



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review **2019 – Revised Template**

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	West Africa (RAF)
Country (ies):	The Gambia
Project Title:	Community-based Sustainable Dryland Forest Management
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/GAM/O31/GFF
GEF ID:	5406
GEF Focal Area(s):	Land degradation (LD)
Project Executing Partners:	Department of Forestry
Project Duration:	5-years

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	09 th May 2016
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	25 th October 2016
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	24th September 2021
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	N/A
Actual Implementation End Date³:	N/A

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	USD 3,066,347
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	USD 12,718,100
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	USD 817,892
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019⁵	USD 7,635,000

¹ as per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

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

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

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	25 th March 2019
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	n/a
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	n/a
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	Yes
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	No
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	n/a
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁶	Yes (to be submitted after the mid term review)

Ratings

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

Status

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

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

⁶ Please note that the Tracking Tools are required at mid-term and closure for all GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects. Tracking tools are not mandatory for Medium Sized projects = < 2M USD at mid-term, but only at project completion. The new GEF-7 results indicators (core and sub-indicators) will be applied to all projects and programs approved on or after July 1, 2018. Also projects and programs approved from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018 (GEF-6) must apply core indicators and sub-indicators at mid-term and/or completion

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Sambou Nget	Sambou.Nget@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Magnus Grylle	Magnus.Grylle@fao.org
Budget Holder	Perpetua Katepa-Kalala	Perpetua.Katepakalala@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division	Fritjof Boerstler	Fritjof.Boerstler@fao.org

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Objective(s):						
Outcome 1: 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		Policy and institutional capacity for sustainable dryland forest management Strengthened	90 staff from Government, Non-Government and Community-based Organizations trained on Sustainable Dryland Forest Management	S
		Forest policy provides very limited guidance on dryland forest management		A National Dryland Forest Management Strategy developed and the National Forestry Action planned reviewed	A National Forest Strategy has been developed and the National Forestry Action Plan reviewed by a team of national consultants led by Mr Falie Baldeh and validated on the 17 & 17 th August 2018	S

⁷ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

⁸ Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework) therefore this column should only be filled when relevant.

⁹ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**, **Satisfactory (S)**, **Marginally Satisfactory (MS)**, **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)**, **Unsatisfactory (U)**, and **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)**.

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Outcome 2.1: 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		18 JFPM Agreements and 28 Gazettes	9 JFPM Committee formed and 14 PCFMA advanced to CFMA	S
	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		18 JFPM plans and 73 management plans	9 JFPM plans and nine 5-year management plans developed	MS
Outcome 2.2: 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		15 000 ha of dryland forests sustainably managed by local communities	About 4 000 ha of natural forests brought under community management	MS
Outcome 3.1: Project implementation based on results based management and application of project findings and lessons learned in	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	An existing RMB in place	M&E framework and plan developed	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
future operations facilitated.						
Outcome 3.2: - Project M&E system designed, established and applied throughout the project and across all components, provinces and project sites	A Project M&E system designed, established and applied throughout the project and across all components, provinces and project sites	No M&E system exists	N/A	An existing and functional M&E system in place	Developing the ToR for an international consultant to support the development of the M&E system	MS

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating ¹⁰

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 2.1: Community forestry legal ownership strengthened (management plans developed)	To develop more JFPM and other management plans	The Department of Forestry with FAO support	End of 2019 (Expiry of current LoA)
Outcome 2.2: 15,066.84 ha of dryland forests are sustainably managed by local communities	More outreach programmes and sensitization to bring more dryland forest under sustainable management.	The Department of Forestry with FAO support	End of 2019 (Expiry of current LoA)
Outcome 3.1 & 3.2: Project implementation based on results based management and application of project findings and lessons learned in future operations facilitated.	To mitigate the current M&E challenge (establishment of the M&E system)	PMU	Fourth quarter

¹⁰ To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs ¹¹	Expected completion date ¹²	Achievements at each PIR ¹³					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁴ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
Output 1.1.1 Key sectors and institutional stakeholders trained on effective dryland forest management	Q2 Y2	<i>90 staff from Government, Non-Government and Community-based Organizations trained on Sustainable Dryland Forest Management</i>	<i>Done</i>				100%	
Output 1.1.2 National dryland forest management and rehabilitation strategy developed as a supplement to	Q2 Y2	<i>n/a</i>	A National Forest Strategy developed and validated The National Forestry Action Plan reviewed and validated				100%	

¹¹ Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

¹² As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

¹³ Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

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

the Forest Policy 2010-2019								
Output 1.1.3 Multi-stakeholder regional dryland forest management forums created	Q2 Y2	<i>Additional Multi-stakeholder forum yet to be created (however, 4 have been created under the project "Action Against Desertification in same project sites"</i>	An additional multi-stakeholder forum created in addition to 4 others created under the project "Action Against Desertification) thus making a total of five 100 participants (92 male and 8 female) sensitized on the project				90%	The forum is yet to be fully functional, however 8 meetings and 8 monitoring missions are planned for 2019 to strengthen the forums
Output 2.1.1 Regional community forestry task forces created and strengthened	Q3 Y3		160 members (138 male and 12 female) of 4 regional CF taskforces created under the Forest and Farm Facility (FFF) project in North Bank Region (NBR), Lower River Region (LRR), Central River Region (CRR) and Upper River Region trained participatory forest ownership transfer, forest governance, forest policy and legislation.				50%	Training was conducted by NACO (IP) Additional trainings for 100 taskforce members are planned for 2019 prioritising female participation to be conducted by the Department of Forestry (DoF)
Output 2.1.2 3251.4 ha of forests under start-up phase advanced to PCFMA stage	Q4 Y5		906.31 ha advanced to PCFMA 24 communities were sensitized on the CF				22%	The process of forest transfer is slow due to the different activities or legal requirements that have to be fulfilled before actual

and 4578.42 ha of forests at PCFMA stage are advanced to CFMA stage			concept and 16 communities sent in their letters of interest to the Department of Forestry					transfer
	Q4 Y5		2,616.24 ha advanced to CFMA				30%	Same as above
Output 2.1.3 14 new management plans (1438.12 ha) developed for CFs under CFMA	Q4 Y3	No management plans have been developed	Nine (9) 5-year management plans have been developed				54%	The process continues in the subsequent years
Output 2.1.4 5,749.9 ha of forests brought under Joint Forest Park Management	Q4 Y3	No JFPM management plans developed	9 JFPM management plans covering approximately 2749.9 ha have been developed				50%	Output process distributed over the project duration
	Q4 Y3	No JFPM Committee formed	9 JFPM committees formed				50%	Output process distributed over the project duration
	Q4 Y3	No JFPM Agreement signed	9 JFPM Agreements signed				50%	Output process distributed over the project duration
Output 2.2.1 Community Forestry Committee and Joint Forest Park Management committee members trained in improved dryland forest	Q4 Y4	Out of 600 members of the CFs and JFMPs for Yr 1 and 2 training, 50 members have been trained in improved Dryland management	50 (16 female and 34 male) CF and JFPM Committee members trained. Topics: participatory forest resource management, forest enterprise development and forest governance				24%	Output process distributed over the project duration

management and CF procedures/processes (600 members) <i>(trainings linked to Outputs 2.1.2, 2.1.3 & 2.1.4, and the committees under them)</i>								
<u>Output 2.2.2</u> 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	Q3 Y5	No planting activity	An assortment of 10,500 seedlings covering 31.5 ha have been planted 18 communities sensitized on agroforestry practices and 200 ha identified for agroforestry practices				21%	Poor rains and late rehabilitation of the central nurseries to raise enough seedlings for the planting contributed to the low results.

	Q4 Y3	Five central nurseries have been identified for rehabilitation and supplied with water	5 boreholes drilled and reticulation system put in place in the central nurseries identified				48%	Awaiting other accessories (solar panels, water pumps, overhead tanks ...) which are under procurement
	Q3 Y5	<p>Preliminary consultations with Department of Forestry staff at Regional level have been conducted by the project recruited International Consultant.</p> <p>The DoF staff and 18 communities were sensitized and sites covering 200 ha was compiled at Regional level for Agroforestry</p>	<p>Increment of 3951.41 ha through tree planting and assisted natural regeneration</p> <p>Carried out 4 Radio sensitization programme on 2 community radios in NBR and URR on tree regeneration protection and management</p> <p>Annual bush fire campaigns conducted in all the project intervention regions</p> <p>Guidelines for Community-Based Fire management and for the selection of suitable sites for agroforestry were developed by two international consultants respectively in June 2018.</p>				35%	Late drilling of the boreholes in the central nurseries to provide water for production of tree seedlings

<u>Output 2.2.3</u> Controlled grazing implemented through 10 community grazing agreements in the community forests and efficiency of fuelwood use improved by introduced cooking stoves (2000 households)	Q4 Y3		4 rangelands and 4 cattle tracks identified awaiting signing of agreements				50%	Negotiations among livestock owners have been slow
	Q3 Y3		2000 cook stoves constructed and 1500 distributed to 750 households				90%	SP awaiting funds in its next LoA to distribute the rest of the stoves
<u>Output 2.2.4</u> Community based forest enterprises strengthened (21 enterprises)	Q2 Y4		Eight (8) Enterprise Development Plans (EDPs) in place				38%	Late disbursement of seed money from the project for the enterprise groups slowed the process
	Q4 Y3		Eighty (80) (46 male and 34 female) Community Forest Management Committee members trained on Enterprise				53%	Other training events are planned for 2019

			Development					
	Q4 Y4		3 Collaboration Fairs for 60 Interest Group (IG) Members and 15 Support and Service Institutions conducted to facilitate value addition of marketed forest products				33%	Other events spread in the subsequent project years
<u>Output 3.1.1</u> Project monitoring system providing systematic information on progress in meeting project outcomes and output targets	Q4 Y3		Project baseline assessment using the SHARP Tool conducted and the M&E frameworks developed				50%	An International M&E officer would be hired in October 2019 to work with a national M&E officer to develop the M&E system of the project
<u>Output 3.1.2</u> Project related 'best practices' and 'lessons learnt' published			Nothing done yet				0%	This will be carried out towards the end of the project.

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating ¹⁵	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating ¹⁶	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	MS	<i>Slow procurement process and late disbursement of funds to Implementation Partners (IPs). Slow recruitment process particularly for international consultants and variability of rainfall leading to postponement of tree planting in the first year. Slow process of legal forest ownership transfer (3 years). Passing away of the previous National Project Coordinator and the late recruitment of a replacement leading to serious delay in implementation of activities in 2019</i>
Budget Holder	S	MS	<i>The slow procurement and recruitment processes, the slow implementation rate by IPs as well as the slow process of legal transfer of forest ownership have both contributed to this rating. In addition, the sudden demise of the former National Project Coordinator (Mr Kebba N. Sonko) in late 2018 shocked everyone and therefore it took sometime before we could come to terms with this event and to look for his replacement. This has contributed to delays in the implementation of the project activities.</i>
Lead Technical Officer¹⁷	S	MS	<i>Natural resource management projects rely to large extent, obviously, on the nature. Nature does not take human planning into account. Erratic rainfall has thus affected tree planting this year. This will have to be compensated for subsequent years, when the nurseries are operational. So technically, this is only a temporary glitch. Given the sad circumstances surrounding the completely unexpected passing away of the previous NPC much critical institutional and operational knowledge got lost. In addition, everybody involved in the project got an emotional blow. It took some time to compensate for this, during which many activities were stalled. The effect on the project due to this extreme and exceptional incident should not be underestimated</i>

¹⁵ **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁶ **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁷ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

GEF Funding Liaison Officer	S	MS	<i>The unexpected passing of the NPC and slow recruitment of his replacement mainly contributed to slowing down of the project's implementation progress this year. The project can still achieve most of its development objective, however, activities (in particular under Component 2) with an expected visible/measurable impact on the ground have to pick up on pace for this purpose. It will be important to link the results of the SHARP survey to the project's baseline in order to measure progress against targets (e.g. improved livelihoods and resilience through IGA and improved stoves).</i>
--	----------	-----------	---

Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation

Please briefly summarize main progress achieving the outcomes (cumulative) and outputs (during this fiscal year):

Max 200 words:

Capacity of national and local institutions including NGOs and CSOs have been strengthened on sustainable dryland forest management through series of trainings which included Community-based Fire management and silviculture on dryland forests. Strategic documents such as a National Forestry Dryland Forest Management Strategy was developed, the National Forestry Action Plan was reviewed and guidelines on forest fires and agroforestry practices elaborated. A significant progress on legal transfer of forest ownership was realized through the identification 8 new Community Forests (CFs) and 8 CFs under PCFMA were advanced to CFMA covering an area of 906.31ha while fourteen 5-year management plans were developed for CFs under CFMA covering and area 1438.12ha. Nine Joint Forest Park Management (JFPM) Committees managing and area of 2749.9ha were formed and trained on their roles and responsibilities. Fire management tools/materials were procured and distributed to local forest managers while 5 central forest nurseries were identified in the project intervention regions and installation of solar powered water systems (boreholes and reticulation) for production of tree seedlings is ongoing. Two thousand (2000) improved cook stoves were constructed and distributed to 750 households thus reducing the amount of firewood collected from the forest

What are the major challenges the project has experienced during this reporting period?

Main challenges experienced by the project during this reporting period included slow recruitment procedures for consultants (particularly international) and procurement of goods and services. This delayed activities under Outcome 2 the provision of water to central nurseries for

the propagation of tree seedlings as well as procurement of materials for the fire award scheme. As we reported, the facilities supposed to be provided in these nurseries are yet to be completed thus delaying the production of seedlings for enrichment planting and afforestation. Some of the IPs were also slow in the implementation of activities under their Letters of Agreement. As a result of late rainfall, tree planting had to be postponed and/or scaled back for fear of low planted seedling survival in the first and second year. There was delays in the provision of mobility to project cluster monitors to facilitate their engagements with the IPs and project beneficiaries to assure effective project implementation. The passing away of the previous National Project Coordinator in late 2018 and delays in finding a replacement contributing to delays in implementation of planned activities for 2019. There were instances of late disbursement of fund to IPs, which caused delays in activity implementation.

3. Risks

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

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid¹⁸. If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low	The risks remain the same.

Please make sure that the below risk table include also Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans.

Risk ratings

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

Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
------	---------------------------	-------------------	--	-----------------------------------

¹⁸ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

¹⁹ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

²⁰ If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period”.

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	<p>Institutional risk</p> <p>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</p>	M	<p>The project will work closely with the Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR) platform, and will establish under the forum a sub-coalition focusing specifically on dryland forest management issues. The ANR platform, at the national level, works towards ensuring effective multi-sectoral coordination. The sub-coalitions established by the project will ensure multi-sectoral coordination at all levels with regards to the dryland forest management issues.</p> <p>The project's steering committee will also comprise of senior members from the partner government agencies ensuring constant involvement and coordination.</p>	<p>5 multi-stakeholder SLM forums have been formed in the project intervention regions and members have been trained on SLM issues including participatory forest ownership transfer, forest governance etc.</p> <p>A Project's Steering Committee (PSC) chaired by the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Environment with member drawn from other relevant government and non-government institutions have been formed and are meeting twice annually</p>	
2	<p>Political-institutional risk: difficulties in securing co-financing</p>	L	<p>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 will continuously follow up on the co-financing commitments.</p>	<p>Government is committed to the project and co-financing letters have been secured from different co-financing sources</p>	

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
3	Social risk Lack of interest or sense of ownership on the part of local communities	L	Moreover, communities have been consulted during the preparation of the project and have expressed their interest and willingness to participate in the project activities.	Awareness raising, consultations and capacity building of local communities is on-going and interest in the programme is high	
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 neighboring communities claiming rights over the forests	M	The targeted CFs under the project were chosen keeping in mind the customary tenure conflicts, and none of the CFs have any documented conflicts.	Project is aware of the potential for conflicts and therefore it is working closely with the local authorities, CF communities to avoid them.	N/A
5	Socio-economic risk Conflicts between members of Community Forestry Committees (CFCs) and Joint Forest Park Management (JFPM) committees for access to benefits	M	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.	Department of Forestry's field officers are working very close with Community Forestry and Joint Forest Park Management Committees to ensure that the criteria for benefit sharing are followed.	

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
6	Political risk Reduction in political will and decrease in support from the government		The government has fully backed the development of the project and high level participation was ensured both at the project preparation and validation workshops. The project through its PSC will constantly coordinate with high level policy makers to keep them apprised and maintain their support for the project.	The Ministry of Environment is fully in support of the project and as Chair of the PSC it is regularly brief on project activities which is increasing the political support for the project.	
7	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	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 tree planting operations (reducing the scale of enrichment planting and using well developed seedlings –preferably 2-year old seedlings)	
8	Slow processing of Letters of Agreement (LoAs) with Implementation Partners (IPs)	M	The process of developing the LoAs will be done very early by the end of the year and submitted for approval.	Regular follow-ups with the Admin office to complete final reviews and clearances for approval.	

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

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Low	Medium	Up to end of June 2019, the LoAs with IPs have not been signed which means that there are only six months before end of 2019 to implement the planned activities for the year. This is a risk of not being able to implement all the planned activities.

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months²¹

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

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

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

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	<p>Original NTE: June 2016 Revised NTE: Oct. 2016</p> <p>Justification: Late signing of the FAO, Government, Gambia government Agreement for project start up.</p>

²¹ Minor adjustments to project outputs can be made during project inception. Significant adjustments can be made only after a mid-term review/evaluation or supervision missions. The changes need to be discussed with the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, then approved by the whole Project Task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

5. Gender Mainstreaming

Was a gender analysis undertaken or an equivalent socio-economic assessment? Please briefly indicate the gender differences.

Does the M&E system have gender-disaggregated data? How is the project tracking gender impacts and results?

Does the project staff have gender expertise?

The project M&E system with gender-disaggregated data is being developed.

If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:

- closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;
- improving women's participation and decision making; and or
- Generating socio-economic benefits or services for women.

Result areas; 2.1.2, 2.2.3 and 2.2.4 both contribute to gender equality related to the above dimensions.

Women in The Gambia bear many responsibilities for the care of the family at household level. The household division of labour between women and men is not equal, and poverty is more prevalent amongst women due to gender inequalities in access to resources such as land, credit and information technology.

Community Forestry (Result: 2.1.2), Agroforestry (2.2.2), Access to improved cook stoves (Result: 2.2.3) and Community-based forest enterprises (Result: 2.2.4) all make a substantial contribution to income generation for women and enhance food security by providing women access to resources and reducing their daily chores for collecting firewood etc.

The Participatory forest management approach promoted through the community forestry programme advocates for both women and men participation and decision making in forest resources management and guarantees equal and equitable access to resources and benefits accrued from participatory forest management activities.

The production and distribution of improved cook stoves to households under the project directly benefits women who are responsible for cooking in the household. It will reduce the time spent on collection of firewood, the time spent on preparing food as well as the health hazards related to smoke from traditional cooking methods. The time gained could be used for income generation activities for these women.

Women like their men counterparts are actively involved in community-based forest enterprises under result area 2.2.4 focusing mainly on Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs) for example, fruits and nuts, honey, branch wood etc. This programme is empowering women in terms increased income and capacity on business management.

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

If applies, 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

n/a

7. Stakeholders Engagement

Please report on progress, challenges and outcomes on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan included at CEO Endorsement/Approval (when applicable))

If your project had a stakeholder engagement plan, specify whether any new stakeholders have been identified/engaged:

The project's stakeholders remain the same

If a stakeholder engagement plan was not requested for your project at CEO endorsement stage, please

List all stakeholders engaged in the project;

- Ministry of Environment, Climate Change and Natural Resources (MECCNAR)
- Department of Forestry (DoF)
- Department of Lands and Surveys (DLS)
- Department of Agriculture (DoA)
- National Environment Agency (NEA)
- Department of Parks and Wildlife Management (DPWM)
- Ministry of Energy (MoE)
- Ministry of Lands and Rural Administration (MoLRA)
- ANR Working Group
- Natural Resources Consulting (NACO)
- Agency for Development of Women and Children (ADWAC)
- Local communities, CFCs and JFPM committees
- Local Government Authorities (LGAs)
- National Farmers Platform
- All Gambia Forestry Platform (AGFP)
- Livestock Owners Association
- National Bee Keepers Association (NBAG)

- briefly describe stakeholders' engagement events, specifying time, date stakeholders engaged, purpose (information, consultation, participation in decision making, etc.) and outcomes.

The main stakeholders' engagement events at national level are during PSC meetings to discuss progress on project implementation including challenges and possible solutions and review of annual work plans and budgets for approval. At local or community level, the engagements are through CF and JFPM meetings, trainings and field activities.

8. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in knowledge management approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval

- Please tell us the story of your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihood and how it is contributing to achieve the expected global environmental benefits
- Please provide the links to publications, video materials, etc.

The project has not yet started documenting its activities but it can already be said that the introduction of improved cook stove among some households and communities has helped in reducing the amount of fuelwood used for cooking and heating therefore providing a good savings in money and/or time used to buy or collect fuelwood. This has also reduced the pressure of fuelwood collection from the forests. The support to community-based forest products enterprises is also increasing the income streams from community forests and therefore enhancing the livelihoods of some of the target beneficiaries of the project.

9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²²	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019-	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
National Government	Department of Forestry		USD 1 800 000	500,000		USD 1 800 000
National Government	NEMA		USD5 000 000	USD 3 500 000		USD 5 000 000
National Government	FASDEP		USD2 800 000	USD 1 900 000		USD 2 800 000
National Government	AAD		USD1 555 100	USD 700, 000		USD 1 555 100
National Government	FFF		USD953 000	USD 700 000		USD 953 000
NGO	ADWAC		USD450 000	USD 255 000		USD 450 000
CSO	NACO	In-kind	USD100 000	USD 50 000		USD 100 000
FAO	FAO Representation	In-kind	USD60 000	USD 30 000		USD 60 000
TOTAL			USD 12, 718, 100	USD 7,635,000		USD 12 205 100

²² 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.

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

There are no major changes in project co-financing, however, some co-financiers such as NEMA, FASDEP and AAD will be phasing out in 2020. FFF has already phased out (in 2018).

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. **DO Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** - Project is expected to achieve or exceed **all** its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”); **Satisfactory (S)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings); **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits); **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** - Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major global environmental objectives); **Unsatisfactory (U)** - Project is expected **not** to achieve **most** of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits); **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** - The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, **any** of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

Implementation Progress Rating – Assess the progress of project implementation. **IP Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as “good practice”. **Satisfactory (S):** Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action. **Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action. **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action. **Unsatisfactory (U):** Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.