



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



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)
Project Duration:	Five years

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	10/3/2016
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	01 Aug 2016
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	31 Jul 2021
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	
Actual Implementation End Date³:	

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	4,533,333
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	14,491,594
Total Project Cost:	19,024,927
Total GEF grant disbursement as	1,954,374

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.

of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	
Total estimated co-financing as of June 30, 2019⁵	2, 017,683

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	7 th May 2019
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	NA
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	March 2019
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	No
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	No
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual⁶:	
Tracking tools required⁷	Yes
Tracking tools date	

Ratings⁸

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes:	Moderately Satisfactory
Overall implementation progress rating:	Moderately Satisfactory
Overall risk rating:	Modest

Status

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

⁵ Please see Section 7 of this report where you are asked to provide updated co-financing estimates. Use the total from this Section and insert here.

⁷ Please note that the Tracking Tools are required at mid-term and closure. At mid-term tracking tools are not mandatory for Medium Sized projects = < 2M USD.

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Innocent Ombeni Ciribagula, FAOCD	Innocent.OmbeniCiribagula@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Jean-Claude Nguingui, FOA	jeanclaude.nguingui@fao.org
Budget Holder	Aristide Ongone Obame, FAOCD	Aristide.Ongone@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division	Kuena Morebotsane, CBC	Kuena.Morebotsane@fao.org

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁹	Baseline level	Mid-term target ¹⁰	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ¹¹
Objective¹²	The <u>Global Environmental Objective</u> of the project is to promote the sustainable management and restoration of miombo forest ecosystems in order to reduce carbon emissions from deforestation and forest degradation. The <u>Development Objective</u> is 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	Zero	30,000 hectares (year 3)	80,000 hectares of degraded miombo forests under sustainable management by local communities	229,665,000 hectares of forests demarked by 23 communities for 21 community forests. Requests for government's formal recognition and authorization where submitted for approval, in August 2019. However, action has not yet been taken.	MS

⁹ 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.

¹⁰ 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.

¹¹ 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)**.

¹²Applicable only for projects with objective level indicators.

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁹	Baseline level	Mid-term target ¹⁰	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ¹¹
	Number of operational community forest management funds	Zero	At least 10 (year 3)	At least 20	0 23 field facilitators were trained in the use of the Market Analysis and Development (MA&D) 2 enterprise development plans for two communities are currently being finalized	MS
Outcome 1.2: Enhanced productivity on 30,000 hectares of fallow and cropland	Area under agroforestry and improved fallow practices	Zero	15,000 ha	10% increase in productivity on 30,000 ha	<i>Enrichment planting experiment was conducted in a total area of 2,200 ha of degraded fallow land with native plants produced by community nurseries established in 25 communities. 48,145 ha of learning plots on conservation agriculture techniques have been established in 25 community areas with approximately 500 households participating in the Farmer Field School in order to replicate the techniques in their own fields. A Consultant has been identified to</i>	MS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁹	Baseline level	Mid-term target ¹⁰	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ¹¹
					<i>take stock of the situation in order to provide basis for improvements</i>	
Outcome 2. 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	Zero		50 project pilot communities have legal documents empowering them to establish and implement rules governing access and use of their forest and the right to harvest and market forest products, including wood and non-wood products	0 A preliminary analysis of the legal constraints to the preparation and implementation of simple management plans carried out and the results were submitted to the “Environmental Litigation and Regulations Department” of the Ministry of the Environment and Sustainable Development and was shared with the Thematic Working Group of Community Forestry Lawyers at the national level	MU
	New legal texts addressing gaps in the national legal framework for CBFM		New legal texts submitted to authorities for approval (year 4)	New legal texts for participatory forest management submitted to authorities for approval.	NA in year 3 <i>However, a Thematic Working Group of Community Forestry Lawyers has been established and the UGP actively</i>	

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁹	Baseline level	Mid-term target ¹⁰	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ¹¹
					<i>participates in its meetings and hopes to use it to attain this output.</i>	
	Adopted provincial strategy			Approved provincial strategy and action plan for adapting and replicating community miombo forest management	NA in year 3	
Outcome 3. 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	Zero		At least one partner initiative integrates best practices identified by the end of the project.	practitioners' network established and the observatory for Miombo forests is under development Two technical sheets were produced, including one on the conduct of enrichment planting operations, which has already been used for the training of members of the community of practitioners and NGO partners. ; A first draft of the silvicultural practices handbook for the Miombo forests has	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁹	Baseline level	Mid-term target ¹⁰	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ¹¹
					been produced	
Outcome 4. Project implemented and monitored effectively and efficiently	Effectiveness and efficiency as assessed in mid-term and final evaluations	Zero	Mid-term evaluation results.	Final Evaluation results.	A mid-term review was conducted and its recommendations were taken into account by the Steering Committee and in the Year Work Plan 3	S

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating ¹³

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 1.1: Miombo forests managed sustainably by empowered communities	Conduct a high-level advocacy campaign to make the provincial government more sensitive to community empowerment and push them to support the project and to provide the formal recognition of the community rights on their lands, including on the governance of forests resources.	The BH and the Project management unit	July and august 2019
Outcome 1.2: Enhanced productivity on 30,000 hectares of fallow and cropland	Avoid any delay in the processing of letters of agreement with the project implementing partners in order to conduct in due time the preparation of Simple Management Plans that will set for each community forestland areas where assisted natural regeneration activities will be carried out	The BH and the Project management unit	July and august 2019
Outcome 2. The legal framework presents a clear and simple process for the empowerment of communities for sustainable forest management.	Take the opportunity offered by the thematic group of community forestry lawyers to contribute to the regulatory reform dialogue with lessons learned from the project	Project Management Unit, with the support of the international consultant and the LTO	July-december 2019

¹³ To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs ¹⁴	Expected completion date ¹⁵	Achievements at each PIR ¹⁶					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁷ 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 Communities structured and empowered for sustainable forest management	Q4 Y3	awareness raising conducted, 40 pilot areas selected	10 new communities expressed their consent after sensitization, 09 were selected from the batch, 05 have set up their start-up teams. 21 communities of the first wave chose the form of the legal management entity, elected the leaders of the different management bodies and produced their basic texts (statutes and internal regulations) in accordance with the regulations in force				50%	23 Communities have submitted requests for the formal recognition of their CFCLs and 9 are in the process of preparing required documents for their requests of CFCLs
Output 1.1.2 Participatory zoning of village lands and simple forest management plans developed and implemented	Q2 Y4	25 pilot areas demarcated and their map are available	9 new communities demarcated their land, conducted participatory mapping and produced land use maps The processing of LoA with				30%	The preparation of community forest management plans was postponed. The PSC, in its 1 st extraordinary meeting held in January 2018, decided to allocate the budget foreseen for this activity

¹⁴ 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.

¹⁵ As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

¹⁶ 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)

¹⁷ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

			implementing partners for the preparation of PSG is in progress and the guide for the production of PSG has been validated at the national level					to activities under Output 121
Output 1.1.3. Biennial capacity development plans for community managers, government services and NGOs developed and implemented	Q4 Y5	4 training sessions conducted and at least 300 persons trained	3 new training sessions were carried out (group dynamics, development of PSG (socio-economic study), assisted natural regeneration techniques) and new training sessions continued for the old sessions (MA&D), participatory mapping, community forestry) Nearly 350 people participated in these new waves of training				60%	The second two-year capacity building plan was developed and validated with implementing partners.
Output 1.2.1. Agroforestry and improved fallow management practices promoted	Q4 Y5	Tests conducted regarding control and management of fire and its impact on forest regeneration	250,000 native trees planted 2,200 hectares of degraded fallow land enriched 45.67 hectares of demonstration plots on conservation agriculture installed 50 hectares of degraded areas enriched with native tree species 12,500 fruit tree plants distributed to 25 Communities				30%	
Output 2.1.1. Experimental regulations for the empowerment of the project communities in the	Q4 Y2	Authorization to conduct field tests	National Guidelines for the Development of PSG available				30%	The Operational Guide for the elaboration of PSG has been validated at the national level and thus provides a framework for

Lubumbashi supply zone are established through ministerial decree(s)		of fire granted to the project						support to local communities in the preparation of community forest management plans
tOutput 2.1.2. New legal texts addressing gaps in the nation legal framework for community forest management drafted	Q4 Y4	LoA signed with the legal Unit of the Ministry of environment	Preliminary report on legal constraints to the preparation and implementation of PSG in CFCL disseminated				30%	A thematic working group of community forestry lawyers has been set up
Output 2.1.3. Compatible legal texts for relevant sectors drafted	Q4 Y4						%	No activities were planned in Y1,Y2 and Y3
Output 2.1.4. A provincial strategy for adapting and replicating sustainable community forest management throughout the province.	Q3 Y4							No activities were planned in Y1 ,Y2 and Y3
Output 3.1.1.1 A community of practitioners network created and experiences related to SFM routinely exchanged	Q2 Y1	Community of practitioners network established	With the aim of making more effective the community of practitioners, an executive secretariat was set up				75%	A training course on silvicultural techniques was organized for the community of practitioners A first draft of silvicultural practices handbook for the Miombo forests has been produced
Output 3.1.2. Miombo Observatory established	Q1 Y2	Miombo Observatory is under development	Additional equipment for the Miombo observatory, particularly a Phantom 4 drone and Idrisi TerraSet software was acquired.				60%	The first website traffic reports (number of visits received by the observatory's website (https://www.ofcc-rdc.org/)) were produced and allowed to assess its visibility at the local, national and international levels.
Output 4.1.1. Project M&E system in place	Q3 Y1		A simple data collection system based on service provider reporting, monthly data collection sheets and				60%	

			field activity registers located in each of the accompanied communities makes it possible to monitor project activities, information recording and analysis					
Output 4.1.2. Midterm and final evaluations conducted.			The mid-term review took place and the preliminary recommendations were taken into account in the planning for Y3				50%	

Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

Main significant results:

- 10 new communities have expressed their free consent, after awareness campaign conducted by the project. 09 communities have been selected, 05 have already set up their start-up teams, they have been trained on the community forestry process in the DRC, have scheduled their Community Assemblies for CFCL requests and are in the process of preparing requests for formal recognition and allocation of their collective rights on land and forests by the provincial authorities in accordance with the DRC's rules;
- 23 communities have already submitted the requests for formal recognition and allocation of their collective rights on land and forests to provincial authorities ;
- 21 communities of the first wave have conducted consultations on governance arrangements, made the choice of the appropriate option for the legal entities owning the forest and in charge of its management, and elected its members in accordance with the DRC's rules ;
- Management entity members of the 10 communities (of the first wave) were trained on organizational development with the aim of strengthening their leadership skills which are helpful to manage effectively the community forests. ;
- 09 communities of the second wave produced the sketches of their territories, six of these communities carried out participatory boundary mapping and validated their maps both internally and validations with neighbours are being finalized;
- 28 land use maps (22 for first wave communities and 06 for second wave communities) were produced and validated ;
- An Operational Guide for the preparation of simple management plan (PSG) has been validated and LoA with implementing partners involved in the preparation of 21 PSG have been submitted to quality assurance;
- 23 MA&D field facilitators (including 3 from the government , 5 from NGO partners and 15 members of local communities) were trained to act as coaches in the development of small scale forest enterprises;
- Enrichment planting experiment was conducted in a total area of 2,200 ha of degraded fallow land with 250,000 native trees produced by community nurseries established plants in 25 communities.
- 48,145 ha of demonstration plots on conservation agriculture have been installed in 23 communities;
- 50 ha of degraded areas enriched with native tree species in of the 10 CFCL at a rate of 5 ha per community;
- 12,500 fruit tree plants were distributed to 25 communities to enrich the home gardens and diversify sources of income;
- Early fire tests were carried out in areas where enrichment planting experiment was conducted;
- The report on legal constraints encountered to the preparation and implementation of simple management plans were shared with the Thematic Working Group at the national level with the aim to contribute to reforms planned. The Project Management Unit actively participates in all these exchanges;

- The community of practitioners has been established. In order to make it more effective, an executive secretariat has been set up .;
- The Miombo forests observatory was set up; staff were assigned by decision of the Rectorate and an official inauguration ceremony was held. In addition to the equipment received from the project, including a Phantom 4 UAV, UNILU has acquired additional equipments from other projects. The observatory's website is functional (<https://www.ofcc-rdc.org/>);
- A first draft of the Silvicultural practices handbook for the Miombo forests has been produced;
- Exchanges between UNILU, OSFAC and UGP have made it possible to harmonize OSFAC's methodology and work schedule for stratifying vegetation classes as part of the implementation of the LoA with OSFAC. Field activities have been finalized

Major challenges:

- Making the provincial authorities more sensitive to community empowerment and push them to support the project.
- Reduce the delay in the preparation of the management plans, particularly time spent in processing Letters of Agreement with implementing partners.

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating ¹⁸	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating ¹⁹	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	S	It should be noted that there have been major advances in the implementation of the Project. Indeed, with the validation of the Operational Guide for the Development of PSG and the allocation of sufficient financial resources for the development of PSG in PTBA 2019 and the promises made by the new provincial authorities for the signing of CFCL allocation orders are good signals.
Budget Holder	MS	MS	The project is lagging behind due mainly to the confusing situation of the provincial authorities, which did not sign the documents for the transfer of forest concessions to the local communities until their departure. The new authorities have promised us, for a month, to sign these documents. The situation remains worrying.
Lead Technical Officer²⁰	MS	MS	The project implementation in the Year 2 was seriously affected by the decision taken by the Project steering committee regarding the reallocation of the budget to agroforestry and other activities supposed to increase the visibility of the project in the field. Therefore, the support to the preparation of the community forest management plans was therefore placed in the second priority. In spite of management issues already highlighted, particular effort was made to complete at least one community forest management plan and to meet all requirements for the launching in 2019 of the process of the preparation of 23 simple management plans. However, the lack of support from provincial authorities has been the main constraint affecting the project in the second half of 2018 et the first half of 2019. If the problem is not solved by the team newly elected at the head of the Province, the project will not be able to attain outcomes expected.
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	MU	MU	Granting of forest management rights to communities is key to making meaningful progress in this project – at the moment, without this then progress is unsatisfactory.

¹⁸ **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.

¹⁹ **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

²⁰ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

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 valid²¹. If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low	Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid

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. The “Notes” column has one section for the BH and PMU and one for the LTO.</i>

	Risks ²²	Original rating in ProDoc	BH rating now	LTO ²³ rating now	Notes from the BH and/or Project Management Unit	Notes from the LTO and/or GEF FLO

²¹ **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.

²² Risk ratings will assess the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risks 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 and/or the project may face substantial risks); **Modest 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 modest risks.); **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 modest risks.) **Please add any new risk not initially foreseen in the Project Document.**

²³ LTO = Lead Technical Officer - The LTO will consult the Budget Holder, the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

	Risks ²²	Original rating in ProDoc	BH rating now	LTO ²³ rating now	Notes from the BH and/or Project Management Unit	Notes from the LTO and/or GEF FLO
1	Climate change impacts	M			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	M		M	A permanent framework for exchanges with customary authorities was established. In this regards, customary authorities met with the Governor regarding pending requests submitted for his approval. .	A dialogue platform among customary authorities can help to avoid miscommunication issues reported this year.
3	Insufficient political will associated with changes in high ranking key officials, changing priorities, or similar factors	L		s	The risk remains at low level.	The probability of the risk occurring has increased. It clearly appeared that the former Governor hasn't shown any interest to the process initiated and facilitated by the project
4	Opposition by powerful stakeholders who benefit from the existing charcoal market chain	M		M	With the resumption of redwood exports, artisanal logging are resurfacing in negotiations with communities. The adoption of management rules essentially on the use, access and control of resources through PSG should curb certain possible attempts	Because of the mukula (Pterocarpus tinctorius) exportation ban, the probability of the risk occurring was low during the first two years of the project.

	Risks ²²	Original rating in ProDoc	BH rating now	LTO ²³ rating now	Notes from the BH and/or Project Management Unit	Notes from the LTO and/or GEF FLO
5	Insecurity: Low level rebel activity occurred around Lubumbashi earlier in 2013	L		L	During the month of December 2018 the situation was turbulent with the elections. At the moment there are still political unrest that requires vigilance.	
6	Limited capability of governments and cofinancial partners to provide co financing contributions				Some co-financing has actually been mobilized.	

HIGH RISK MITIGATION PLAN²⁴

Risk Statement – (The Current situation with respect to the risk and Consequence of no action. How is it affecting or will it affect the project?)

Action to take – action planned/taken to handle the risk

Who – person(s) responsible for the action

Date – date by which action needs to be or was completed

Risk number ²⁵	Risk Statement ²⁶		Action to Take to mitigate high or substantial risk.	Who	Date
	Current Situation with respect to the risk	Consequence of no action			
3	None of 21 requests submitted for approval to the Office of the Governor was processed completely. Requests are still pending since August 2018	Forest management rights and responsibilities will not formally granted to local communities	Conduct a high-level advocacy campaign to make the provincial government more sensitive to community empowerment and push them to support the project.	FAOR in collaboration with the Minister in charge of forests	By sept. 2019

²⁴ The purpose of this table to enable additional focus on those risks in the previous table rated “High” or “Substantial”

²⁵ Use corresponding number from previous table to identify risk – no need to repeat risk wording here.

²⁶ Only for substantial to high risk.

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, since the Project Document signature²⁷

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Objective	No	
Project Outcomes	No	
Project Outputs/Activities/Inputs	Yes	The Mid-term Review proposed to amend the indicators relating to the number of communities to be supported and the area to be developed, in the light of the latest developments. The number of communities can be reduced (30 instead of 50) and the area to be developed can be doubled

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 GEF Unit, 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	NA
Project evaluation	

²⁷ 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 pre-cleared by the GEF Unit, then approved by the whole Project task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

5. Gender Mainstreaming

Is the project applying a gender sensitive approach? How? Please briefly explain.

Key areas for gender mainstreaming in the project were identified and taken into consideration in the preparation of the annual work plan and its implementation. Women's participation was identified as one of the requirements that local communities should meet to have access to the project support. In that regard, a gender analysis will be conducted for each community and women will be involved in the decision-making process (zoning, choice of best options for conservation agriculture, preparation of the forest management plan), income-generating activities (small-scale enterprises development), and different institutions that will be established (increase female representation in leadership roles). It should also be noted that there is a fairly balanced representation of women in the various management bodies set up.

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

NA.

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

7. Stakeholders Engagement

Please list (i) all stakeholders engaged in the project and specify whether any new stakeholders have been identified/engaged; (ii) briefly describe stakeholders' engagement events, specifying time, date stakeholders engaged, purpose (information, consultation, participation in decision making, etc.) and outcomes. If a Stakeholder Engagement Plan was prepared please report on the progress in its implementation.

The project is implemented in a participatory manner. The selection of project pilot sites was based on the principle of free consent. After the awareness raising campaign, the community interested by the project support was invited to confirm their consent through a formal request. This approach contributed to make the process more community-driven and to develop an ownership attitude towards SFM and restoration of degraded forests and lands. The community will lead the preparation and implementation of forest management plans, business plans for small-scale forest enterprises, etc. The new communities were selected in the same way.

9. Co-Financing Table

*Materialized Co-financing – Mandatory for projects that are completing the Mid-term review or ending operations within this reporting period
Recommended for all projects.*

Sources of Co-financing ²⁸	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing ²⁹	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019- Highly recommended but not mandatory	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team) Mandatory for projects that has completed an MTR or closure	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project (or Actual Amount Materialized at Closing) Highly recommended but not mandatory
CSO	PREMICONGO	Grant, In-Kind	607,000	62.300		607,000
CSO	BDD	Grant, In-Kind	1 500,000	1.091.143		1 500,000
CSO	APRONAPAKAT	Grant, In-Kind	398,000	398000		398,000
CSO	OPED	Grant, In-Kind	N/A	703.308		N/A
National Governmental	UNILU	Grant, In-Kind	1 772,000	146.800		1 772,000
National Governmental	MEDD	Grant, In-Kind	5 600,000	632.050		5 600,000
GEF Agency	FAO	Grant, In-Kind	1 300,000			1 300,000
International NGO	OSFAC	Grant, In-Kind	1 200,000			1 200,000
CSO	ZEBREAU	Grant, In-Kind	763,000			763,000
International Organisation	GIZ	Grant, In-Kind	1 350,000			1 350,000
TOTAL			14, 491,594	2, 017,683		14 491,594

Explain “Other Sources of Co-financing”: COOPDEF, CSO, US\$ 20.750 of contribution to the awareness raising campaign conducted in Y1 & Y2.

²⁸ 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, Other.

²⁹ Type of Co-financing may include: Grant, Soft Loan, Hard Loan, Guarantee, In-Kind, Other.

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

GIZ has left the Katanga and will not provide its cofinancing as previously promised.