



REQUEST FOR: CEO ENDORSEMENT
PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT
TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Community-based miombo forest management in South East Katanga			
Country(ies):	Democratic Republic of Congo	GEF Project ID: ¹	5547
GEF Agency(ies):	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	618733
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development	Submission Date:	4 January 2016
GEF Focal Area (s):	MFA (CC, LD, SFM)	Project Duration(Months)	60
Name of Parent Program (if applicable): ➤ For SFM/REDD+		Project Agency Fee (\$):	430,667

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
LD-2	LD Outcome 2.3: Sustained flow of services in forest ecosystems in drylands	Output 2.3 Suitable SFM interventions to increase/maintain natural forest cover in dryland production landscapes	GEFTF	650,000	2,491,594
CCM-5	CCM Outcome 5.2: Restoration and enhancement of carbon stocks in forests and non-forest lands, including peatland	Forest land under good management practices.	GEFTF	2,600,000	3,606,979
SFM/REDD-1	SFM/REDD Outcome 1.2: Good management practices applied in existing forests.	Forest area (hectares) under sustainable management, separated by forest type.	GEFTF	937,460	5,000,000
SFM/REDD-2	SFM/REDD Outcome 2.1 Enhanced institutional capacity to account for GHG emission reduction and increase in carbon stocks	National forest carbon monitoring systems in place (number)	GEFTF	130,000	2,893,021
Sub-total				4,317,460	13,991,594
Project Management Cost			GEFTF	215,873	500,000
Total project costs				4,533,333	14,491,594

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the [Focal Area/LDCF/SCCF Results Framework](#) when completing Table A.

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objectives:						
1) To promote the sustainable management and restoration of miombo forest ecosystems in order to reduce carbon emissions from deforestation and forest degradation; and 2) To improve the sustainability of livelihoods of local communities through the marketing of wood fuels and non-timbre forest products (NTFP) harvested from sustainably managed forests						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Co-financing (\$)
1. Development of sustainable community forest management systems	TA	<p><u>Outcome 1.1</u> miombo forests managed sustainably by empowered communities.</p> <p><i>Indicators:</i> a) 80,000 hectares under sustainable management by communities by Project Year 5 (PY5) b) Lifetime (20 years) direct carbon sequestration = 2,266,000 t CO₂ Lifetime direct emissions avoided = 573,387 t CO₂</p> <p><u>Outcome 1.2</u> Enhanced productivity on fallow and cropland.</p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> a) 10% increase in productivity on 30,000 ha</p>	<p>Output 1.1.1. 50 communities with forest management committees and legal documents granting forest management rights;</p> <p>Output 1.1.2. Simple forest management plans developed and implemented;</p> <p>Output 1.1.3: Biennial capacity development plans for community managers, government services and NGOs developed and implemented (at least 100 field technicians trained and at least 500 men and women from community forest management committees and forest user groups trained);</p> <p>Output 1.2.1. Agroforestry and improved fallow management practices promoted.</p>	GEFTF	3,332,860 LD: 529,400 CC: 1,986,000 SFM: 817,460	6,768,670
2. Strengthening the legal framework	TA	<p><u>Outcome 2.1</u> the legal framework presents a clear and simple process for the empowerment of communities for sustainable forest management</p> <p><i>Indicators:</i> a) approved experimental regulations for the empowerment of the project communities in the Lubumbashi supply zone b) new legal texts addressing gaps in the national legal framework for community forest management undergoing approval.</p>	<p>Output 2.1.1 Experimental regulations for the empowerment of project communities in the Lubumbashi supply zone established through ministerial decree(s);</p> <p>Output 2.1.2 New legal texts addressing gaps in the nation legal framework for community forest management drafted;</p> <p>Output 2.1.3 Compatible legal texts for relevant sectors drafted;</p> <p>Output 2.1.4 A provincial strategy for adapting and replicating sustainable community forest management throughout the</p>	GEFTF	74,000 LD: 10,000 CC: 14,000 SFM: 50,000	500,000

			province.			
3. Knowledge management	TA	<p><u>Outcome 3.1</u> Knowledge management facilitates the extension and adoption of best practices and lessons learned</p> <p><i>Indicator:</i> a) at least one partner initiative adopts/ incorporates best practices identified in the project</p>	<p>Output 3.1.1 A community of practitioners network created and experiences related to SFM routinely exchanged;</p> <p>Output 3.1.2 Miombo Observatory established;</p> <p>Output 3.1.3 Best practices for SFM and SLM incorporated into university and technical schools curricula drylands.</p>	GEFTF	432,000 LD: 32,000 CC: 300,000 SFM:100,000	6,122,924
4. Monitoring and Evaluation	TA	<p><u>Outcome 4.1</u> Project implemented and monitored effectively and efficiently</p> <p><i>Indicator: Effectiveness and efficiency as assessed in mid-term and final evaluations</i></p>	<p>Output 4.1.1 Project M&E system in place</p> <p>Output 4.1.2 Midterm and final evaluations conducted.</p>		478,600 LD: 78,600 CC: 300,000 SFM:100,000	600,000
Subtotal					4,317,460	13,991,594
Project management Cost (PMC) ³				GEFTF	215,873 LD: 50,000 CC: 100,000 SFM:65,873	500,000
Total project costs					4,533,333	14,491,594

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming co-financing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Co-financing	Co-financing Amount (\$)
National Government	MEDD	In-kind	5,600,000
NGO	University of Lubumbashi	Grant	1,772,000
NGO	Observatoire Satellital des Forêts d'Afrique Centrale	Grant	1,200,000

³ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below

NGO	PREMICONGO	Grant	607,000
NGO	ZEBREAU	In-kind	763,670
NGO	Bureau Diocésain de développement	In-kind	1,500,000
NGO	APRON APAKAT	In-kind	398,000
Bilateral	GIZ	Grant	1,350,000
GEF Agency	FAO	Grant	1,300,924
Total Co-financing			14,491,594

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL, AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
FAO	GEFTF	Land Degradation	Democratic Republic of the Congo	700,000	66,500	766,500
FAO	GEFTF	Climate Change	Democratic Republic of the Congo	2,700,000	256,500	2,956,500
FAO	GEFTF	SFM/REDD+	Democratic Republic of the Congo	1,133,333	107,667	1,241,000
Total Grant Resources				4,533,333	430,667	4,964,000

1 In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

2 Indicate fees related to this project

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
Local consultants	684,600	1,000,000	1,684,600
International consultants	438,000	500,000	938,000
	1,122,600	1,500,000	2,622,600

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A "NON-GRANT" INSTRUMENT?

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF⁴

The objectives and outcomes of the proposed project have not changed. Outputs and activities have been refined and reworded where necessary. The following changes have been made:

Project monitoring and evaluation has been separated from component 3, and is now under component 4 Monitoring and Evaluation. This was done because knowledge management activities are intended to continue beyond the duration of the project whereas project M&E activities will be within the project duration – to make this it clear.

It was also decided to incorporate in the design sustainable land management practices, particularly agroforestry and improved fallow practices to improve soil fertility, on agricultural (individual farmers fields) and fallow land, instead of only focusing on management of community forests. This is to address shifting cultivation driven by inherently low fertility of miombo soils combined with modern-day shortened fallows and insufficient nutrient replacement resulting in falling yields requiring more and more intact forest to be cleared.

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NAPs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Updates Reports, etc.

NA

A.2 GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities

NA

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage

Sustainable forest management is a core area of expertise for FAO. Building on its experience over the past 60 years, FAO is supporting SFM worldwide through a comprehensive programme covering aspects of forest management and conservation, environmental and economic aspects of forest utilization, and policy and institutions. FAO provides information on all aspects of SFM, direct technical support to countries through normative and field programme activities, and develops and promotes best practice guidelines and technical tools such as the SFM toolbox www.fao.org/sustainable-forest-management/toolbox/

FAO is a founding member of the UN-REDD Programme, and together with UNDP and UNEP is providing coordinated REDD support to countries, consistent with the “One UN” approach. Under the UN-REDD Programme, FAO is supporting the DRC in the development of its national MRV system. In addition, the organization supports several activities in the Congo Basin, including the harmonization of forest policies and programs in the region.

FAO has been instrumental in the development of community forestry in DRC. FAO supported DRC in the implementation of “Projet de développement et de mise en oeuvre de la foresterie communautaire en République Démocratique du Congo”, which led to the development of the national Community Forestry Programme and is the foundation for the proposed project .

FAO is currently supporting the implementation of GEF-funded community-based SFM projects in Africa (e.g. Cameroon) and in other regions, and will ensure exchange of lessons and best practices among these projects.

A.4 The baseline project and the problem it seeks to address:

⁴ For question A.1-A,7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question

Following the PPG data collection and analyses, the description of the problem and the baseline has been improved. Please see sections 1.1 and 1.2 in the FAO project document.

A.5 Incremental / Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

The incremental reasoning has been refined based on PPG analyses. Please see section 1.2 and section 2 in the FAO project document.

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

An identification and ranking of risks has been conducted as well as identification of mitigation measures. Overall, the risks are not exceptionally high and should be manageable. Risks, their ranking and mitigation measures are presented in the following table:

Risk	Probability	Impact	Mitigation measures
Environmental Risks			
Climate change impacts	Medium	Climate change may increase the chances of destructive fire or of forest mortality. It may lead to more frequent crop failure leading people to rely more on destructive harvesting for charcoal.	Mitigation measures included in the design of the project: - building the capacity of communities to manage forest fires, and subsequent inclusion in simple forest management plans; - improvement of the conditions of the forest through restoration and sustainable harvest will improve the biophysical conditions of the forests and increase their resilience to climate change - agroforestry and conservation agriculture techniques in community trainings to contribute to adaptation in crop production.
Social, governance and institutional risks			
Traditional authorities may seek to block or to sabotage community concessions for fear of loss of their prerogatives and their control over the resource.	Medium	Project implementation stalled or delayed. Project will not achieve the targets set, and any targets achieved will not be sustainable	The traditional chiefs will be involved from the beginning – a first meeting with traditional chiefs was held during project preparation. The project will continue to develop strong working partnership with the high-level chief Kaponda who supported the FORCOM project and has expressed pride in being the first chief in the area to conserve forests.
Insufficient political will associated with changes in high ranking key officials, changing priorities, or similar factors.	Low	Project progress stalled	Key Government decision-makers, including the DRC GEF Political Focal Point, will be members of the project steering committee. The project will maintain close communications with key authorities, keeping them briefed on successes and challenges as they develop and on the socio-economic and environmental benefits of the pilot community forest management systems.
Opposition by powerful stakeholders who benefit from the existing charcoal	Medium	Project will not achieve the targets set, and any targets achieved will not be sustainable	The project will establish and maintain frequent communications with the actors in the existing market chains. There will certainly be both advantages and initial disadvantages to the new woodfuel production systems to be developed.

market chain			One major advantage for charcoal buyers and producers is that the organized community groups should be able to provide reliable prearranged quantities of woodfuel at a set time and place.
Insecurity: Low level rebel activity occurred around Lubumbashi earlier in 2013	Low	Project implementation stalled.	Insecurity has been widespread in DRC but not in the Lubumbashi area (apart from the low level incident in 2013). Given the high level of investments in the mining sector, insecurity can be expected to be dealt with rapidly by the Government.

A.7 Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

The most relevant GEF-funded initiatives that the proposed project will collaborate with and learn from include:

- GEF-FAO Regional Project “Sustainable Management of the Wildlife and Bushmeat Sector in Central Africa” is developing pilot community-based wildlife management systems at eight pilot sites in four Congo Basin countries, including DRC. The Bushmeat project is confronted with many of the same challenges as the Miombo project including the critical need to find interim legal tools to empower pilot communities before national legal frameworks are revised. The Miombo project will maintain close contact to exchange best practices and lessons learned through the lead national executing agency – the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development and the FAO Lead Technical Officer for these projects.
- GEF-UNDP Project “Building the Capacity of the Agriculture Sector in DR Congo to Plan for and Respond to the Additional Threats Posed by Climate Change on Food Production and Security”. The project has one site in the Katanga province. The project will aim to build technical capacities of small farmers and agricultural institutions, diversify livelihood strategies and build climate resilience among rural population and disseminate the best practices. The Miombo Project will maintain close contact, through the knowledge management network, with the Katanga site and will make any pertinent lessons learned and best practices known to pilot communities of the Miombo Project.
- GEF-FAO project “Sustainable Forest Management under the Authority of Cameroonian Councils”. The main objective of is to reduce deforestation and forest degradation in council forests in order to improve biodiversity conservation, reduce emissions and enhance carbon stocks, and improve livelihoods of local communities. This objective will be achieved through empowering councils to better manage their forests by improving their technical skills and tools to: implement SFM practices, assess and monitor biodiversity, restore degraded forest areas, measure and monitor carbon stocks, and promote sustainable alternative forest based livelihoods. Of particular interest for the proposed project in DRC will be the management and monitoring of carbon by communities within council forests. Coordination will be mainly through the FAO Lead Technical Unit and possibly through study tours.

B. Additional information not addressed at the PIF stage

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation

Workshops during project preparation as well as meetings and field visits helped to identify and consult key stakeholders and beneficiaries of this project. A multi-stakeholder Project Steering Committee (PSC) which will bring together all key institutions including Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, the Ministry of Agriculture, Coordination Provinciale de l’Environnement (CPE), Institut Congolais pour la Conservation de la Nature (ICCN), local NGOs, Agroforêts pour le Développement de Kipushi (AFODEK), GIZ, African Minerals, representatives of local communities and traditional authorities.

A summary of the various stakeholders and how they will be engaged in the project is provided in the table below:

Stakeholders	Expertise and Roles in Project Implementation
Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development at the central and provincial (Provincial Coordination for Environment and Conservation office) levels	Main executing partner. Responsible for supervision, coordination, participation and monitoring of project implementation. Will ensure that project execution is in line with evolving national and ministerial priorities and policies.
Directorate of Forest Inventory and Forest Management	Will contribute to the development of the Miombo Observatory including a system for monitoring carbon at the level of the pilot community forests.
Other relevant ministries and departments (Ministry of Mines, Min. of Agriculture, Min. of Rural Development among others)	These ministries will be involved in the project, particularly through a multi-sectoral platform that will work towards eliminating conflicts between legal frameworks for related sectors and the legal framework for community forestry.
Traditional authorities, especially the Kaponda Chieftanship	Chief Kaponda has played a pioneering role in forest conservation and has been very supportive of the Miombo Project. Traditional chiefs will play a strong role in community awareness raising on community forest management. The chiefs will play a key role in enforcement, both within the community and when community forests suffer from incursions by outsiders.
Local communities	The main stakeholders for the project. The project will support 50 communities to organize themselves into forest management structures and prepare and implement simple sustainable forest management plans.
PREMICONGO (local NGO)	Experience and expertise in community forestry (at Kikonké), community capacity building, participatory mapping, support for displaced people, monitoring of miner's respect for mining standards, agroforestry research. PREMICONGO will be contracted under an LOA to provide training and support to communities.
Association for the Protection of Nature and for Indigenous People of Katanaga (APRONAPAKAT)/GTCR (local NGO)	Experience in governance, defence of community and indigenous rights, participatory mapping, advocacy, community structuring and focal point for a thematic group under REDD. Will be contracted under an LOA to provide training and support to communities in the preparation and implementation of their forest management plans.
Union of Forest Ecologists (UNEF -- local NGO)	Experience in community forestry at Kikonke through FORCOM. Will support capacity building and awareness raising.
Diocesan Development Office for Katanga (BDD -- local NGO)	Experience in organizing and structuring communities, organizational problem analysis, ag extension, capacity building, monitoring and evaluation and promotion of innovation. Will be contracted under an LOA to provide and support services to communities.
BUCODED	Expertise in training and capacity building for community organization. May be contracted under an LOA to provide support services to communities.
Natural Resources Network / Katanga	Has expertise in governance and transparency in the forest sector, institutional management, monitoring and advocacy of natural resources, integration of information, education and communication and in community forestry. The Network will play an active role in the revisions to the legal framework in Component 2.
ZEBREAU	Has expertise in human rights, analysis of legal texts concerning natural resources and support to community organizations. Zebreau will play an active role in the revisions to the legal framework in Component 2.
Institut National de recherche agronomique/Katanga	Expertise in agricultural, agroforestry and forestry research and in climate change. Expected to contribute to knowledge management in Component 3.

University of Lubumbashi and the Institut Supérieur Pédagogique	Expertise in research and training, adult education, forest inventory, REDD and climate change. Will play a key role in the implementation of component 3 on knowledge management.
African Minerals and other Mining companies	African Minerals has supported miombo forest restoration by communities and undertook the first carbon accounting in the miombo zone of DRC. African Minerals and other mining companies will be knowledge management partners and will be encouraged to finance replication of miombo sustainable forest management systems.
GIZ/PBF	The project will collaborate with GIZ on multiple aspects including capacity building, legal reform and knowledge management.

B. 2. Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCE/SCCF):

The project will delivery the following key socio-economic benefits:

- At least 50 communities, with the assistance of the project, will be granted the legal right to establish and implement rules governing access and use of forest and the right to harvest and market forest products, including wood and non-wood products (established community forests). This is a key incentive for communities to invest in participatory forest management, particularly in southeast Katanga.

Legally all land and natural resources belong to the State. People and entities desiring use-rights to land can apply for concessions. Although formal law applies to all land in DRC, application of the law relating to concessions is mostly restricted to urban areas and large holdings of productive land in rural areas. In most rural areas, customary law governs. Under the customary law, groups and clans hold land collectively, and traditional leaders allocate use rights to parcels. The land tenure system is characterized by a juxtaposition of rights, with lack of clarity which undermines tenure security. Moreover, Katanga is a mining province and mining concessions make customary land rights fragile. There have been cases of land grabbing of traditional lands in the province.

This is why assisting communities to be legally recognized entities, recognized by the State with documented rights to control access and use of their lands, is a major benefit.

- Another major incentive is the rapidly expanding circle of severely degraded lands surrounding Lubumbashi that all villagers can see each time they travel to the city. These severely degraded lands produce no charcoal, only minor amounts of non-timber forest products and have severely degraded crop lands. The project will assist communities to restore these severely degraded lands, improve their management and enhance their productivity – and therefore wood and non-wood forest products supporting their livelihoods. In additional, the project will deliver technical assistance to improve soil fertility through agroforestry (also to reduce pressure on natural miombo forests) and productivity in croplands.
- Enhanced capacity of communities for sustainable forest management and marketing of forest products. The project will make major investments in capacity building, especially for good governance. Experience shows that investments in community capacity for good governance for NRM usually leads to communities applying these capacities across all of the different challenges and problems they are confronted with. Participatory forest management allows all forest user groups to have their say over how the forests are used – and for each of them to defend their interests through the governance systems put in place. The project will intentionally promote gender equality. Typically, woodcutters and charcoal makers are mostly men and most

non-timbre forest products (NTPF) are harvested by women. The charcoal cutters frequently harvest trees with little regard to their value for NTPF. With women represented in community management structures, they will have a say in the development of a hierarchy of relative value of each tree species to be applied in the silvicultural thinning of the managed forests.

B.3 Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design

To ensure cost-effectiveness and sustainability of project results, a lot of emphasis has been placed on building the capacity of community support institutions, Government field technicians and NGOs – particularly local NGOs, who will continue providing support beyond the project. Experience from a previous project *Projet de Développement et de Mise en Oeuvre de la Foresterie Communautaire (FORCOM)* has shown that investing in training NGO technicians as community trainers (NGOs who have proven long-term local experience), and then implementing most of project activities at community level through the trained NGOs, instead of individual consultants, contributes to cost-effectiveness, replication and sustainability of project results.

Collaboration with partners with relevant experience (in Katanga, DRC, the miombo zone, the Congo Basin and West Africa) through the knowledge network that the project will establish is another element that will contribute to cost-effectiveness. Collaboration will ensure that results and products (such as training materials) are shared, and best practices are adapted and replicated in the miombo project and vice-versa.

Another cost effective measure is the use of one site – Kikonke – as the lead site for silvicultural trials, fire management and agroforestry trials. Kikonke will serve as the main awareness raising and demonstration site for interventions, which will then be replicated and adapted first in the other four initial pilot areas and from there to surrounding communities in the charcoal supply zone. This is more effective than conducting trials in all pilot sites simultaneously.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M&E PLAN

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of progress in achieving project results and objectives will be done based on the targets and results indicators established in the project results framework and annual work plans and budgets. M&E activities will follow FAO and GEF monitoring and evaluation policies and guidelines. The M&E plan will be reviewed and updated, as necessary, during the project inception phase. This will involve: (i) review of the project’s results framework; (ii) refining of outcome indicators; (iii) identification of missing baseline information and actions to be taken to collect the information; and (iv) clarification of M&E roles and responsibilities of project stakeholders. The project’s M&E system will be established within the first 6 months of project implementation.

The monitoring and evaluation plan is summarized below (details in section 4.6 in the FAO project document).

Type of monitoring and evaluation activity	Responsible parties	Time frame	Budget (USD)
Inception Workshop	National Project Coordinator leads the organization, in close consultation with FAO (BH, LTO and FAO GEF Unit).	Within first two months of project inception	10,000
Inception report	National Project Coordinator (NPC) with inputs from project partners. Cleared by FAO and the Project Steering Committee.	Immediately after the project inception workshop	-

Type of monitoring and evaluation activity	Responsible parties	Time frame	Budget (USD)
Design of monitoring and evaluation system	Monitoring and Evaluation consultant with support from the NPC and FAO Lead Technical Officer	Within the first six months after the project inception	3,000
Field-based impact monitoring and support	PMU with support from other project partners	Continually	315,600
Supervision missions	FAO LTO and FAO DRC	Annual or as required.	Paid by GEF Agency fee
Project progress reports (PPRs)	PMU. Submitted to FAO DRC (Budget Holder). Finalized reports submitted to the FAO GEF Unit by the LTO, and to the PSC by the National Project Coordinator.	Six- monthly	20,000
Project Implementation Review (PIR)	FAO LTO with inputs from the National Project Coordinator and FAO Budget Holder. Submitted by the FAO GEF Coordination Unit to the GEF Secretariat. Final report also submitted to the PSC and the GEF Operational Focal Point by the National Project Coordinator.	Annually	Paid by GEF Agency fee
Reports on co-financing	National Project Coordinator with information from all co-financing partners.	Six monthly and annually as part of PPR and PIR.	-
PSC meetings	National Project Coordinator, DDD, FAO Budget Holder	At least once a year .	40,000
Technical reports	PMU, Consultants, FAO	As appropriate	component budgets
Mid- term evaluation	External Consultant, FAO independent evaluation unit in consultation with the project team and other partners	At mid-point of project implementation	40,000
Final evaluation	External Consultant, FAO independent evaluation unit in consultation with the project team and other partners	At the end of project implementation	40,000
Terminal Workshop and Report	PMU	At least one month before end of project	10,000
TOTAL			478,600

PROVISION FOR EVALUATIONS

An independent Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) will be undertaken at project mid-term to review progress and effectiveness of implementation in terms of achieving the project objectives, outcomes and outputs. Findings and recommendations of this evaluation will be instrumental for bringing improvement in the overall project design and execution strategy for the remaining period of the project's term. FAO will arrange for the MTE in consultation with the project partners. The evaluation will, *inter alia*:

- (i) review the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation;
- (ii) analyze effectiveness of partnership arrangements;
- (iii) identify issues requiring decisions and remedial actions;
- (iv) propose any mid-course corrections and/or adjustments to the implementation strategy as necessary; and
- (v) highlight technical achievements and lessons learned derived from project design, implementation and management.

An independent Final Evaluation (FE) will be carried out three months prior to the terminal review meeting of the project partners. The FE will aim to identify the project impacts and sustainability of project results and the degree of achievement of long-term results. This evaluation will also have the purpose of indicating future actions needed to sustain project results and disseminate products and best-practices within the country and to neighbouring countries.

PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S): (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this template. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Vincent KASULU SEYA MAKONGA	Directeur du Développement Durable; Point Focal Opérationnel FEM et Point Focal UNFCCC/Rep.Dem.du Congo	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development	08/13/2013

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.					
Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Gustavo Merino Director, Investment Centre Division Technical Cooperation Department FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153, Rome, Italy		4 January 2016	Jean-Claude Nguinguiri, Forestry Officer FAO Subregional Office for Central Africa JeanClaude.Nguinguiri@fao.org	+241 01774783	JeanClaude.Nguinguiri@fao.org
Jeffrey Griffin Senior Coordinator FAO GEF Coordination Unit Investment Centre Division FAO				+3906 57055680	GEF-Coordination-Unit@fao.org

Annex A: Project Results Framework. (either copy and paste the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found)

Please see Appendix 1 in the FAO Project Document on pages 50 to 57. A detailed results budget is presented in Appendix 3 on pages 63 to 68.

Annex B: Responses to Project Reviews (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF)

GEF Secretariat Review	Responses
<p>31. At CEO Endorsement:</p> <p>a) Describe how other drivers are being addressed through activities through other partners.</p> <p>b) Clearly distinguish activities that will be undertaken in the community forests vs in the village lands and also clarify on role of the project in implementation of the zoning plans and articulation of activities allowable within each land-use type.</p> <p>c) Provide clarity on the ways the proposed project will influence the communities decide on use the land in a sustainable fashion regardless of the purpose (fuel, fodder for example).</p> <p>d) Clearly identify what the "appropriate measures" regarding interim legal measures would be and the details of their content.</p> <p>e) Note the carbon pools clearly in the calculations provided by the CEO endorsement. To clarify, the realistic assumption was related to the success of the project with respect to protecting the entire carbon stock (100% of 15-19tc/ha or some proportion of it?). Please consider using such assumptions in the CEO Endorsement Request.</p> <p>f) At CEO endorsement, include a comprehensive risk analysis;</p> <p>g) Detail the implementation arrangements and the role of local communities, including traditional authorities.</p> <p>h) Confirm the cofinancing.</p> <p>i) Include a M&E plan.</p> <p>j) Ensure there is no reputation risks for the GEF and its partners in this operations potentially involving the private sector on sensitive issues (mining, logging and wood products business, etc). Please check the recent history of these companies/partners in the country or the sector.</p>	<p>a) A description of what other partners are doing in Katanga to address drivers of miombo forest loss is described in FAO project document section 1.2a) pages 13 to 16.</p> <p>b) Set-up in the project area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Village land which includes communal forests and agricultural land with individual farmers fields. Communities ownership of the land is currently under customary tenure system. The customary land tenure is not secure as described in the project document section 1.1 . The project will provide technical expertise to support the government to develop administrative regulations that allow forest concessions to be awarded to communities under Law No. 11/2002. These regulations will be applied/tested by the project, by accompanying each pilot community through the administrative process to obtain legal rights. – Participatory zoning (not zoning plans) is an integral part of preparation of forest management plans. Within the community forests, there 3 main zones – intact miombo, secondary forests and severely degraded forests. With two main objectives (sustainable use to conserve the forests, and maintaining and enhancing livelihood benefits to the communities), these 3 zones will be placed under different forest management regimes/practices. The role of the project is to provide for technical assistance through training of community support institutions, to accompany communities through the zoning process, and the preparation and implementation of simple forest management plans. <p>c) The success and sustainability of project results will depend on benefits delivered to communities vs the current situation. These benefits or incentives, that will influence communities to adopt sustainable practices, are</p>

	<p>described in section B.2 above.</p> <p>d) Please see a detailed description of component 2, under section 2 in the project document.</p> <p>e) carbon calculations including assumptions in appendix 5</p> <p>f) risk analysis in section 3.2</p> <p>g) implementation arrangements in section 4.2</p> <p>h) cofinancing letters are attached</p> <p>i) M&E plan described above in section C</p> <p>J) No logging and mining companies involved in the project.</p>
STAP Review	
<p>1. The proposal identifies carbon sequestration as the global environmental benefit the project will seek to deliver. However, this activity is not described clearly in the component section, or in the project framework. STAP suggests defining further the activities on carbon sequestration through sustainable forest management/sustainable land management. This information could be included under component 1, and its expected outputs/outcomes detailed in the project framework.</p>	<p>Please see a description of component 1, pages 25-29 in the FAO project document.</p>
<p>2. As mentioned above, STAP appreciates the details in the project overview (section A "barriers, causes, drivers of land/forest degradation). However, STAP encourages the project developers to enhance this section further by citing published, or rigorous un-published literature to support this section. For example, the proposal states that overall deforestation rates for the DRC remain relatively low; and, that the causes contribute to "...degraded forests, reduced forest ecosystem services and large net emissions to the atmosphere." It would be useful to provide figures, or references, to support further this section.</p>	<p>This has been done, please see section 1.1 General context in the FAO project document.</p>
<p>3. STAP appreciates FAO's note that precise calculations on carbon stock changes will be done during the development of the proposal. In addition to these figures, STAP recommends specifying in the full proposal the methodology that will be used to estimate and monitor the carbon stock changes. Two potential methodologies are UNEP/GEF's Carbon Benefits Project and FAO's EX-ACT: http://www.unep.org/ClimateChange/carbon-benefits/cbp_pim/ http://www.fao.org/tc/exact/en/</p>	<p>Methodology used is described in Appendix 5 in the FAO project document.</p>
<p>4. In this regard, STAP recommends strengthening the</p>	<p>Done. Results framework Appendix 1 , section 4.6</p>

<p>baseline by defining the impact indicators, providing data, and describing the methodology that will be used to estimate and monitor the global environmental benefits. This information is important for establishing the incremental reasoning, and ultimately measuring/monitoring global environmental benefits.</p>	<p>Monitoring and Evaluation plan, and Appendix 5 Quantifying and monitoring carbon benefits.</p>
<p>5. Additionally, FAO may wish to use the following study conducted in miombo forests in Zambia to further inform its activities on sustainable forest management and carbon stock changes. The paper's reference list also may prove useful to the project developers in informing further the design of the proposal: Chidumayo, E.N. "Forest degradation and recovery in a miombo woodland landscape in Zambia: 22 years of observations on permanent sample plots". Forest ecology and Management 291, 154-161. 2013.</p>	<p>Thank you. In addition we used this study: Kalaba F.K., C. Quinn, A.J. Dougill, R. Vinya. 2013 Floristic composition, species diversity and carbon storage in charcoal and agriculture fallows and management implications in Miombo woodlands of Zambia. Forest Ecology and Management 304: 99–109.</p>
<p>GEF Council Comments</p>	
<p>Comments by United States</p> <p>The United States believes that the goal of this project is beneficial and that community based approaches can play a significant role in addressing the barriers to sustainably managed forests. Prior to CEO endorsement, we recommend the proposal address expectations for local managers, including whether or not the sustainable management of forests will be mandated.</p> <p>Additionally, the final proposal should provide greater detail on the community funds that manage the revenues from the sale of wood and non-wood forest products. Oversight and transparency of these funds is critical for success. Therefore, clear guidelines on the role of the fund should be developed, including what revenues will be transferred to the fund, how the funds will be distributed, how information on the funds will be disseminated, how management is designed, and the methods for ensuring proper accountability of the funds.</p>	<p>Lessons learned indicate that community-based forest management approaches are most successful when they are voluntary and not imposed or mandated. This is part of the criteria to select project communities. A number of consultations with communities and local chiefs were conducted during project preparation to explain the goal of the project, potential benefits to communities and the environment. The empowerment of communities for the control of access and use to the marketing of forest products from community forests will be conditional upon their commitment to prevent deforestation and to the sustainable use of the forest.</p> <p>There is full agreement on the high importance of oversight and transparency on the forest management funds. Key aspects of funds management that have been included in the design are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Funds will be collected and managed by the community managers. Government will have no direct control over the funds; - The development of community capacities for good governance is considered to be the most important of all the different institutional capacities. A large part of project funding is dedicated to capacity development, especially for good governance; - Annual audits of community funds will be standard practice; - All forest users should contribute in cash or in kind to forest management costs;

	<p>Forest management labor needs and expertise will be paid out of the management funds. The use of voluntary labor will be kept to a minimum.</p>
<p>Comments by JICA JICA is conducting forest resources assessment in Province du Bandundu for the purpose of establishing MRV system for REDD. Although there is no overlap with expected GEF project, information sharing is highly appreciated. Because Community Forest Management plays central role in DRC and JICA is planning to include such component into future project of JICA.</p>	<p>Comment taken into account. There was much discussion about methodologies used by JICA during project preparation. Collaboration with JICA as a technical partner will indeed be important.</p>
<p>Comments by Germany Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The focus of the project is on Miombo woods, a highly fragile ecosystem that needs to be managed very carefully in order to maintain the provisioning services. Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but requests that the following comments are taken into account: - The current approach proposed by the project does not build upon existing governance and management structures on the local level but rather proposes to create new structures. Germany strongly suggests reviewing this approach and basing the proposed forest management on existing structures. There are decentralized structures which are linked to the top or bottom. - Since Miombo woods are highly fragile a transparent and long-term engagement has to be ensured. The current proposal does not follow such a long-term engagement. - Communication with other projects is highly suggested to benefit from their expertise and their lessons learnt. 	<p>The only local structures that are found in all communities are hereditary traditional authorities (chiefs). The project recognizes that one needs to work with the traditional authorities. One of the two main chiefs – Chief Kaponda has played a pioneering role in forest conservation and and has been very supportive of the Miombo Project.</p> <p>We strongly agree that long-term engagement is critical to the success of the development of participatory NR management systems and the following have been taken into consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Emphasis on self-financing - Emphasis on capacity building of communities and community support institutions - Development of a provincial strategy for widespread replication of the management systems developed <p>We have established communications with other projects and partners working in Katanga including GIZ, GRET (Groupe de Recherches et d'Echanges Technologiques) and others.</p>

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁵

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG GRANT APPROVED AT PIF: USD			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent to date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Activity 1: inception workshop and training of national consultants	24,034	20,954.06	
Activity 2: Spatial analysis of charcoal supply zone	10,343	14,712.33	
Activity 3: Review of lessons learned and best practices	8,680	15,597.20	
Activity 4: Sociological, market chain and stakeholder analysis	7,753	6,744.35	
Activity 5: Analysis of legal framework	5,772	9,024.95	
Activity 6: Consultations and drafting of the project document	73,418	28,924.95	
Activity 7: Project completion workshop and finalization of the project document	20,000	40,501.65	4,218.90
Total	150,000	136,459.49	4,218.90

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

NA

⁵ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent funds, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for activities.