



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2022 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022

Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE)	4
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	7
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	10
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	13
6. RISKS	15
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION	17
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	18
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	19
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING	20
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	21
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	22
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	23

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	AFR (Central Africa)
Country (ies):	Democratic Republic of the Congo
Project Title:	Community-Based Miombo Forest Management in South East Katanga
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/DRC/046/GFF
GEF ID:	5547
GEF Focal Area(s):	Multi-focal Areas
Project Executing Partners:	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD), University of Lubumbashi, Satellite Observatory of Central African Forests and other local authorities and NGOs relevant to the project (PREMICONGO, ZEBREAU, Bureau Diocésain de développement (BDD), APRONAPAKAT, OPED
Project Duration (years):	5 years
Project coordinates:	<i>Provided separately</i>

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	10 March 2016
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	01 August 2016
Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	31 July 2021
Revised project implementation end date (if approved) ²	30 December 2022

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	4,533,333
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc³:	14,491,594
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2022 (USD)⁴:	4,164,474
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2022⁵	13,558,548

¹ As per FPMIS

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

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

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

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

M&E Milestones

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	March 4th 2022
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	
Actual Mid-term review date (when it is done):	31 May 2019
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date⁷:	September 2022
Tracking tools/Core indicators updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	NA

Overall ratings

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

ESS risk classification

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

Status

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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Innocent OMBENI, FAOCD	Innocent.OmbeniCiribagula@fao.org
Budget Holder	Aristide ONGONE OBAME, FAOCD	Aristide.Ongone@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Jean-Claude Nguinguiri, NFO	Jeanclaude.nguinguiri@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Kuena Morebotsane, OCB	Kuena.Morebotsane@fao.org

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

⁷ 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)

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating ¹¹
To improve livelihoods of local communities through the improvement of wood and non-timber forest product value chains	Outcome 1.1. Miombo forests managed sustainably by empowered communities	Forest area under community management	0	30,000 hectares	80,000 hectares [Target has been increased to 150,000 hectares]	210,911 hectares under community management. 20 communities forest concessions titles granted in 2021/ 123,745 hectares demarcated for 10 CFs with draft of management plans and requests for CFCL's titles submitted to the office of the governor of Haut Katanga / In spite of the delay in issuing new CFCL titles, forest area under community management has reached a total of 334,656 ha.	HS
		Number of operational community forest management funds (CFF)	0	30	50	The creation of a CFF is mandatory for each CFCL. 30 CFF are operational. A community-based Miombo forests restoration fund under development within the framework of the implementation of the scaling-up strategy (output 2.1.4)	S

⁸ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project.

⁹ 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.

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

¹¹ 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).

Outcome 1.2. Enhanced productivity on fallow and cropland	10% increase in productivity on 30,000 hectares	0	15,000 ha	30,000 ha	The area of forest fallows restored has increased from 18,382 hectares to 20,882 hectares /In addition, 250 hectares of cropland are under conservation agriculture system	S
Outcome 2.1. The legal framework presents a clear and simple process for the empowerment of communities for sustainable forest management	Approved experimental regulations for the empowerment of the project communities in the Lubumbashi supply zone	0	Approved experimental regulations for the empowerment of the project communities in the Lubumbashi supply zone		Due to new developments in the community forestry, this outcome was not relevant when the project implementation was launched, as the law decree 14/1018 fixing the modalities for attributing CFCL and the Ministerial Decree No. 025 related to rules governing forest concessions managed by local communities were issued by the government.	-
	New legal texts addressing gaps in the national legal framework for CBFM	0		New legal texts submitted for approval	Standards for timber exploitation in CFs of Miombo forests developed. The implementing act for the standard is not yet issued by the government.	MS
	Adopted provincial strategy	0		Adopted provincial strategy	The scaling up strategy and action plan are available. Some of the expected outputs are achieved (umbrella associations of CF legal entities, etc.).	S
Outcome 3.1 Knowledge management facilitates the extension and adoption of best practices and lessons learned	At least one partner initiative adopts/ incorporates best practices identified in the project	0		At least one partner initiative integrates best practices identified by the end of the project	250 family farmers have adopted best practices, including conservation agriculture practices, the use of fire as a tool for ANR, the fallow enrichment treatments with native tree species, etc.	MS

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

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 2.1. The legal framework presents a clear and simple process for the empowerment of communities for sustainable forest management	Ensure that the government has issued the implementing act for the standards before the project completion.	UGP/DRCE/DIAF	Sept 2022
Outcome 3.1. Knowledge management facilitates the extension and adoption of best practices and lessons learned	Conduct the documentation of good practices and ensure that technical publications are available before the closing workshop for the project (scheduled in the first week of December 2022)	UGP/UNILU	July – November 2022

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outcomes and Outputs ¹²	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹³ (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁴ in delivering outputs
Outcome 1.1				
Output 1.1.1 Communities empowered and structured for sustainable forest management	Number of communities with forest management committees and legal documents granting forest management rights	10 communities	10 communities (of the second wave) have submitted to the governor of Haut Katanga the requests of CFCL titles on their customary lands	Good progress has been made. The target will be reached in due time provided that the governor decides to sign the CFCL titles
Output 1.1.2 Participatory zoning of village lands and simple management plans (SMP) developed and implemented	Number of simple management plans developed and approved	30 SMP plans implemented	30 SMP under implementation (20 SMP for the first wave and 10 for the second wave)/ Regarding the second wave, 10 SMP are under implementation, but not yet approved, because of the delay in issuing CFCL titles by the governor of Haut Katanga	Significant progress has been made, in despite of the delay in issuing the CFCL titles by the governor. The SMP cannot be approved if the CFCL title is not issued.
Output 1.1.3. Biennial capacity	Number of community support personnel trained and providing	At least, 100 members of local organizations managing the CF.	10 training sessions organized and approximately 300 community forest	The target was achieved

¹² Outputs as described in the project Logframe or in any approved project revision.

¹³ 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)

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

development plans for community managers, government services and NGOs developed and implemented	quality services to project communities	including customary authorities, trained in the implementation of SMP	managers and the managers of the SSFE, trained	
Outcome 1.2.1. Agroforestry and improved fallow management practices promoted	Area under agroforestry and improved fallow practices	At least 300 community forest managers, including 120 women, are familiar with conservation agriculture practices and agroforestry	6 farmer field school sessions conducted – 250 farmers trained	Conservation agriculture system is adopted by farmers trained and has gradually spread into the project area
Outcome 2.1				
Output 2.1.1 Experimental regulations for the empowerment of the project communities	Approved experimental regulations			The annual Work Plan does not foresee a target for this output
Output 2.1.2 New legal texts addressing gaps in the nation legal framework for CFM drafted	Submitted legal texts	Finalize the standards for timber exploitation in CFs of Miombo forests	Standards for timber exploitation in CFs of Miombo forests developed and submitted to the government.	The implementing act for the standards is not yet issued by the government. Target achieved.
Output 2.1.3 Compatible legal texts for relevant	Submitted compatible legal texts			The annual Work Plan does not foresee a target for this output

sectors drafted				
Output 2.1.4. A provincial strategy for adapting and replicating sustainable CFM throughout the province	Adopted provincial strategy	The scaling up strategy and action plan disseminated	The foreword section has been drafted and submitted to the governor of Haut katanga for signature / the design process has been launched	Good progress has been made.
Outcome 3.1				
Output 3.1.1 A community of practitioners network created	Operational practitioners network	2 face-to-face meetings and 3 virtual meetings on experiences related to the implementation of SMP	In addition to activities aimed at contributing to the target, the CoP facilitated 3 meetings in the field with the aim of involving more participants	Good progress made. Target achieved
Output 3.1.2. Miombo observatory established	Operational miombo observatory	The website is operational	The problem of broken link is not yet solved (https://www.ofcc-rdc.org).	The observatory is a useful tool. However UNILU has limited capacity to unleash its potential
Output 3.1.3. Best practices for SFM and SLM incorporated into university and technical schools curricula	Project best practices in community SFM reflected in the UNILU technical school curricula	Publications on good practices available and disseminated	The collective publication authored by stakeholders involved in the project implementation is not yet completed / the documentation of good practices and the publication of a practical guide delayed because of time spent by the procurement unit for the selection of the Service Provider.	Slow and low progress made. It is a pity to see that lessons learned from the project and good practices have not been documented and disseminated.

4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

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

- 20 communities' forest concessions (CFCL) titles granted to local communities with the total of 210,911 hectares (<http://www.fao.org/republique-democratique-congo/actualites/detail/fr/c/1376229/>)
- 123,745 hectares demarcated for 10 additional communities' forest concessions (CFCL). The requests for CFCL's titles submitted to the office of the governor of Katanga. Forest area under community management has reached a total of 334,656 ha.
- 20 CF management plans approved and implemented. 10 other CF management plans drafted and implemented, but not yet approved because of the delay in issuing the CFCL titles.
- 20,882 hectares of degraded fallows are under restoration through assisted natural regeneration techniques.
- 483,000 native trees and fruit trees planted within the framework of fallow enrichment treatments.
- 250 hectares under conservation agriculture system on cropland owned by smallholder family farmers.
- 30 community forestry funds (CFF) developed and functional. One umbrella fund, the miombo community-based restoration fund is under development.
- The scaling up strategy and action plan is available and actions taken for its implementation (concept note drafted in response to the call for expression of interest launched by CAFI).
- The draft of standards for timber exploitation in CFs of miombo forests is available.
- Project achievements are gradually visible. On 11 June 2022, King Philippe and Queen Mathilde of Belgium visited the village of Katanga to talk about the engagement of the local community in forest restoration (<https://www.fao.org/republique-democratique-congo/actualites/detail/fr/c/1539573/>).
- EX-ACT analysis conducted in June 2022 (with the Ex-Ante Carbon-balance Tool). The results are as follows: -1.4 tCO₂eq per ha per year (yearly average of about -363,814 tCO₂eq; 7,276,276 tCO₂eq avoided in 20 years)

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 progresses of project results.

	FY2022 Development Objective rating¹⁵	FY2022 Implementation Progress rating¹⁶	Comments/reasons¹⁷ justifying the ratings for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	The project is making interesting progress and is attracting more and more uninvolved communities. The sustainable management efforts made by the local communities produce effects that gradually impact the lives of the beneficiaries. The provincial government should ensure the signing of decrees granting CFCLs to second-wave communities in order to maintain this momentum of community involvement.
Budget Holder	S	S	The progress made on the ground within the framework of the implementation of the Miombo community forest management project and the degree of appropriation by local communities and other stakeholders sufficiently prove the relevance of the Project. The visit of distinguished guests such as that of the King of the Belgians was a moment that allowed a wider audience to inquire about the improvements made by the Project on the ecological, economic and social levels
GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁸	S	S	<i>Le Projet est une opportunité pour le Gouvernement de révéler à la face du monde que les forêts claires du Congo, jusque-là reléguées au second rang, ont un énorme potentiel pour faire face aux défis globaux. La visite du Roi des Belges dans l'un des sites du Projet et les journées portes ouvertes organisées par la FAO en juin ont montré à quel point les communautés locales se sont appropriées les acquis du projet. Face à ce succès, le Gouvernement recherche des nouveaux financements pour la consolidation des acquis du projet.</i>

¹⁵ **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.

¹⁶ **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.

¹⁷ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

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

Lead Technical Officer¹⁹	S	S	Documentation of good practices and lessons learned remains the greatest weakness of the project. Action taken to solve the problem through the development of a partnership with Nature+, an NGO working under the university of Liege, was not completed because of the direct selection. The competitive selection conducted by the procurement unit has not help to find a skilled candidate in due time.
FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	S	S	The project has generated good results and lessons on community-based SFM that need to be shared widely within DRC, partners and with other countries in the Congo Basin beyond. With the project ending within the next 6 months, it is important that the project team and FAO prioritize this aspect.

¹⁹ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

Under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

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

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

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

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

<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>
NA

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

6. Risks

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

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	Climate change impacts	Moderate	Y		The risk is under control	No significant change in trends of temperature and rainfall
2	Traditional authorities may seek to block the process of the preparation of community forest concessions management plans because of fear of loss of their prerogatives and their control over the resource	Moderate	Y	Involvement of customary authorities in the management of the CFs and use of traditional mechanisms of conflict management	Traditional authorities are gradually playing a key role in mobilizing the social capital to strengthen institutional arrangements and local organizations managing CFCLs.	Moderate risk level Except in Satumba and Mwangu, where the customary authority is involved in illegal forest logging

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

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
3	Insufficient political will associated with changes in high ranking key officials, changing priorities, or similar factors	Low	Y	Involvement of the local government in the decision-making process regarding the exit strategy and the visibility of the project.	the probability of the risk occurring is low, despite the delay in issuing CFCL titles for the second wave	Low risk level.
4	Opposition by powerful stakeholders who benefit from the existing charcoal market chain	Moderate	Y	the probability of the risk occurring is low	the probability of the risk occurring is low	Low risk level. The risk is under control
5	Insecurity: Low level rebel activity occurred around Lubumbashi earlier in 2013	Low	Y	No political unrest that requires vigilance was noted in the project area in the reporting period,		Low risk level.

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

FY2021 rating	FY2022 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
L	L	the project overall risk remains at low risk level in 2022, in despite of the delay in issuing the CFCL titles for the second wave by the governor of Haut Katanga province

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>
Recommendation 1:	NA
Recommendation 2:	NA
Recommendation 3:	NA
Recommendation 4:	NA

Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please describe	A scaling up strategy and action plan have been developed in an inclusive manner.
--	---

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 Guidelines²². Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories. And, provide supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

Category of change	Provide a description of the change	Indicate the timing of the change	Approved by
Results framework			
Components and cost			
Institutional and implementation arrangements			
Financial management			
Implementation schedule	Project extension Original NTE: June 2021 Revised NTE: December 2022	18 months	PSC
Executing Entity			
Executing Entity Category			
Minor project objective change			
Safeguards			
Risk analysis			
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%			
Co-financing			
Location of project activity			
Other Outcome indicator 1.1. (from 80,000 hectares to 150,000 hectares/ from 50 communities to 30 communities)			Recommendation of the Mid-term review

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

9. Stakeholders' Engagement

Please report on progress and results and challenges on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan) included at CEO Endorsement/Approval during this reporting period.			
Stakeholder name	Role in project execution	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
Government Institutions			
DDD	Project national coordination at national level	Project monitoring	PSC annual meetings are regularly held
DIAF	Technical collaboration	Technical support regarding the use of standards	Delays in delivering products
CPEDD	Project national coordination at local level	Project implementation	Fully involved in the project team
Non-Government organizations (NGOs)			
PREMI CONGO	Implementing partner	Management plan developpement and implementation	Delays in delivering products
BDD	Implementing partner	Management plan developpement and implementation	partner very motivated
OPED	Implementing partner	Management plan developpement and implementation	partner very motivated
APRONAPAKAT	Implementing partner	Management plan developpement and implementation	partner very motivated
Private sector entities			
AEFAKAT (Small scale forest producers organization of Katanga)	Private sector spokesperson	Participation in consultation processes	Partner very motivated
Others[1]			
UNILU (University of Lubumbashi)	Implementing partner	Knowledge management	Delays in delivering products

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

10. Gender Mainstreaming

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

Category	Yes/No	Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period
Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.	Yes	The project have adopted a gender responsive approach. Socio-Economic and Gender Analysis (SEAGA) has helped to conduct the situation analysis and to facilitate the decision-making processes in inclusive manner.
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes	Women and young people are involved in decision-making processes, including in the management of local organisations managing the CF and the small-scale forest enterprises. In some cases, women are elected at the head of CF management entities. A video was produced by the CoP to further increase awareness in gender mainstreaming in the CBF (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KPVM1ATwko8)
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	women are involved in the negotiation of institutional arrangements and the management of local institutions built with the support from the project
b) improving women's participation and decision making	Yes	40 percent of members of local organisation managing CFs are women and 30 percent of local organisation managing CFs are chaired by women
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	Yes	60 % of members of small scale forest enterprises are women.
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	Yes	
Staff with gender expertise	No	
Any other good practices on gender		

11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval <u>during this reporting period.</u>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The component 3 of the project framework is dedicated to knowledge management. The University of Lubumbashi is supposed to collect and document good practices. Good progress has been made in managing the Community of Practice and the Miombo Observatory. Good practices have been identified but technical reports are not yet published.</p>
<p>Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.</p>	<p>No</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>Not yet documented</p>
<p>Please provide links to related website, social media account</p>	
<p>Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.</p>	
<p>Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's Name and contact details</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.

NA. The presence of indigenous peoples is not confirmed in the project area

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²³	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2022	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (Confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
CSO	PREMICONGO	Grant, In-Kind	607 000	575 000	101 000	676 000
CSO	BDD	Grant, In-Kind	1 500 000	2 315 548	1 091 143	2 315 548
CSO	APRONAPAKAT	Grant, In-Kind	398 000	352 000	420 000	420 000
CSO	OPED	Grant, In-Kind	N/A	947 000	1 027 000	1027000
National Governmental	UNILU	Grant, In-Kind	1 772 000	1 628 000	250 000	1878000
National Governmental	MEDD	Grant, In-Kind	5 600 000	5 423 000	340500	5763000
GEF Agency	FAO	Grant, In-Kind	1 300 000	1375000	75000	1455000
CSO	ZEBREAU	Grant, In-Kind	763 000	00	00	
International Organisation	GIZ	Grant, In-Kind	1 350 000			
International NGO	OSFAC	Grant, In-Kind	1 200 000	943 000		1 200 000
TOTAL			14 490 000	13 558 548	3,304,643	14 734 548

²³ 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

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development Objectives Rating. A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”
Satisfactory (S)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project is expected to achieve 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. A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project’s components and activities is in compliance with the project’s approved implementation plan.	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as “good practice
Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

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