

Support to Nagoya protocol implementation, research and development, on Biodiversity value chain for small holders in the South West and Far North Regions of Cameroon

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10850

Countries

Cameroon

Project Name

Support to Nagoya protocol implementation, research and development, on Biodiversity value chain for small holders in the South West and Far North Regions of Cameroon

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

8/24/2021

Review completed by PM

11/16/2021

Program Manager

Adriana Moreira

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

MSP

PIF

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9-10-21 The proposed project is aligned with the BD Focal Area strategy, BD 3-9
Implement the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing.

11-26-21: Project title: please make sure the project of the title matches the title of the Letter of Endorsement.

Project Title ⓘ

Support the implementation of Nagoya protocol through the valorization of potential ABS value chains by farmer organizations (Cooperatives, local community organisations) in the South West and Far North Regions of Cameroon

LOE:

Subject: Endorsement for "Support to Nagoya protocol implementation, research and development on biodiversity value chain for small holders in the South West and Far North Regions of Cameroon Project"

Please also include the name of the Executing partner in the appropriate space, as per the LoE, the project will be executed by the Ministry of Environment, Protection of Nature and Sustainable Development (MINEPDED).

Other Executing Partner(s) ⓘ	Executing Partner Type
[REDACTED]	Government

I would like to thank you for your kind response and for your support in endorsing the preparation of the above project proposal with the support of the GEF Agency. If approved, the proposal will be prepared and implemented by MINEPDED. I request the GEF Secretariat to provide a copy of the project document before it is submitted to the GEF Secretariat for CEO approval.

Agency Response

07 December 2021

Project title and MINEPDED EA reference updated in the Portal as per guidance.

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9-10-21: Component 1: Output 1.1.1 Please clarify the enabling environment for adoption and full implementation of ABS measures in Cameroon.

Component 2: Output 2.1.2 Please indicate what are the potential ?sustainable regeneration and associated management practices? envisioned by the project. Please clarify and provide examples in the component description.

Output 2.2.3: Please clarify what will be the basis for measuring farmer income. What percentage of current farmer income (before the project) is derived from customary uses of biodiversity and GR? Is the proposed increase in income to derived from the proposed ABS Agreements? The component description does not include information related to this output. Please explain and provide examples.

Component 3: Output 3.1.1 Please clarify how R&D and GR manipulation will be addressed under each ABS contract.
Please provide more detail on how the project plans to improve biodiversity outcomes in the target areas.

Agency Response

12/11/2021

On Component 1: Output 1.1.1 On the clarification requested for the enabling environment for adoption and full implementation of ABS measures in Cameroon. The clarifications are now provided under Component 1, Page 12 (see yellow highlight) in PIF document.

On Component 2: Output 2.1.2 Please indicate what are the potential ?sustainable regeneration and associated management practices? envisioned by the project. Please clarify and provide examples in the component description.
Potential sustainable regeneration and associated management practices with examples have been provided under component 2 (See yellow highlight in PIF document).

On Component 2: Output 2.2.3: Please clarify what will be the basis for measuring farmer income. What percentage of current farmer income (before the project) is derived from customary uses of biodiversity and GR? Is the proposed increase in income derived from the proposed ABS Agreements? The component description does not include information related to this output. Please explain and provide examples.

The basis for measuring farmers income is now clarified and indication about current figures and examples are now provided thereby describing the output. See Component 2 page 11 description with yellow highlight in PIF document.

On Component 3: Output 3.1.1 Please clarify how R&D and GR manipulation will be addressed under each ABS contract.
Clarification on how R&D and GR manipulation will be addressed under each ABS contract has been provided under Component 3 page 13. (See Yellow highlight in PIF document).

Please provide more detail on how the project plans to improve biodiversity outcomes in the target areas. Additional information is now provided in Section 6: The Global Environment Benefit.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9-15-21: Please clarify why the type of co-financing provided by MINEPDED (National Budget) is classified as "grant" for "recurrent expenditures" and not as "investment mobilized".

MINEPDED	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	500,000.00
MINEPDED-National Budget in support of ABS implementation	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	1,000,000.00
GIZ – BioInnovation Project	Grant	Investment mobilized	2,000,000.00
North Regions Divisions	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	500,000.00
South – West Regions Divisions	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	500,000.00

Please clarify how con-financing was identified and how the impacts of COVI have been factored in co-financing prospects. Please justify the low co-financing ratios (1:2.25) proposed for this project.

11-26-21: Please change the category of the co-financier GIZ from *CSO* to *Donor Agency*.

Civil Society Organization	GIZ – BioInnovation Project	Grant	Investment mobilized	2,000,000.00
----------------------------	-----------------------------	-------	----------------------	--------------

Agency Response

12 November 2021

On clarification requested on why the type of co-financing provided by MINEPDED (National Budget) is classified as "grant" for "recurrent expenditures" and not as "investment mobilized"

Section C: Indicative Sources of Co-financing for the project by Name and by Type, on Pages 2 & 3 has been corrected to read: "investment mobilized" for co-financing provided by MINEPDED.

On clarification requested on how con-financing was identified and how the impacts of COVID-19 have been factored in co-financing prospects. Please justify the low co-financing ratios (1:2.25) proposed for this project:

Co-financing was identified in a participatory manner with key stakeholders during the PIF preparation process. During PIF revision, additional co-financing was leveraged from other public and local NGO sources associated with the implementation of the project to accomplish project goals, which we hope will contribute to strengthening partnerships between the Cameroon government, and these institutions. As it will be

noticed in section C, Pages 2 & 3, the co-financing has become more diversified in terms of a number of sources and types of co-financing.

The project is now reaching a ratio of co-financing of at least 1:5,

The initial low ratio was justified by the fact that during the PIF preparation it was difficult to secure co-financing from partners as these institutions were severely impacted by the COVID 19. During the PIF revision, MINEPDED leadership took further action to engage with other sectors Ministry, private sector, and NGO which resulted in an increase in the Co-financing currently reflected in section C

07 December 2021

GIZ category changed to Donor agency.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9-15-21: The resources requested are within the BD funds available in GEF-7

11-26-21: On PMC: there is no proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 10%, for a co-financing of \$11,500,000 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$1,150,000 instead of \$500,000 (which is 4.3%). Please amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion.

	Sub Total (\$)	1,818,182.00	11,500,000.00
Project Management Cost (PMC)			
	GET	181,818.00	500,000.00
	Sub Total(\$)	181,818.00	500,000.00
	Total Project Cost(\$)	2,000,000.00	12,000,000.00

Agency Response

07 December 2021

The PMC cofinancing has now been increased to \$1,500,000. This is in line with the announced in-kind co-financing from the Executing Agency, that is the MINEPDED. See Table B Project Framework

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9-15-21: The resources requested are within the BD funds available in GEF-7

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9-15-21: The resources requested are within the BD funds available in GEF-7.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9-15-21: Project has been classified as MSP:

GEF ID
10850

Project Type
MSP

As per the guidelines the PPG amount limit for MSPs is USD 50,000. Table E and the Letter of Endorsement (LOE) from the Operational Focal Point indicate a request of USD 100,000. Please clarify and revise Table E and the LOE.

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
UNEP	GET	Cameroon	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	91,324	8,676	100,000.00
Total Project Costs(\$)					91,324.00	8,676.00	100,000.00

Agency Response

12 November 2021

We appreciate the review for drawing our attention to this which was an oversight. The Letter of Endorsement of the GEF Operational Focal Point has been revised. The PPG amount requested in Table E is now revised at USD 50,000 to align with the PPG Guidelines

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9-15-21: Please indicate the methodology used to derive the target number of beneficiaries and gender ratios. The PIF document indicates that an estimated 200,000 IPLCs will benefit from the ABS law and agreements. Please explain why the low number of direct beneficiaries.

Agency Response

12 November 2021

Some studies^[1] revealed that for *Irvingia* spp. it was estimated that over 850 households were involved in the harvesting process while 889 were retailers, intermediaries, wholesalers and Exporters. This gives a total of 1739. Considering that the same people

are involved in the production of *Monodora myristica*, *Balanites aegyptiaca* and *Acacia nilotica* (Gonakier) we can estimate that the number of direct beneficiaries will be about 7000. The number of indirect beneficiaries could be estimated as being over 100000, when considering the impact it will have in local areas.

Over 2 000 000 IPLCs will benefit from the ABS law and agreements instead of 200 000. Among Cameroon's more than 20 million inhabitants, some communities self-identify as Indigenous. These include the hunter/gatherers (Pygmies), the Mbororo pastoralists and the Kirdi. According to [The Indigenous World 2021\[2\]](#), the Pygmies represent around 0.4% (80 000) of the total population of Cameroon while the Mbororo are estimated to make up approx. 12% (2 400 000) of the population. The precise number of the Kirdi is not known. This correction has been provided in Section F, page 4.

[1] Markets and market chain analysis for bush Mango (*irvingia* sp.) In the south west and east Regions of Cameroon, Master's thesis by Ewane Marcus Elah in 2010

[2] <https://www.iwgia.org/en/cameroon/4207-iw-2021-cameroon.html>

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9-21-21: Project is properly tagged with appropriate keywords.

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9-21-21: The description of root causes and barriers is adequate.

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9-21-21: Baseline scenario is adequately described. It will be important to discuss in more depth how the lessons learned from previous projects have been incorporated in project design, particularly related to consultations with IPLCs.

Agency Response

12 November 2021

Lessons learned from previous projects particularly from the development of an ABS process for two value chains, *Echinops giganteus* and *Mondia whitei* in past projects, were helpful in developing this new project. The insights gained from these projects especially regarding community involvement processes were valuable in setting up the project objectives, outcomes and outputs. The choice of the value chains to be considered for the project were equally made based on their current exploitation similarities with *Echinops giganteus* and *Mondia whitei* in terms of their capacity to trigger an ABS case, their availability and identified private sector interest.

Moreover, lessons learned in engaging with local communities through the development of biocultural community protocols, including MAT and PIC procedures for the utilization of biological/genetic resources and in accordance with local practices and national law in previous projects were extremely useful in the assessment of the barriers, risk and costing of each component of the project.

This addition has been added in section 2) the baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects, pages 10 & 11, 2nd Paragraph, lines 8-17.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9-21-21: Alternative scenario description is satisfactory for PIF stage.

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9-21-21: Proposed project is aligned with BD Focal Area strategy.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9-21-21: The incremental cost reasoning is adequate.

Agency Response

6. Are the project?/s/program?s indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9-21-21: Because this project is in support of the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol there are no targets, except the number of beneficiaries. No land indicator is provided at PIF stage. This should change at CEO Endorsement when the target communities are properly assessed. Please confirm/provide estimated land area of the target communities.

Agency Response

12 November 2021

The land indicator will be provided at CEO endorsement when the target communities are properly assessed.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9-21-21: Please address practical sustainability questions more directly. The goal of project sustainability ? nationally sustainable governmental ABS frameworks and the capacity to implement them domestically- relies on attention to the key factors directing national support. The development of national capacities to utilize and add value to domestic Genetic Resources (GR) and ATK can only be scaled up with appropriate budget allocations and support. Please provide more detail on the existing conditions in Cameroon.

Agency Response

12 November 2021

The Sustainability sub-section in section 7 has now been strengthened to establish the project's institutional, financial sustainability.

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project?/s/program?s intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9-21-21: Map presented is not geo-reference and does not contain coordinates. Please submit an appropriate map of the project's intended location.

Agency Response

1 November 2021

A geo-referenced map has been provided on page 18.

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9-21-21: Description of stakeholder engagement is adequate for PIF stage.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9-21-21: Please include more contextual information on the relevant laws, cultural norms and traditions shaping behaviors that might hinder or accelerate gender mainstreaming.

11-26-21: Thanks for the additional contextual information added to section 3. Please provide more detail on any plans to address gender in project design, including consultations, gender analysis as well as effort to develop a gender action plan. Also, please provide some indicative information on the gender-responsive measures planned to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment.

Agency Response

12 November 2021

Contextual information has now been added in Section 3 (See yellow highlight). On gender mainstreaming to strengthen the section

07 December 2021

Information on the plan to address gender in project design as well as the gender action plan is now added in section 3. Furthermore, linkage of the project to additional legal

frameworks at national and regional levels is now added in Section 7: consistency with national policies.

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9-21-21: Please provide more specific information on how the project will the private sector, in particular the multinational companies mentioned in the document. Are there any of these companies already operating in the proposed project area? Which strategies will be used for engagement? Are there any existing links of private sector and the local communities? How are the communities organized (cooperatives, associations)? Are there any capacity to establish contracts with multinational companies? Please, provide more detail and examples in the text.

Agency Response

12 November 2021

The section on private sector engagement has been amended to consider the review guidelines. During the PPG an in-depth discussion will be conducted with the private sector and a comprehensive engagement plan will be provided.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9-21-21: Description of risks and mitigation approach is adequate for PIF stage.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9-21-21: Description of proposed institutional arrangements and coordination is adequate for PIF stage.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9-21-21: Proposed project demonstrates alignment with national strategies and plans.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed knowledge management (KM) approach in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9-21-21: Knowledge management is a key element of the proposed project. Please indicate how the lessons learned from previous projects have been incorporated into the current project design. Will the project include plans for strategic communications?

Agency Response

12 November 2021

Section 8. Knowledge Management has now been amended to include the lessons learned from previous projects and strategic communication.

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9-21-21: The information provided on environmental and social risks assessment (SRIF) is limited. Please provide more specific information and justification for the low risk classification for all safeguards standards triggered by the project. Please also indicate

why the ?Carry out further assessments (e.g., site visits, experts? inputs, consult affected communities, etc.)? recommendation was not marked in section 2.D and describe the proposed grievance mechanism for IPLCs.

11-26-21: Thanks for the revisions provided in the document. The project overall ESS risk is classified as "low" in the Portal. However, the Safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF) dated November 11, 2021 reviewed by Safeguard team states that overall project risk is classified as "moderate" due to risk regarding short-term economic displacement of local communities. Please adjust to correct this inconsistency.

Agency Response

12 November 2021

The entire SRIF document has been amended to consider the review guidance and further analysis of the criteria (See yellow Highlight). At CEO endorsement, a revised SRIF will be provided particularly with a clear analysis resulting from the choice of pilot sites.

07 December 2021

Project overall risk reflected as ?moderate in the portal.

Part III ? Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country?s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9-15-21: The Letter of Endorsement is adequately signed by the current country's GEF Operational Focal Point listed in the database.

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating

reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9-22-21: Please provide responses to the minor comments above and re-submit. Thanks!

11-26-21: Please review and respond to the comments provided above. Thanks!

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		11/12/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)		12/7/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Review

Agency Response

Additional Review (as necessary)

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval