



## FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

### 2023 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

## Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA .....	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE) .....	4
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	8
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS .....	11
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS) .....	14
6. RISKS .....	16
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION .....	21
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS .....	23
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	24
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING .....	26
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES .....	27
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT .....	34
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE .....	35

## 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>Initial project duration (years):</b>	6-years
<b>Project coordinates:</b> <i>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.</i>	<i>[Projects in a) and b) categories should indicate YES here and provide the geocoded data in Annex 2]</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>st</sup> December 2022

### Funding

<b>GEF Grant Amount (USD):</b>	USD 3,066,347
<b>Total Co-financing amount (USD)<sup>3</sup>:</b>	USD 12,718,100
<b>Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD):</b>	USD 2,839,131
<b>Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD)<sup>4</sup>:</b>	USD 2,808,965
<b>Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023<sup>5</sup></b>	USD 10,933,000

<sup>1</sup> As per FPMIS

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

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

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

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

**M&E Milestones**

Date of Last Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	21 December 2022
Expected Mid-term Review date <sup>6</sup> :	February 2020
Actual Mid-term review date (if already completed):	February 2020
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date <sup>7</sup> :	<b>June 2022</b>
Tracking tools (TT)/Core indicators (CI) updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	Yes

**Overall ratings**

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

**ESS risk classification**

Current ESS Risk classification:	Low
----------------------------------	-----

**Status**

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

**Project Contacts**

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Coordinator (PC)	Sambou Nget	sambou.nget@fao.org
Budget Holder (BH)	Moshibudi Rampedi	moshibudi.rampedi@fao.org
GEF Operational Focal Point (GEF OFP)	Mr. Badgie Dawda	<a href="mailto:dawda.badgie@nea.gm">dawda.badgie@nea.gm</a> <a href="mailto:badgiedawda@gmail.com">badgiedawda@gmail.com</a>
Lead Technical Officer (LTO)	Mohamadou Aw (NFODD)	mohamadou.aw@fao.org
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	Nifesimi Ogunkua	Nifesimi.ogunkua@fao.org

<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 TargetMid-term Target <sup>9</sup>	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress <sup>10</sup> since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating <sup>11</sup>
To reduce forest degradation in the northern part of The Gambia through the strengthening and expansion of community-forestry and implementation of Sustainable Forest Management	<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	Under Land Degradation (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 limited guidance	N/A	A National Dryland Forest	A National Forest Strategy has been developed and the National Forestry Action Plan reviewed and validated on the 17 &	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). Refer to Annex 1.

(SFM) practices			on dryland forest management		Management Strategy developed and the National Forestry Action planned reviewed	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.	S

	<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

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

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)	December 2023
<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	December 2023

### 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 DO NOT repeat results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance <sup>14</sup> in delivering outputs
<b><u>Outcome 1.1</u></b>				
<b><u>Output 1.1.1</u></b> Multi-stakeholder regional dryland forest management forums created and strengthened	Number of staff trained	5 Regional SLM Forum meetings	2 Regional SLM Forum meetings conducted with 75 participants to plan for field monitoring visits to project intervention sites. Itinerary for the field visits was developed.	
<b><u>Outcome 2.1</u></b>				
<b><u>Output 2.1.1</u></b>				
<b><u>Output 2.1.2</u></b> 3,251.4 ha of forests under start-up phase advanced to PCFMA stage and 4578.42 ha of forests at PCFMA stage	CFMA award	28 community forests (CFs) gazetted		

<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.



are advanced to CFMA stage				
	PCFMA award	20 PCFMA to be awarded (part of the 28 gazetted)		
	3-year management plans	20 preliminary management plans developed		
<b><u>Output 2.1.3</u></b>	5-year management plans	20 5-year management plans developed/updated		
<b><u>Outcome 2.2</u></b>				
<b><u>Output 2.2.2</u></b> SFM practices implemented - Forest cover increased by 5% through small scale tree planting and assisted natural regeneration - Site suitable agroforestry techniques implemented across 500 ha - Improved bushfire management techniques	Number of hectares covered by tree planting	Enrichment planting on 100Ha degraded forests	Trees planted on degraded forest sites	
<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	Number of grazing agreement	10 agreements	5 Management Committees formed and trained	
	Number of improved cooking stoves	2,000	2,000 energy-efficient cooking stoves distributed to 1,000 households	

stoves (2,000 households)				
<b><u>Outcome 3.1</u></b>				
<b><u>Output 3.1.2</u></b> Project related 'best practices' and 'lessons learnt' published	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	

#### 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 registered major milestones including formation of 20 CF and 10 rangeland management committees, and constructed 1800 concrete poles for the demarcation of the identified cattle tracks. The project procured and distributed 2000 improved metallic cooking stoves to 525 households in the project intervention regions. Furthermore, the project supported capacity building for beneficiaries on improved dryland forest management and CF procedures and processes, Farmer Managed Natural Regeneration (FMNR) technique, and development and establishment of community-based natural resource enterprises as a way of contributing to food security, poverty reduction and sustainable land use. 16,000 seedlings of five species (Khaya, Gmelina, Acacia, lime, Anacardium) were distributed to eleven communities for planting on farmlands covering an area of 150ha as part of the agroforestry intervention. Draft Forest Notice Schedules for 29 CFs in the project sites produced. Major challenges included the slow procurement process, delays in implementations and limited capacity of contractors.

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

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

	<b>FY2023 Development Objective rating<sup>15</sup></b>	<b>FY2023 Implementation Progress rating<sup>16</sup></b>	<b>Comments/reasons<sup>17</sup> justifying the ratings for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period</b>
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	The project completed all the major planned outcomes except one multipurpose house and erection of concrete poles for 9 cattle tracks, that are ongoing.
<b>Budget Holder</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	Commendable results are recorded for the reporting period. Statements of affirmation were given by stakeholders and implementing partners.
<b>GEF Operational Focal Point<sup>18</sup></b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	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 improve 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

<sup>15</sup> **Development Objectives Rating** – A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

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

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

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

			productive and protected land/seascapes conserved by improved land use and marine spatial planning policies and land/seascape level management in Gambia.
<b>Lead Technical Officer<sup>19</sup></b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	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.
<b>GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	The perseverance of the project team together with the support of project partners and stakeholders enabled the project to deliver most of its results. In line with the TE recommendations, it is crucial to roll out the exit strategy and systemize the exchange of project knowledge and learnings to support replication of good practices and upscaling of results, and inform the design of new interventions.

<sup>19</sup> 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
<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:

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

<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>

<sup>20</sup> **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit ([Esm-unit@fao.org](mailto: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 <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 worked 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 Steering Committee brought on-board senior staff members of implementing partner institutions from government and non-government institutions. This enhanced their constant participation in planning 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 were organized to foster institutional coordination.</p>	Government remained committed to project implementation with the participation of regional Governors and staff of the the Ministry of Environment, Climate Change and Natural Resources. The PSC provided effective advice and guidance to the PMU.

<sup>21</sup> 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 <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 ensured strong government commitment to the initiative. All project partners had expressed their willingness to support the initiative through formal co-financing commitment letters. The PSC and the PCU continuously follow up on the co-financing commitments.	Government's commitment to the project and co-financing arrangements remained throughout the project circle.	The co-financing partners remained committed to the agreements.
3	Social risk: Lack of interest or sense of ownership on the part of local communities	L	Y	The project continuously engaged participating communities in project implementation giving them a leadership role in decision-making.	Livelihood enhancement opportunities (such as beekeeping, tree nursery management, cash-for-work activities etc.) were strengthened under the project alongside capacity building and awareness raising activities which enhanced stakeholder and community ownership.	The project successfully generated interest and ownership among local communities.

	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 successfully facilitated conflict resolution through consensual negotiations with the support of local authorities. Local natural resources management conventions were developed to promote sustainable grazing and management of natural resources. This is expected to reduce future conflicts between livestock owners and crop farmers as well as transhumance herders.	The project continuously monitored potential conflicts on tenure over grazing rights not only between local communities but also with cross-border transhumance herders.

	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 were clearly articulated. They were based on equitable and fair sharing of benefits derived through CF and JFPM. Arising conflicts were dealt within through respective CFCs and JFPM committees.	The Department of Forestry through its regional forestry offices worked closely with Community Forestry and Joint Forest Park Management Committees to ensure that agreements on benefit sharing were respected.	Payment of 15% of proceeds accrued from community forest to the National Forestry Fund was agreed upon. This will financially empower communities to manage the affairs of their forests.
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 were chosen considering the species adaptation and resilient to drought.	Well targeted enrichment planting was pursued.	The risk of bushfires and drought impacting forest rehabilitation and other natural resource management activities remained high. Climate change is believed to be increasing this risk over time.

**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
L	N/A	Implementation rate during the Post-COVID phase of the project was much better. It was possible to catch-up on capacity building and other field activities that were put on hold.

## 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” facilitated the identification of three cattle tracts, establishment of watering points on these tracts and formation of management Committees for the tracts.
<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 revision was done.
<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 was developed and validated with the relevant stakeholders in June 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.	Project delivery was greatly enhanced by tracking project expenditure.
<b>Recommendation 12:</b> The Project Steering Committee should meet at least twice / year for the remainder of the project.	The scheduling of at least two PSC meetings per year was adhered to.
<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 Services (DLS), the Ministry of Energy (MoE), and the Ministry of Lands and Rural Administration (MoLRA).	The National Agricultural Research Institute (NARI) was brought in to focus on the agroforestry component of the project.

<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 was 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 was attached to the project and the project's M&E plan was effectively implemented.
<b>Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please summarize</b>	Yes. The project has developed an Exit Strategy. The Strategy was reviewed by the PSC and validated in a stakeholder workshop. The Exit Strategy outlined action plans for the implementing partners to sustainable continue actions initiated under the project.

## 8. Minor project amendments

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

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

<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	Type of partnership	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
<b>Government institutions</b>			
Department of Forestry (DoF)	Implementing Partner (IP)	Support provided to facilitate tenure transfer of state forests to local communities and conducted capacity building of local forest managers on dryland forest management, community forestry and Joint Forest Park Management, agroforestry and Assisted Natural Regeneration. Finalized maps for community forests prior to gazetting and handing over to local communities.	Minimal challenges
<b>NGOs<sup>23</sup></b>			
Agency for the Development of Women and Children (ADWAC)	Implementing Partner (IP)	Supported the provision of livestock management services. Identified 3 cattle tracks, facilitated the development of local conventions on grazing and natural resources management. IP facilitated the formation of rangeland management Committees and provided trainings on group and financial management.	Slow implementation rate and late submission of reports continues to be a challenge.
<b>Private sector entities</b>			

<sup>23</sup> Non-government organizations



Natural Resources Consulting (NACO)	Implementing Partner (IP)	IP provided mentoring and incubation support to forest enterprise groups. Provided capacity building of forest enterprise groups on simple records keeping. Facilitated field monitoring visits of the regional SLM forums to various project intervention sites.	Minimal challenges
<b>Others<sup>24</sup></b>			
<b>New stakeholders identified</b>			
National Agricultural Research Institute (NARI)	Implementing Partner (IP)	Provide support to farmers on agroforestry practices. More than 100 farmers in the project intervention regions were guided through tree planting on their farms and provided trainings on tree management and Farmer Managed Natural Regeneration.	Slow implementation rate

<sup>24</sup> 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):		
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		
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 interest 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

	<p>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>
<p>Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges <b>this year</b>.</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 the best partner for change</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> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 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.</p>	<p>In the Gambia: Farmers Laud Agroforestry's Potential to Improve Livelihood</p>  <p><i>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</i></p> <p>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</p>

	<p>livelihoods, economic viability and agricultural production significantly.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>“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> <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</p>
--	--

	<p>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></p> <p>FAO Gambia Facebook page: <a href="https://www.facebook.com/FAOGambia">https://www.facebook.com/FAOGambia</a></p> <p>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></p> <p>Project Newsletter 2021: <a href="https://www.fao.org/3/cb8975en/cb8975en.pdf">https://www.fao.org/3/cb8975en/cb8975en.pdf</a></p> <p>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></p> <p>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></p> <p><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><b>Media Coverages:</b></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>

	<div data-bbox="873 191 1364 743"> <p>Thursday 21 April 2022   <a href="#">Site</a>   <a href="#">Home</a>   <a href="#">Page 14</a></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>rees are dotted with intricate vegetation, palm and hardwood trees. They are speckled with tall ferns, acacia and the forest on the woodland of the Gambia, tinged in different shades of green, look menacing and breathtakingly beautiful.</p> <p>Adorned with an array of prominent bushes, thick with cotton trees and palm of mangrove forests, land both for island and along the banks of the river Gambia, the country holds 400,000 hectares of forests with sweet promise.</p> <p>These forests and woodlands have, however, seen a decline due to a rapidly increasing population as well as unsustainable resource extraction and uncontrolled forest fires. The growing rural population in this West African nation has struggled with poverty and with sustainably managing these dryland forests while relying on them for their livelihoods and food security.</p> <p>Through a flagship programme spearheaded by FAO and the Gambia's Department of Forestry, the "Community-based Sustainable Dryland Forest Management" project has enabled groups of community beekeepers, known locally as Honey Enterprise Groups, with beekeeping equipment such as beehives, uniforms, hats, gloves, uniforms and bee tools. With the support of FAO through the Global Environment Facility (GEF)-funded project, the Honey Enterprise Groups are contracting beehives in the forest to harvest honey for their livelihoods. "I would have never thought that our dream of implementing our honey enterprise development plan would come to fruition," said community beekeeper, Kamileh Njie, as she and her team inspect 40 beehives at an apiary in Jiflamm village in the Lower River Region in the south of the country. "Although there have been numerous talks about forest enterprise</p> <p>in the Gambia. This is highly pronounced in the region north of the Gambia River. Dryland forests in the country play a pivotal role in halting desertification. Though 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 by promoting the sustainable management of forest resources. 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 these natural resources and conserve biodiversity.</p> <p>"The FAO/GEF project is indeed a blessing for the farmers, beekeepers and the honey," said Taa Bah, President of the Jombe Sekara Diara Forest Park Management Committee and a member of the honey enterprise group. "Our bees were saved from extinction in 2020 thanks to the training the forest park managers received from the project. The</p> <p>possible climate shocks while they will be contributing to forest and biodiversity conservation," Sambou Njie, FAO's GEF Project Coordinator said.</p> <p>There is already a very high demand for honey and honey products 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</p>   </div>
<p>Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's name and contact details</p>	<p><b>Other communication assets published online:</b></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/3xv0TaP">https://bit.ly/3xv0TaP</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/3mpGXzQ">https://bit.ly/3mpGXzQ</a></li> <li><a href="https://youtu.be/o1OP9e7sdfU">https://youtu.be/o1OP9e7sdfU</a></li> </ul> <p>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 interest stories.</p> <p>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</p>



	<p>harvesting and selling honey to generate income for their communities.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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>
--	--

## 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.**

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>25</sup>	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing <sup>26</sup>	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	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>25</sup>Sources of Co-financing may include: GEF Agency, Donor Agency, Recipient Country Government, Private Sector, Civil Society Organization, Beneficiaries, Other.

<sup>26</sup>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](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_FI_GN_01_Cofinancing_Guidelines_2018.pdf)

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	120,000	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	900,000	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>10,933,000</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 <b>major</b> 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 <b>relevant</b> 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
<b>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</b>	Project is expected to achieve its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to <b>achieve only 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 <b>some</b> 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 <b>most</b> 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 <b>none</b> of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

<b>Risk rating</b> 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:	
<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 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

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