

Removing Barriers to Biodiversity Conservation, Land Restoration and Sustainable Forest Management through Community-based Landscape Management – COBALAM

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

9604

Countries

Cameroon

Project Name

Removing Barriers to Biodiversity Conservation, Land Restoration and Sustainable Forest Management through Community-based Landscape Management – COBALAM

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

5/29/2019

Review completed by PM

1/10/2020

Program Manager

Jaime Cavelier

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Project Design and Financing

1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-19-19

There is a session with the comparison between the PIF and the CEO Endorsement.

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-20-19

1) Please clarify the names (or sites) of the target areas. Suggest having only one table. Very difficult to reconcile the numbers provided in the Core Indicators, with the numbers in Tables 7,8 and 9. Values in text (p. 65 of Project Document) and in the table that explains the changes since PIF approval (Under Project Description in Portal) do not match either.

2) Component 1.

Output 1.1.1. LMBs: These appear similar/same as the ones RFA has demonstrated in Ghana and experimenting in Cote D'Ivoire, but new in Cameroon. What are the Lessons Learn regarding the effectiveness and sustainability of the LMBs? Please include in text. The project depends on their success.

Outcome 1.2. What is the conservation status that the KBAs, HCVF and Sacred Forest will receive as part of the upgrade as indicated in the title of the outcome? This is confusing since in the text, it says "The legal status of a KBA in the WHC cannot therefore be that of a protected area, as defined by either MINFOF or IUCN. As the KBA/Sacred Forest areas cannot be converted into protected areas, their status must allow for establishment of an integrated management system that simultaneously takes into account the co- existence of natural resources to be conserved and the cultural and economic activities of rural communities, while targeting increased protection" (p.61 of Project Document). There is also reference to "legal and technical frameworks".

3) Component 2.

Output 2.1.4. 2. In relation "Build market commitment from target companies to sourcing from producers applying SLM practices". Please elaborate on the most likely markets, products and companies to engage in this activity? Are there companies already in the local markets? Please elaborate in the text.

Output 2.1.5. and Output 3.1.1 *Insights on best practices for SLM and SFM, CBNRM, CBO/SME governance and enterprise development identified and shared among government, CSO, CBO and SME*. This is one of the most opaque parts of the proposal. Needs to dissect all these terms to understand what is

going to be carried out on the ground. SLM and SFM say very little as of what will be actually done on the ground. This issue is also evident in the description of Output 3.1.1. The PPG should have provided that information.

9-3-19

Please address the first question. It was left unattended in the Response:

1) Please clarify the names (or sites) of the target areas. Suggest having only one table. Very difficult to reconcile the numbers provided in the Core Indicators, with the numbers in Tables 7,8 and 9. Values in text (p. 65 of Project Document) and in the table that explains the changes since PIF approval (Under Project Description in Portal) do not match either.

Please include in the Portal a SINGLE TABLE OF THE project's target areas with the name and area in hectares (Like in Table 8 of the Project Document (p.73-74). The sum of the different areas (ha) should correspond to the areas (ha) listed in the Indicators. REMOVE ALL OTHER NAMES AND MAPS that do not relate to the project in hand (i.e. map of all KBAs in Cameroon). These other maps and areas makes the reading very confusing. There must be a way to produce a single table with the names and areas (ha) that matter to the project so you can see it all at a glance. Correspondence with Indicators is critical.

11-18-19

While the figure of 14,099 ha of protected areas is the same in the Table of Indicators and Table 8 of the Prodoc (as in the Portal), the names and areas are not listed. Please pull out the names and areas for Table 8 and insert them into the Indicators Table (see below)

Indicator 1.1 Terrestrial Protected Areas Newly created

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)
0.00	14,099.00	0.00

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)
		Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources		14,099.00	

In the above locations, the project target 53 038 ha of land including:

- 14,099ha of protected areas
- 3,500 ha of HCVF/Sacred Forest
- 2,688 ha of agricultural landscapes to be meet national or international third-party certification and that incorporates biodiversity considerations
- 32 751 ha of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems including 7600 ha of KBA; 24,551 ha of community forests and 600 ha of agricultural and pastoral lands.

11-21-19

Cleared

NOTE AFTER INITIAL TECHNICAL CLEARANCE

The project indicates that Indicator 6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated is mapped under sub-indicator 6.2 which works for projects *outside* of AFOLU scope. Given that this project actually falls *within* the scope of AFOLU, please move the value from indicator 6.2 to indicator 6.1, where it should fit.

CLEARED

Response to Secretariat comments

06 August 2019

Output 1.1.1 Lessons learned on implementing LMBs in Ghana are now explained in paragraph 170 and 171 of UNEP Project Document. To ensure adequate monitoring of the effectiveness and sustainability of LMB, a risk associated with it is now included in Risk Table. Para. 189

Outcome 1.2 and Output 1.2.1. Reformulated – See Project Framework and all related parts in both Project Document and CEO Endorsement document- to reflect below explanation:

The legal status of a KBA in the WHC cannot be that of a protected area with strictly protected measures, as defined by the 1994 Cameroon forest law (e.g national parks, forests, and fauna reserves etc.). KBA is most suited to be classified in IUCN category V. (see paragraph 166 and 167). Based on the Law n°2011/008, dated 6 May 2011, which lays down guidelines for territorial planning and sustainable development in Cameroon, the project will target a status of Priority Management Zones to upgrade the conservation status of Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA).

Some of these KBA already includes HCVF/Sacred forest that will directly benefit from this status.

For the Sacred forest outside the KBA, a consultation with traditional authorities during the PPG phase demonstrates a high risk of having sacred forest out of traditional control if they obtain a legal status of protected areas according to the forest law. The identification and implementation of management arrangements and the economic valorisation of sacred forest were identified as the best options to improve their conservation. (see paragraph 168).

Based on the project's experience, the technical framework to guide the operationalization of PMZ concept will be developed with the engagement of authorities (Activity 1.2.2.1)

Activity 2.1.4.2. A text in Paragraph 177 is now provided which give background information on likely markets, products, and companies.

Output 2.1.5 has been reformulated as “Learning is disseminated within and beyond the project areas and stakeholders through exchange visits, communications products, workshops and other events”

What is going to be carried out on the ground particularly on SLM and SFM is now been dissected and the outcome 3.1 and output 3.1.1. the description is now amended in the project document

17 October 2019:







Project target areas are now presented in one single table 8 of Project Document including names and coverage of project targeted Protected Areas. In the same table 8, more information is given on the numbers aligned with Core Indicators and in the table that explains the changes since PIF approval

All other maps and tables not related to the project are now removed

19 November 2019:

Updated in the portal as per suggestion (see below)

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Ha (Expected at PIF) ⓘ	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) ⓘ	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR) ⓘ	Total Ha (Achieved at TE) ⓘ	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
----------------------------	---------	---------------	------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------------

Bali Nguemba Forest Reserve		Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources		899.00			11.00			 
Bana Forest Reserve		Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources		4,800.00			18.00			 
Mt. Bamboutos forest Reserve		Natural Monument or Feature		200.00			15.00			 
Tofala Hill Wildlife Sanctuary		Habitat/Species Management Area		8,200.00			25.00			 

12-06-19

Values under indicator 6.2 moved to indicator 6.1.

3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-20-19

The co-financing is very high. Wh

Budget Lines in Project Document:

2201. Details of the SFM & SLM need to be provided in text to justify this \$654,750 investment.

1302 Needs to be covered by Co-Financing

4201 There is no justification to purchase 2 vehicles. One if properly justified.

1209 (\$5,432,678), 1210 (\$3,703,000), 4106 (\$4,201,914). The cost of these plans is astronomical. Not clear how the project going to use so much funding for these activities. What is the cost per unit plan or area and how many of these plans are going to prepared? What is the budget for IMPLEMENTATION of these plans? Does the project run the risk of ending with plans and no funding for implementation? Please address this matter in depth.

9-3-19

1302. Not clear why this salary can't be covered with co-Financing. The Ministry of Environment, Nature Protection and Sustainable Development of Cameroon (MINEPDED) is providing \$1.5 million in-kind.

Why the budget for Vehicle fuel & maintenance was reduced by only \$18,000. It was \$121,125 (2 vehicles) and now it is \$103,125 (1 vehicle)?

11-18-19

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

06 August 2019

2201. SLM and SFM practices to be developed by the project are now more explained in paragraph 172, 173 and 174 and in Outcome 3.1 Description. The small grant mechanism will be essential to engage and provide CSOs, CBOs and council with resources to implement landscapes management plans, accelerate the uptake of SLM/SFM practices described in component 2, to address drivers of species and habitat loss identified in four protected areas in the PMZ or their vicinity (Mts Bamboutos forest reserve, Bali-Nguemba forest reserve, Bapou-Bana forest reserve and Tofalla Hill Wildlife sanctuary) and for initiatives for the economic valorisation of Sacred Forests to sustain their conservation. Small grant approaches have the potential for broader replication of successful approaches, they strengthen institutions striving to meet new goals and serve more people. Through this approach, partners will be -learning by doing – with a high potential to continue the implementation of good practices on their own long after the project. (paragraph 178)

1302. This budget line is a provision for the driver to be recruited by the project on a full-time position to facilitate field operations directly linked to GEF funds.

4201. A vehicle is needed to support the project management unit at Bafoussam in its day to day management and support in the target locations. The project areas cover 10 municipalities in the two KBA landscapes and 10 additional HCVF/SF in WHC outside the two KBA. It will practically be impossible to achieve the project results without at least a vehicle and a full-time driver directly funded by the GEFTF.

The budget lines 1209 (\$5,432,678), 1210 (\$3,703,000), 4106 (\$4,201,914) are not part of the COBALAM project's budget

17 October 2019:

1302. The budget line is now canceled. GEFTF budget previously on line 1302 is now reallocated in various budget lines for more support from the project to thematic consultants, training and equipment to support sustainable production.

The cost related to the second vehicle has now been reallocated to the Stakeholder mobilization and policy dialogues. The amount for vehicle fuel and maintenance for the second vehicle is now allocated to training activities

4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-20-19

Yes

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-20-19

One of the LoC from the Government includes two figures: \$5,432,678 and \$6,362,999. Nevertheless, there is only one figure in the Portal \$ \$5,432,678 (This is in addition to another LoC for \$1,500,000).

The LoC from PRODEL is for \$18,368,000 but the figure on the portal is \$18,368,000.

9-3-19

There is no correspondence between the LoC and the names+figures in the Portal. Please highlight the value of co-finance in each of the letters, that should correspond to a line in the Portal. An explanation may be warranted if a co-financier provides funding from two or more sources. Co-financing must be for upcoming projects, not passed projects.

11-18-19

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

06 August 2019

The LoC from the government has two components which have now been corrected in the documents:

- MINEPDED: \$1,500,000

- MINEPAT: \$5,432,476

A new LoC from PRODEL for \$8,733,000 has been included.

17 October 2019:

Value of co-funding now highlighted in the co-finance letters

6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-20-19

Please provide the IUCN category. <https://www.iucn.org/theme/protected-areas/about/protected-area-categories> If no Category (I-VI) please disregard this comment. GEFSEC understand these 14,099 ha are several areas. Providing a table with each and all of the target areas will help.

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
		Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources		14,099.00		

9-3-19

Please bring the Table of PAs to the Portal. It is an important part of the project.

9-3-19

Table 8 (Project Document) list the Project's target areas (adding to 14,099 ha). What about the areas in Table 9? Where do these hectares reported? See comment above.

11-18-19

This issue remains. Please look at Item 2 above

11-21-19

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

06 August 2019

Information on protected areas, including their IUCN categories, are now included in Table 9: Protected Areas covered by the project

17 October 2019

All Protected Areas with their respective surface area and IUCN categories are now included in table 8: a single table with all target areas in the PA in former table 9.

7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement NA

Response to Secretariat comments

8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-20-19

There is reference to a number of projects but not clear if there were conversations during PPG on how to coordinate and on what activities. Please elaborate.

9-3-19

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

06 August 2019

Coordination with several of these projects (PNDP, PRODEL, Mount Bamboutos initiative) have been discussed during the PPG and activities have been identified, and funding used to evaluate their CO-funding. Main areas of collaboration are defined in the CEO endorsement page 24. Example of consultations are:

- Meeting with PRODEL organized on 2nd October 2018 to discuss coordination and activities have been identified, and funding used to evaluate their CO-funding.
- Coordination with PNDP has been discussed during a meeting organized on 22nd August 2018 the PPG and activities have been identified, and funding used to evaluate their CO-funding

The COBALAM content was presented at the launching of the Mt Bamboutos Initiative on 2nd August 2018 in Dschang and main complementary activities identified.;

The main content of COBALAM on community forestry have been discussed during the side event organized by ICRAF, the Implementing organization for DRYAF, at the International scientific conference: “African forest-related policies and politics” 24 – 27 September 2018 in Yaoundé been discussed

9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-20-19

Annex G in Project Document

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-20-19

Yes

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Responses

11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:

GEFSEC

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-20-19

Yes

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

STAP

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-20-19

Yes

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

GEF Council

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-20-19

Yes

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

Convention Secretariat

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Response to Secretariat comments

Recommendation

12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-20-19

No. Please address outstanding issues. The GEF is available for consultation.

9-3-19

No. Please address outstanding issues. When submitting the Prodoc please send a clean copy, not with Track Changes. The GEF remains available for consultation.

Thanks.

11-18-19

No. Please address issue in item 2 above. Thanks

11-21-19

Yes. This CEO Endorsement is recommended.

12-5-19

No. Please address small point under item 2 and resubmit. Thanks

1-6-20

Yes. This CEO Endorsement is recommended.

Response to Secretariat comments

17 October 2019

The highlighted issues have been addressed. Thank you.

06 December 2019

Comment under item 2 addressed.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations

CONTEXT: Cameroon's biodiversity endowment is outstanding. For instance, nearly half of the bird and mammal species, and almost all ecosystems in the continent are present in Cameroon. This micro-cosmos of the African biodiversity is threatened by unsustainable agricultural practices, increase competition for land between agriculture and pastoralism, and forest degradation and deforestation. Although considerable progress has been made for the protections of these assets, burdensome bureaucratic processes, a lack of social, a lack of social and enterprise capacity and limited financial and weak markets has limited the development of Community Based Natural Resource Management. The objective of this project is to improve biodiversity conservation and sustainable forest management in the Western Highlands of Cameroon. This area is characterized by high endemism, and unique and unprotected montane ecosystems that are also home of a population that heavily depends of traditional agriculture. The purpose of COBALAM is to conserve biodiversity in the Western Highlands and the South region of Cameroon through a sustainable landscape approach, in which High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) is protected by law and the surrounding forested and agricultural areas are managed through participatory community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) and the development of local enterprises that use natural resources sustainably and generate livelihoods for local populations.

PROJECT: The project aims to directly improve the conservation of 7,600 ha of KBA in the WHC (Mount Bamboutos 7,400 ha; Mount Bana 200 ha), 3,500 ha of High Conservation Value Forests/Sacred Forests in the Western Highlands of Cameroon (WHC) outside the two KBAs, and 24,551 ha of Community Forests. The project will also support SLM activities in 38,939 ha in the landscapes around the KBA and Sacred Forests while creating sustainable land use alternatives for farmers, reducing the pressure for further forest encroachment, and reversing land degradation. The project will also reduce the pressure on natural resources through developing participatory and integrated landscape management plans, in which all land users agree on how to conserve the natural ecosystem while pursuing their livelihoods. The project will build an incentive structure, leveraging policy, market commitments and technical services, to create the capacity and motivation for sustainable land management and sustainable forest management among Community Based Organizations and small and medium enterprises.

INNOVATION AND SUSTAINABILITY: The project will take stock of the experiences of Community Based Natural Resources Management in Africa and apply the appropriate models to the Cameroonian environment and culture. The sustainability of the project will be based on the investments to be made in the legal and regulatory frameworks governing land use and in the inter-institutional coordination. The experiences gained during the implementation of the project in three priority landscape areas in the Western Highlands could be replicated in other sites in the region with similar environments (mountains) and traditional land use activities (agriculture and pastoralism).

CO-FINANCING: It will be provided by the Ministry of Environment, Nature Protection and Sustainable Development of Cameroon (MINEPDED), Ministry of Economy, Planning and Regional Development (MINEPAT), National Community Driven Development Program (PNDP), Livestock Development program (PRODEL) and Rainforest Alliance.