institute (NARI) was included in the pool of Implementing Partners (IPs)	2021	PSC, BH
<b>Financial management</b>			
<b>Implementation schedule</b>	One year no-cost-extension	2021 (at MTR)	PSC, BH, LTO, FLO
<b>Executing Entity</b>			
<b>Executing Entity Category</b>			
<b>Minor project objective change</b>			
<b>Safeguards</b>			
<b>Risk analysis</b>	Additional risks were included (Covid, CC and procurement)		PSC
<b>Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%</b>			
<b>Co-financing</b>			
<b>Location of project activity</b>			
<b>Other</b>			

<sup>22</sup> Source: <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy-2020-update>

## 9. Stakeholders' Engagement

Please report on progress and results and challenges on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan) included at CEO Endorsement/Approval during this reporting period.

Stakeholder name	Role in project execution	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
<b>Government Institutions</b>			
Department of Forestry (DoF)	Implementing Partner (IP)	IP has finalized one LoA is currently on new LoA. It has supported tenure transfer of state forests to local communities and conducted trainings to enhance the capacity of local forest managers on dryland forest management, community forestry and Joint Forest Park Management, agroforestry and Assisted Natural Regeneration.	<p>Main challenge was getting the IP finalized maps for community forests due for gazetting and handing over to local communities.</p> <p>There were also some coordination challenges to get the planned activities implemented on time.</p>
<b>Non-Government organizations (NGOs)</b>			
Agency for the Development of Women and Children (ADWAC)	Implementing Partner (IP)	IP has signed a LoA for the provision of livestock management services. Has identified 3 cattle tracks, facilitated the development of local conventions on grazing and natural resources management. It has also facilitated the formation of rangeland management Committees and provided trainings on group and financial management.	Slow implementation rate and late submission of reports.
<b>Private sector entities</b>			

Natural Resources Consulting (NACO)	Implementing Partner (IP)	IP has signed a LoA with the project and has provided mentoring and incubation support and capacity building on simple records keeping to forest enterprise groups. Has also facilitated field monitoring visits of the regional SLM forums to various project intervention sites. Organized contact and collaboration fairs for forest enterprise groups with service providers for increased dialogue and opportunities for markets and funding.	Delayed in implementing some of the activities due to conflicts of some activities with election campaigns farmers' season calenders (harvesting of farm produce)
<b><i>Others[1]</i></b>			
<b><i>New stakeholders identified/engaged</i></b>			
National Agricultural Research Institute (NARI)	Implementing Partner (IP)	IP has signed a LoA with the project to provide support to farmers on agroforestry practices. The IP has identified more than 100 farmers in the project intervention regions and guided them through tree planting on their farms and provided trainings on tree management and Farmer Managed Natural Regeneration.	Slow implementation rate and a challenge of the pre-financing the last 20% payment thus causing delay in finalizing the LoA

[1] They can include, among others, community-based organizations (CBOs), Indigenous Peoples organizations, women's groups, private sector companies, farmers, universities, research institutions, and all major groups as identified, for example, in Agenda 21 of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit and many times again since then.

## 10. Gender Mainstreaming

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

Category	Yes/No	Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period
Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.	Yes	A socio-economic baseline assessment was conducted at the project design stage and a Self-evaluation and Holistic Assessment of climate Resilience of farmers and Pastoralists (SHARP) was carried out during execution stage.
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes	30% of the members of forest management Committees and forest enterprise groups are women  Women were trained on value addition on honey and honey products as well as business planning and management
Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):		Result areas; 2.1.2, 2.2.3 and 2.2.4 both contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment.
a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources	Yes	Involvement of women in agroforestry and community forest and Joint Forest Park Management is reducing the gender gaps in access and control over natural resources
b) improving women's participation and decision making	Yes	Communal forest ownership gives an opportunity for women to be included in forest resource management Committees.
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	Yes	Women are actively involved in community-based forest enterprises under result area 2.2.4 focusing mainly on Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs) for honey and tree seedlings. During the reporting period women were involved in the sale of harvested honey and transformation of bee wax into soap and body cream to generate income.  The production and distribution of improved cook stoves to households to help reduce work burden and cooking time for women.

M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	Yes	
Staff with gender expertise	No	
Any other good practices on gender	Yes	Participation of women on tree nursery enterprises, agroforestry practices, tree planting participatory forest management and the construction and use of improved cook stoves such as clay ovens are good practices on gender.



## 11. Knowledge Management Activities

**Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval during this reporting period.**

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.

The project does not have a standalone knowledge management strategy. However, the communications strategy includes aspects on documentation and the dissemination of best practices and success stories or human centric stories.

Among the relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project so far, are the establishment and implementation of community-based forest enterprises by local forest managers such as the Community Forest and Joint Forest Park Management Committees. With the support of the project, 20 such enterprises (18 on beekeeping and 2 on tree nursery management) have been established and are now functional. Some groups have started harvesting and selling honey to generate income for their communities.

Transformational initiative is also a good practice that the project can share. In the first two years of the project, beehives were ordered from China for the beekeeping groups and the delivery of these beehives took more than one year. With this bad experience, the project decided to train the beekeeping groups on construction of beehives through the National Beekeepers' Association of The Gambia. After the training, the project supplied the groups with the materials needed for the construction of their beehives and were asked to construct their own beehives through cash-for-work. This was successfully done on time and each of the groups benefitted from cash payment, which served as good motivation for them. Some women from these groups were also trained on adding value to honey products such as transforming bee wax to body cream and soap. Some of the women have started benefitting from sales of the value added products thus increasing their income stream.

Knowledge transfer to women on construction of clay ovens is also a good practice that the project can share. The project supplied 2000 improved metallic cook stoves to 1000 households and supported the training of about 100 women in its intervention areas on the construction of clay ovens with the objective to reduce the collection of firewood from the dryland forests. With the adoption of the stoves by many households in the project sites, the amount of fuelwood used for cooking and heating and the time spent by women on fire wood collection has gone down. This, therefore, means that households could keep their meals warm throughout the day by using the stoves and the drudgery of women and children on firewood collection has also been reduced to allow women to engage on other revenue generating activities.

<p>Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.</p>	<p>Yes the project has a communication strategy that highlights the following aims and objective:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Communicate and promote the GEF Forestry Project's works, activities and achievements to build trust from the donor and target audiences to position FAO as a relevant partner based on the organizations' comparative advantages.</li> <li>2) Improve documentation and the dissemination of best practices and success stories or human interest stories (including through multi-media communication products) by highlighting the project's impacts on the ground and the donor's return on investment</li> <li>3) Support advocacy and campaigns including public communications activities for the project</li> </ol> <p>Overall, we were able to generate substantial visibility to the project through various communication activities including social media posts, and global stories targeting specific audiences. Major successes includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication strategy drafted and approved aimed at bringing about better visibility to the project</li> <li>• A major story related to project was published on FAO Global "Stories" section, which was translated into six languages with a global reach: <a href="https://www.fao.org/fao-stories/article/en/c/1500032/">https://www.fao.org/fao-stories/article/en/c/1500032/</a></li> <li>• The story was amplified by major corporate social media handles including FAO Global accounts, FAO forestry, FAO in Africa, FAO West Africa and FAO Gambia</li> <li>• The story was also boosted using FAO Gambia Facebook page and we were able to reach more than 19,000 local people with the story and gained over 2200 post engagements (likes, comments and shares)</li> <li>• A success story was contributed to the FAO West Africa Sub-regional office to be published on the June 2022 version of the newsletter</li> <li>• A Project News (newsletter) was published on FAO Global publication page highlighting all the successes and activities of the year 2021</li> <li>• A Project-specific factsheet for the project was drafted and published on the FAO Global publication page highlighting major information and successes of the project over the years.</li> <li>• Both the newsletter and the factsheets were promoted using social media accounts periodically and leveraging relevant UN observances.</li> </ul> <p>Challenges:</p> <p>One challenge was the difficulty in registering successes as some of the activities are still in their early stages.</p>
<p>Please share a human-interest story from your project, focusing on how the project has helped to</p>	<p>In the Gambia: Farmers Laud Agroforestry's Potential to Improve livelihood</p>

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.





*FAO staff members and farmers gather around a tree planted in a field as part of the effort to implement agroforestry in the Gambia. @FAO/Amadou Bah*

In a small village of Aljamdou in the North Bank Region of the Gambia, crop fields look slightly unusual with different shades of colour and vegetation. However, a closer look reveals that the farms are dotted with trees integrated and grown with crops. At first glance, it might look odd, but this practice can potentially improve livelihoods, economic viability and agricultural production significantly.

Known as "Agroforestry", the practice involves integrating trees or shrubs with annual or perennial crops or livestock on the same land, usually at the same time and complementing each other. Through a project supported by the Global Environment Facility called the "Community-based sustainable dryland forest management project," FAO has assisted in the introduction of tree plantation on over 329 hectares of farmland in the Gambia in the past 3 years. Results from some farms are encouraging, with reasonable seeding survival rates and many farmers already reporting potential contribution of the practice to increase crop yields, even though agroforestry has just been adopted as part of their farming systems.

"We had no idea that planting trees and crops together was beneficial," says Bukary Manneh, the village headman of Demba Wandu community in the Upper River Region, where over 50 households are benefiting from agroforestry. "Trees that we have planted add nutrition to the farm and protect our fields from erosion while improving our productivity. We are grateful for this help".

	<p>Trees in the fields can be helpful for the growing crops beneath as they can improve soil fertility through the litter that falls from the trees and ultimately decompose in the soil. In addition, farmers can also use the trees for livestock feed, timber, fuelwood and other medicinal purposes. At the same time, the presence of trees can also control and protect the crops from wind and water erosion. The principle behind agroforestry is that it uses the complementary relationship between trees and crops so that they can help each other.</p> <p>“We used to spend a lot of money to buy fertilizers for our fields, but something is interesting in the idea that trees can serve as fertilizers,” Bunama Hydara, a farmer in the village, said. “Since we planted trees and integrated them into our fields, we have saved money while protecting our farms from erosion”.</p> <p>Agroforestry is known to enhance the value of agro-ecosystems as the practice can help in carbon storage while mitigating the adverse effects of deforestation and land degradation. It can also help in water purification, erosion control and soil improvement. In general, agroforestry can make agricultural lands more resilient to climate change and help farmers withstand events such as floods, heavy winds and drought. FAO has supplied mostly <i>Leucaena leucocephala</i>, <i>Cassia siamea</i>, <i>Gliricidia sepium</i>, <i>Moringa oleifera</i> and <i>Faidherbia albida</i> trees as they usually add more nutrients to the field and protect them against erosion.</p> <p>The project started supporting agroforestry practice on a large scale in 2019 through sensitization, identification of farmers interested in agroforestry trials, capacity-building support and the supply of seedlings and planting on farms. The project targets to put 500 hectares of farmland in the Gambia under agroforestry practice with the involvement of over 400 households before it phases out.</p>
Please provide links to related website, social media account	<p>FAO Gambia website: <a href="https://www.fao.org/gambia">https://www.fao.org/gambia</a>  FAO Gambia Facebook page: <a href="https://www.facebook.com/FAOGambia">https://www.facebook.com/FAOGambia</a>  FAO Gambia Twitter page: <a href="https://twitter.com/faogambia">https://twitter.com/faogambia</a></p>
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	<p><b>Publications:</b>  Project Newsletter 2021: <a href="https://www.fao.org/3/cb8975en/cb8975en.pdf">https://www.fao.org/3/cb8975en/cb8975en.pdf</a>  Project Factsheet: <a href="https://www.fao.org/3/cb8616en/cb8616en.pdf">https://www.fao.org/3/cb8616en/cb8616en.pdf</a></p> <p><b>Story:</b>  No Sweeter Business:  <a href="https://www.fao.org/fao-stories/article/en/c/1500032/">https://www.fao.org/fao-stories/article/en/c/1500032/</a>  <a href="https://www.fao.org/family-farming/detail/en/c/1505227/">https://www.fao.org/family-farming/detail/en/c/1505227/</a></p> <p>Media Coverages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="https://www.mamostv.tv/embracing-beekeeping-as-a-livelihood-in-the-gambias-dryland-forests/">https://www.mamostv.tv/embracing-beekeeping-as-a-livelihood-in-the-gambias-dryland-forests/</a></li> <li><a href="https://mansabanko.gm/tag/fao/">https://mansabanko.gm/tag/fao/</a></li> </ul>

	<p>Thursday 21 April 2022   <a href="#">Civ @stamara</a>   Page 14</p> <h2>FEATURE</h2> <h3>No sweeter business</h3> <h4>Embracing beekeeping as a livelihood in the Gambia's dryland forests</h4> <p><b>T</b>hey are dotted with towering vegetation, palm and hardwood trees. They are speckled with tall ferns, various mangoes, coconuts. At the first glance, the forest and the woodlands of the Gambia, tinged in different shades of green, look enticing and breathtakingly beautiful.</p> <p>Adorned with an array of prominent baobabs, towering silk-cotton trees and palm of mangrove forests found both for animal and along the coastal banks of the river Gambia, the country holds 480,000 hectares of forests with unmet potential.</p> <p>These forests and woodlands have, however, seen swift depletion due to a rapidly increasing population as well as unsustainable resource extraction and uncontrolled forest fires. The growing rural population in the West African nation has struggled with poverty and with sustainability managing these dryland forests while relying on them for their livelihoods and food security.</p> <p>Through a Gapsap programme spearheaded by FAO and the Gambia's Department of Forestry, the "Community-based Sustainable Dryland Forest Management" project has outlined groups of community beekeepers, known locally as Honey Enterprise Groups, with beekeeping equipment such as beehives, uniforms, hives, gloves, and more tools. With the support of FAO through the Global Environment Facility (GEF)-funded project, the Honey Enterprise Groups are contracting beekeepers in the forest to harvest honey from the woodlands.</p> <p>"I would have never thought that our dream of implementing our honey enterprise development plan would come to fruition," said community beekeeper, Kamleh Njie, as she and her team inspect 40 beehives in an apiary in Jiffling village in the Lower River Region in the south of the country.</p> <p>"Although there have been numerous talks about forest enterprise in the Gambia, this is highly pronounced in the regions north of the Gambia River. Dryland forests in the country play a pivotal role in halting desertification. Through the forestry sector in the Gambia is reported to contribute to about only 1.2 percent of the national Gross Domestic Product, it holds great socio-economic significance to rural livelihoods.</p> <p>The project's overall objective is to halt environmental degradation and the growing threat of desertification in the Gambia because of continued deforestation. The project helps with the legal procedures for community ownership of forests and empowers community members with the skills and knowledge necessary to sustainably manage their natural resources and conserve biodiversity.</p> <p>The INAGIEF forestry project included a blessing for the farmers, livestock and the forests," said Tatu Bah, President of the Joint Salama Daka Forest Park Management Committee and a member of the honey enterprise group. "The forest was saved from bulldozers in 2020 thanks to the training the forest park rangers received from the project. The possible climate shocks while they will be contributing to forest and biodiversity conservation," said Tatu Bah, FAO's GEF Project Coordinator said.</p> <p>"There is already a very high demand for honey and honey byproducts for both human consumption and industrial use at the national and global levels. This creates a good market," he adds. A total of 10,567 people, approximately 50 percent of the population, are dependent on honey and honey byproducts for their livelihoods.</p> <p>The project is also a very high demand for honey and honey byproducts for both human consumption and industrial use at the national and global levels. This creates a good market," he adds. A total of 10,567 people, approximately 50 percent of the population, are dependent on honey and honey byproducts for their livelihoods.</p>  
<p>Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's Name and contact details</p>	<p>Other communication assets published online:</p> <p>Facebook:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="https://bit.ly/39dXYtP">https://bit.ly/39dXYtP</a></li> <li><a href="https://bit.ly/3xvOTaP">https://bit.ly/3xvOTaP</a></li> </ul> <p>Twitter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="https://bit.ly/3mvgKQT">https://bit.ly/3mvgKQT</a></li> <li><a href="https://bit.ly/391M6Lt">https://bit.ly/391M6Lt</a></li> <li><a href="https://bit.ly/3tnWXWN">https://bit.ly/3tnWXWN</a></li> <li><a href="https://bit.ly/3aPgTvt">https://bit.ly/3aPgTvt</a></li> <li><a href="https://bit.ly/399uJsd">https://bit.ly/399uJsd</a></li> <li><a href="https://bit.ly/3Nw1xKU">https://bit.ly/3Nw1xKU</a></li> <li><a href="https://bit.ly/3xiXXwR">https://bit.ly/3xiXXwR</a></li> <li><a href="https://bit.ly/3tpsWWJ">https://bit.ly/3tpsWWJ</a></li> <li><a href="https://bit.ly/3mpGXzO">https://bit.ly/3mpGXzO</a></li> <li><a href="https://youtu.be/o1OP9e7sdfU">https://youtu.be/o1OP9e7sdfU</a></li> </ul> <p>Communication focal person:</p> <p>Gopi Kharel Communication Specialist FAO Gambia Email: <a href="mailto:gopi.kharel@fao.org">gopi.kharel@fao.org</a> Phone: +220 5026720</p>

## 12. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Involvement

**Are Indigenous Peoples and local communities involved in the project (as per the approved Project Document)? If yes, please briefly explain.**

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

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

Yes, local communities actively participate in the project activities. The project supports the expansion and consolidation of participatory forest management with special focus on community forestry (CF) and Joint Forest Park Management (JFPM). In the center of these approaches are the local communities who are supported by the project to have legal ownership of forests and to jointly managed government forest parks with the Department of Forestry. Local communities are sensitized on these management approaches, their capacities are built on CF and JFPM procedures and processes and on sustainable dryland forest management and agroforestry practices. The local communities are involved in the identification and demarcation of potential community forests, they are involved in the development of management plans for both CFs and forest parks under JFPM. They are responsible for the implementation of these management plans. They participate in tree planting funded under the project in their community forests, forest parks and on their farmlands. Local communities are involved in the development of community-based forest enterprise business plans with 18 communities already participating in beekeeping enterprises and 2 in tree nursery management enterprises as income generating activities for enhancement of livelihoods and environmental protection. Some local communities under the beekeeping programme have been trained on construction of beehives through cash-for-work and can now construct their own beehives and provide maintenance services for the beehives. Women are also involved in the construction of clay stoves which is supported by the project. Over 100 community members have been trained on construction of clay ovens. These women are now serving as training other community members on construction clay ovens as a strategy to reduce the quantity of firewood used and thus reduce the pressure on our forest resources. Some local communities participate in the identification of cattle tracks or stock routes in their communities and the development of local conventions for the sustainable management of grazing areas and their forests under the support of the project. They also serve in the management Committees of these cattle tracks and rangelands.

### 13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing <sup>23</sup>	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2022	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
Government	Department of Forestry	Grant	370,000	360,000	0	370,000
		In-kind	1,830,000	1,810,000	500,000	1,830,000
Government	NEMA (National Agricultural Land and Water Development Project)	Grant	5,000,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	5,000,000
Government	FASDEP (Food and Agriculture Sector Development Project)	Grant	2,800,000	2,600,000	1,900,000	2,800,000

<sup>23</sup> Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

NGO	ADWAC (Agency for the Development of Women and Children)	Grant	450,000	450,000	255,000	450,000
Private	NACO (Natural Resources Consulting)	In-kind	100,000	100,000	40,000	100,000
EU	FAO - Action Against Desertification	Grant	1,368,100	1,093,000	700,000	1,368,100
International Organization	FAO - Forest and Farm Facility	Grant	700,000	700,000	200,000	700,000
	FAO Country Office	In-kind	100,000	100,000	30,000	100,000
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12,718,100</b>	<b>10,713,000</b>	<b>7,125,000</b>	<b>12,718,100</b>

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

The major changes in project co-financing are in respect of the NEMA project, which phased out in December 2019 as well as the AAD project which phased out in 2020. NEMA could only fulfill 70% of its co-financing agreement, while AAD fulfilled 80% of its co-financing agreement.



## Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

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

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

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

## Annex I - Updated Tracking Tool

## GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet

## Annex B

Core Indicator 1	Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use				(Hectares)			
		Hectares (1.1+1.2)						
		Expected		Achieved				
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE			
Indicator 1.1	Terrestrial protected areas newly created							
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares					
			Expected		Achieved			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE		
		(select)						
		(select)						
		Sum						
Indicator 1.2	Terrestrial protected areas under improved management effectiveness							
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares	METT Score				
				Baseline		Achieved		
				Endorsement	MTR	TE		
		(select)						
		(select)						
		Sum						
Core Indicator 2	Marine protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use				(Hectares)			
		Hectares (2.1+2.2)						
		Expected		Achieved				
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE			
Indicator 2.1	Marine protected areas newly created							
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares					
			Expected		Achieved			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE		
		(select)						
		(select)						
		Sum						
Indicator 2.2	Marine protected areas under improved management effectiveness							
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares	METT Score				
				Baseline		Achieved		

			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
		(select)				
		(select)				
		Sum				
<b>Core Indicator 3</b>	<b>Area of land restored</b>					<b>(Hectares)</b>
			Hectares (3.1+3.2+3.3+3.4)			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			170.2	170.2	337	529
Indicator 3.1	Area of degraded agricultural land restored					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			70.2	70.2	155	329
Indicator 3.2	Area of forest and forest land restored					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			100	100	182	200
Indicator 3.3	Area of natural grass and shrublands restored					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 3.4	Area of wetlands (including estuaries, mangroves) restored					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
<b>Core Indicator 4</b>	<b>Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)</b>					<b>(Hectares)</b>
			Hectares (4.1+4.2+4.3+4.4)			
			Expected		Expected	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 4.1	Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	

			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
	Improved Forest Management	Community Forestry	18,000	31,682.32	41,682.32	41,682.32
		Private	100	100	103.2	200
		Government	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
Indicator 4.2	Area of landscapes that meet national or international third-party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations					
Third party certification(s):			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 4.3	Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 4.4	Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided					
Include documentation that justifies HCVF			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
<b>Core Indicator 5</b>	<b>Area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity</b>					<b>(Hectares)</b>
Indicator 5.1	Number of fisheries that meet national or international third-party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations					
Third party certification(s):			Number			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 5.2	Number of large marine ecosystems (LMEs) with reduced pollution and hypoxial					
			Number			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 5.3	Amount of Marine Litter Avoided					
			Metric Tons			

			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
<b>Core Indicator 6</b>	<b>Greenhouse gas emission mitigated</b>					<i>(Metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e)</i>
			Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e (6.1+6.2)			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
		Expected CO <sub>2</sub> e (direct)				
		Expected CO <sub>2</sub> e (indirect)				
<b>Indicator 6.1</b>	<b>Carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in the AFOLU sector</b>					
			Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
		Expected CO <sub>2</sub> e (direct)				
		Expected CO <sub>2</sub> e (indirect)				
		Anticipated start year of accounting				
		Duration of accounting				
<b>Indicator 6.2</b>	<b>Emissions avoided Outside AFOLU</b>					
			Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
		Expected CO <sub>2</sub> e (direct)				
		Expected CO <sub>2</sub> e (indirect)				
		Anticipated start year of accounting				
		Duration of accounting				
<b>Indicator 6.3</b>	<b>Energy saved</b>					
			MJ			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
<b>Indicator 6.4</b>	<b>Increase in installed renewable energy capacity per technology</b>					
			Capacity (MW)			
		Technology	Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
		(select)				
		(select)				
<b>Core Indicator 7</b>	<b>Number of shared water ecosystems (fresh or marine) under new or improved cooperative management</b>					<i>(Number)</i>
<b>Indicator 7.1</b>	<b>Level of Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Program (TDA/SAP) formulation and implementation</b>					
		Shared water ecosystem	Rating (scale 1-4)			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE

Indicator 7.2	Level of Regional Legal Agreements and Regional Management Institutions to support its implementation					
		Shared water ecosystem	Rating (scale 1-4)			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 7.3	Level of National/Local reforms and active participation of Inter-Ministerial Committees					
		Shared water ecosystem	Rating (scale 1-4)			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 7.4	Level of engagement in IWLEARN through participation and delivery of key products					
		Shared water ecosystem	Rating (scale 1-4)			
			Rating		Rating	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
<b>Core Indicator 8</b>	<b>Globally over-exploited fisheries Moved to more sustainable levels</b>					<i>(Metric Tons)</i>
Fishery Details			Metric Tons			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
<b>Core Indicator 9</b>	<b>Reduction, disposal/destruction, phase out, elimination and avoidance of chemicals of global concern and their waste in the environment and in processes, materials and products</b>					<i>(Metric Tons)</i>
			Metric Tons (9.1+9.2+9.3)			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	PIF stage	MTR	TE
Indicator 9.1	Solid and liquid Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) removed or disposed (POPs type)					
	POPs type		Metric Tons			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
	(select)	(select)	(select)			
	(select)	(select)	(select)			
	(select)	(select)	(select)			
Indicator 9.2	Quantity of mercury reduced					
			Metric Tons			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE

Indicator 9.3	Hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFC) Reduced/Phased out				
			Metric Tons		
			Expected		Achieved
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR TE
Indicator 9.4	Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control chemicals and waste				
			Number of Countries		
			Expected		Achieved
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR TE
Indicator 9.5	Number of low-chemical/non-chemical systems implemented particularly in food production, manufacturing and cities				
		Technology	Number		
			Expected		Achieved
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR TE
Indicator 9.6	Quantity of POPs/Mercury containing materials and products directly avoided				
			Metric Tons		
			Expected		Achieved
			PIF stage	Endorsement	PIF stage Endorsement
<b>Core Indicator 10</b>	<b>Reduction, avoidance of emissions of POPs to air from point and non-point sources</b>				
					<i>(grams of toxic equivalent gTEQ)</i>
Indicator 10.1	Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control emissions of POPs to air				
			Number of Countries		
			Expected		Achieved
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR TE
Indicator 10.2	Number of emission control technologies/practices implemented				
			Number		
			Expected		Achieved
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR TE
<b>Core Indicator 11</b>	<b>Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment</b>				
			Number		
			Expected		Achieved

			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
		Female	2,720	2,720	1,532	2510
		Male	4,080	4,080	2,298	4725
		<i>Total</i>	<i>6,800</i>	<i>6,800</i>	<i>3,830</i>	<i>7235</i>