



## 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).....	7
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS .....	10
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS) .....	12
6. RISKS .....	14
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION .....	16
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS .....	17
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	18
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING .....	19
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES .....	20
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT .....	21
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE .....	22

## 1. Basic Project Data

### General Information

<b>Region:</b>	AFR (Central Africa)
<b>Country (ies):</b>	Democratic Republic of the Congo
<b>Project Title:</b>	Community-Based Miombo Forest Management in South East Katanga
<b>FAO Project Symbol:</b>	GCP/DRC/046/GFF
<b>GEF ID:</b>	5547
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	Multi-focal Areas
<b>Project Executing Partners:</b>	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, University of Lubumbashi, Satellite Observatory of Central African Forests and other local authorities and NGOs relevant to the project (PREMICONGO, ZEBREAU, BDD, APRONAPAKAT, OPED)
<b>Initial project duration (years):</b>	Five years
<b>Project coordinates:</b> <i>This section should be completed ONLY by:</i> <i>a) Projects with 1st PIR;</i> <i>b) In case the geographic coverage of project activities has changed since last reporting period.</i>	NA

### Project Dates

<b>GEF CEO Endorsement Date:</b>	10 March 2016
<b>Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :</b>	01 August 2016
<b>Project Implementation End Date/NTE<sup>1</sup>:</b>	31 July 2021
<b>Revised project implementation End date (if approved) <sup>2</sup></b>	30 June 2023

### Funding

<b>GEF Grant Amount (USD):</b>	4,533,333
<b>Total Co-financing amount (USD)<sup>3</sup>:</b>	14,491,594
<b>Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD):</b>	4,510,043
<b>Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD)<sup>4</sup>:</b>	4,468,885
<b>Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023<sup>5</sup></b>	13, 558, 548

<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**

<b>Date of Last Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:</b>	30 March 2023
<b>Expected Mid-term Review date<sup>6</sup>:</b>	N/A
<b>Actual Mid-term review date (if already completed):</b>	
<b>Expected Terminal Evaluation Date<sup>7</sup>:</b>	Dec 2022
<b>Tracking tools (TT)/Core indicators (CI) updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)</b>	Yes

**Overall ratings**

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

**ESS risk classification**

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

**Status**

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

**Project Contacts**

<b>Contact</b>	<b>Name, Title, Division/Institution</b>	<b>E-mail</b>
<b>Project Coordinator (PC)</b>	Innocent Ombeni	Innocent.OmbeniCiribagula@fao.org
<b>Budget Holder (BH)</b>	Aristide Ongone Obame	Aristide.Ongone@fao.org
<b>GEF Operational Focal Point (GEF OFP)</b>	Benjamin Toirambe	toirambe2014@gmail.com
<b>Lead Technical Officer (LTO)</b>	Jean-Claude Nguingui	Jeanclaude.nguingui@fao.org
<b>GEF Technical Officer, GTO</b>	Kuena Morebotsane	Kuena.Morebotsane@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 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 improve livelihoods of local communities through the improvement of wood and non-timber forest product value chains	<b>Outcome 1.1.</b> 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]	Figures have remained unchanged from 2022. Forest area under community management has reached a total of 334,656 ha. This includes 210,911 hectares covering 20 community forest concessions with titles granted in 2021 and 123,745 hectares demarcated by 10 local communities. Regarding this second wave, community forest concessions titles have not yet been issued. However, forest management plans have been developed (but not yet approved) and implemented.	HS
		Number of operational community forest management funds (CFF)	0	30	50 [Target has been reduced to 30 CFF]	Figures have remained unchanged from 2022. 30 CFF are operational. However, only 20 CFF established by communities managing forest concessions with titles granted in 2021 have legal recognition. The scaling up strategy has identified activities that will contribute to the	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.

						development of a community-based Miombo forests restoration fund. The feasibility study is available.	
	<b>Outcome 1.2.</b> 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 20,882 hectares in 2022 to 21,832 hectares. The total cropland area under conservation agriculture was estimated to 375 hectares in 2023, an increase in surface area of 125 hectares.	S
	<b>Outcome 2.1.</b> 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		The Government issued respectively in 2014 and 2016 a Decree laying down the rules for granting forest concessions to local communities and a Ministerial Decree providing rules governing concession management by forest communities. Therefore this outcome had lost its relevance before the implementation of the project.	-
New legal texts addressing gaps in the national legal framework for CBFM		0		New legal texts submitted for approval	No progress has been made in 2023. Standards for timber harvesting in forest concessions established in Miombo forests were developed and technically validated in 2021. However, the implementing act is not yet issued by the government. Advocacy activities conducted in 2022 and 2023 have not brought the expected results	MS	
Adopted provincial strategy		0		Adopted provincial strategy	The scaling up strategy validated in 2021 is implemented in phases. Some outputs have been reached (umbrella organizations of legal entities of community forest concessions, documentation of good practices, etc.) or are running (fundraising through project formulation, etc.). Its implementation remains a big challenge.	S	

	<b>Outcome 3.1</b> 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	The miombo observatory and the community of practitioner's network have contributed to the documentation and dissemination of good practices. More than three implementing partners are already making good use of lessons learned and good practices in implementing their new initiatives. More than 250 family farmers have adopted best practices, such as conservation agriculture practices, fallow enrichment treatments with native tree species, etc.	S
--	---	---	---	--	--	--	---

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

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	Pursue advocacy activities with the ministry of environment and the office of the governor of Haut-Katanga	Union des CFCL du Haut Katanga, NGO project implementing partners, General Secretariat for Environment and Sustainable Development	2024

### 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>Outcome 1.1</b> Miombo forests managed sustainably by empowered communities				
<b>Output 1.1.1</b> Communities empowered and structured for sustainable forest management	Number of communities with forest management committees and legal documents granting forest management rights	A functional "Union des CFCL du Haut Katanga", an umbrella organization of legal entities of community forest concessions, is established	The board structure of « Union des CFCL du Haut Katanga » is established and implement its yearly roadmap.	Target has been reached
<b>Output 1.1.2</b> Participatory zoning of village lands and simple management plans (SMP) developed	Number of simple management plans developed and approved	30 simple management plans implemented	30 simple management plans under implementation (20 for the first wave and 10 for the second wave)	Target has been reached
<b>Output 1.1.3</b> Biennial capacity development	Number of community support personnel trained and providing quality services to project communities	At least, 200 members of local organizations managing the CF. including customary authorities, trained in the implementation of SMP	305 members of community forest concessions (126 women) trained in monitoring the implementation of SMP.	Target has been achieved

<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.

plans for community managers, government services and NGOs developed and implemented		25 members of government services trained in the use of the framework for community forestry regulatory compliance	168 members (88 women) of legal entities trained in institutional development and organizational strengthening. 30 members of government services trained in community forestry regulatory compliance controls.	
<b>Outcome 1.2</b> Enhanced productivity on fallow and cropland				
<b>Output 1.2.1</b> Agroforestry and improved fallow management practices promoted	Area under agroforestry and improved fallow practices	Conservation agriculture practices adopted by at least 150 farmers of the second wave	200 farmers' home gardens established and maintained. 125 ha are under conservation agriculture. 950 ha of forest fallows restored.	Target has been achieved
<b>Outcome 2.1</b> The legal framework presents a clear and simple process for the empowerment of communities for sustainable forest management				
<b>Output 2.1.2,</b> New legal texts addressing gaps in the nation legal framework for CFM drafted	Submitted legal texts	The implementing act on standards framework for timber harvesting in forest concessions issued by the government	Advocacy activities to promote the need of specific standards for timber harvesting in Miombo forests by local communities	Advocacy activities have not brought the expected results
<b>Output 2.1.4</b> A provincial strategy for adapting and replicating sustainable CFM	Adopted provincial strategy	Publish and disseminate the strategy and assist in its implementation	The scaling up strategy was endorsed by the Governor of Haut-Katanga (the foreword is signed by the Governor), published and disseminated	Target has been achieved



throughout the province				
<b>Outcome 3.1</b> Knowledge management facilitates the extension and adoption of best practices and lessons learned				
<b>Output 3.1.1</b> A community of practitioners network created	Operational practitioners network	Good practices are collected and disseminated among community forest concessions in Haut-Katanga and elsewhere.	At least 12 videos on good practices produced and disseminated through @foretmiombordcugp201	The target has been achieved
<b>Output 3.1.2</b> Miombo observatory established	Operational miombo observatory	Explore ways to promote “Frontier Technologies” ( <a href="https://www.fao.org/3/cc1076en/cc1076en.pdf">https://www.fao.org/3/cc1076en/cc1076en.pdf</a> ) in the preparation and the monitoring of simple management plans of community forest concessions	Miombo observatory successfully tested the approach	Target has been achieved
<b>Output 3.1.3.</b> 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	Collect and document good practices	A technical publication is under publication	Target partially Achieved.  The SP hired to facilitate the process didn't have technical capacities required to do the job effectively

## 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)

- 334,656 hectares are under community management: 210,911 hectares covering 20 community forest concessions with titles granted in 2021 and 123,745 hectares of 10 community forest concessions for which titles have not yet been issued.
- 30 simple management plans developed and implemented. However, only 20 (with titles granted in 2021) have received a legal recognition.
- 21,832 hectares of degraded fallows are under restoration through assisted natural regeneration techniques.
- 500,000 native trees and fruit trees planted within the framework of fallow enrichment treatments.
- 375 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 harvesting in CFs of miombo forests is available.
- Technical publication on lessons learned from the project and good practices is under publication process.
- EX-ACT analysis conducted (with the Ex-Ante Carbon-balance Tool). The results are as follows: -1.4 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq per ha per year (yearly average of about -363,814 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq; 7,276,276 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq 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 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>Budget Holder</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	This project looks like a real laboratory experiments. Dozens of tools have been tested and significant achievements have been made in the areas of community engagement, community ownership, change in behaviours, etc.
<b>GEF Operational Focal Point<sup>18</sup></b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	The project achievements should serve as a model for other community forest projects across the country. There is a need to disseminate lessons learned from this project and to implement the scaling up strategy.
<b>Lead Technical Officer<sup>19</sup></b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	Most of the project expected outputs have been successfully achieved. The project has fully met requirements for pilot sites of experimental phase of the community forest national strategy.
<b>GEF Technical Officer, GTO</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	Project activities have been completed and outputs delivered. There are opportunities to implement the scaling-up strategy, perhaps incorporating some key aspects that were not included such as climate change adaptation – through the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF), CFI and other sources of funding.

<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.

<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	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

---

<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	Insufficient political will associated with changes in high ranking key officials, changing priorities, or similar factors	Moderate	Y	Keep officials at different levels (local, provincial and national) updated on the importance of products developed with the project support and submitted for their formal approval	Governor of Haut Katanga has signed the foreword of the scaling up strategy	The risk is under control
2	Traditional authorities may seek to block the process of the preparation of community forest concessions management plans	Moderate	Y	Honor the trust of traditional authorities with the aim of avoiding any actions from their side to question the community forestry process at the end of the project	Traditional authorities are playing a key role in mobilizing the social capital to strengthen local organizations managing community forest concessions.	The risk is under control
3	Employees resignation (for job security reasons)		N	Be prepared for any eventuality caused by the resignation of the project staff before the end of project	Consultants hired for vacant positions	The risk is under control

<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.

**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	L	The project overall risk remains at low risk level in 2023, in despite of the delay in issuing the titles for 10 community forest concessions (for the second wave) and the implementing act on standards framework for timber harvesting in forest concessions

**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:	
Recommendation 2:	
Recommendation 3:	
Recommendation.....	
Recommendation.....	
<b>Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please summarize</b>	A scaling up strategy was developed in inclusive manner and endorsed by the Governor of Katanga.



## 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			
Institutional and implementation arrangements			
Financial management			
Implementation schedule	Project extension Original NTE: June 2021 Revised NTE: June 2023	18 + 6 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 minor project amendment (define)	Outcome indicator 1.1. an increase of the target from 80,000 hectares to 150,000 hectares / a decrease of the target from 50 communities to 30 communities		Recommendation of the Mid-term review

<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>			
DDD	Project coordination at national level	Overall project supervision	PSC annual meetings are regularly held
DIAF	Technical collaboration	Technical support regarding the use of standards	Delays in delivering products
CPEDD	Project coordination at local level	Project implementation	Fully involved in the project implementation
<b>NGOs<sup>23</sup></b>			
PREMI CONGO	Implementing partner	Support in the preparation and implementation of simple management plans	partner very motivated
BDD	Implementing partner	Support in the preparation and implementation of simple management plans	partner very motivated
OPED	Implementing partner	Support in the preparation and implementation of simple management plans	partner very motivated
APRONAPAKAT	Implementing partner	Support in the preparation and implementation of simple management plans	partner very motivated
<b>Private sector entities</b>			
AFAKAT (Small scale forest producers organization of Katanga)	Private sector spokesperson	Participation in consultation processes	Partner very motivated
<b>Others<sup>24</sup></b>			
UNILU (University of Lubumbashi)	Implementing partner	Knowledge management	Delays in delivering products
<b>New stakeholders identified</b>			

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

<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) <u>during this reporting period.</u>		
Category	Yes/No	Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period.
Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.	Yes	The 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 process 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 process including in the management of local organizations 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 community of practitioner network to further increase awareness in gender mainstreaming in the CBF( <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KPVM1ATwko8">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KPVM1ATwko8</a> )
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 were fully involved in the negotiation for institutional arrangements
b) improving women's participation and decision making	Yes	40 percent of members of local organizations managing CFs are women and 30 percent of local organizations managing CFs are chaired by women
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	Yes	60 percent of members of small scale forest enterprises are women.
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	Yes	40 percent of members of local organizations managing CFs trained in 2022-2023 are women
Staff with gender expertise	Yes	The CBF expert is familiar with the Socio-Economic and Gender Analysis (SEAGA), one of the tools used to avoid the exclusion of vulnerable groups.
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>	
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 component 3 of the project is dedicated to knowledge management. The implementation of this component was led by the University of Lubumbashi. UNILU was supposed to work closely with the community of practitioner's network. . At least 12 videos on good practices produced and disseminated through @foretmiombordcugp201
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges <b>this year</b> .	No. In 2023, particular effort was made to share the project achievements at national level. One-day event held in Kinshasa on 15 June 2023 had allowed the project team and implementing partners to show what have been achieved, what innovations have been brought and to discuss on scaling up options. A technical publication on innovative practices from the project is under publication.
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.	The community of practitioner's network had produced more than 20 videos on good practices and human-interest story available at @foretmiombordcugp201.  One of the video of the benefits of CBFM in Kikonke is available at <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GnQJVibO7xY">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GnQJVibO7xY</a>
Please provide links to related website, social media account	The community of practitioner's network had produced more than 20 videos on good practices and human-interest story available at @foretmiombordcugp201
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	A technical publication on innovative practices from the project is under publication.
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's name and contact details	

## 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 <sup>25</sup>	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	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
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
		<b>TOTAL</b>	14 490 000	13 558 548	3,304,643	14 734 548

<sup>25</sup> Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

**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

<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.