

# Integrated management of Cameroon's forest landscapes in the Congo Basin

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10287

**Countries**

Cameroon

**Project Name**

Integrated management of Cameroon's forest landscapes in the Congo Basin

**Agencies**

WWF-US

**Date received by PM**

3/12/2021

**Review completed by PM**

7/16/2021

**Program Manager**

Pascal Martinez

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

## PIF

### CEO Endorsement

#### Part I ? Project Information

#### Focal area elements

**1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**April 6, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

**July 14, 2021:**

In Table A there should be only one "Objectives/Programs" which is "IP SFM Congo" and its Focal Area Outcome should be "Promoting effective coordination for sustainable forest management" (as below). Please adjust accordingly and apologies form not have raised this issue in the previous review.

#### A. FOCAL/NON-FOCAL AREA ELEMENTS

Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund
IP SFM Congo	Promoting effective coordination for sustainable forest management	GET
		Total Project

**July 15, 2021:**

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency Response: July 15, 2021-

This has been addressed in Table A

**Project description summary**

**2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**April 6, 2021:**

1. The indicators and expected targets are missing under the Expected Outcomes of table B. To clarify the contribution of each component to the results please complete accordingly.
2. The project document mentions the outputs 4.2 and 4.3 which are not in table B nor under the alternative scenario in the Portal. Please clarify and amend as needed.
3. The title of Component 5 includes Project management. Activities contributing to project management should be covered by the PMC. Please clarify and amend accordingly.

**April 27, 2021:**

1. The indicators have indeed been added in table B but the targets are still missing. Please complete.
2. Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.
3. The Title of Component 5 still includes "Project" which is confusing. Please remove "Project" in the title.

**July 14, 2021:**

Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency Response- 7.12.2021

1. Including core indicator targets into the components would lead to double counting since multiple outcomes deliver the core indicator targets.

Outcome indicators and targets have been added.

2. n/a

3. ?project? has been removed from the title such that it now reads as ?Monitoring and evaluation (M&E), knowledge management (KM), and regional coordination? throughout the document.

WWF GEF Agency Response- 4.21.2021

1. Indicators have been included for the expected outcomes in Table B in the CER and also in Appendix 10 of the ProDoc.

2. The outputs are 4.1.2 and 4.1.3 and have been inserted in table B. Corrections have been made to any reference to 4.2 and 4.3 in the ProDoc and CER.

3. Title of Component 5 has been changed to ?Project and knowledge management (KM), monitoring and evaluation (M&E)? throughout the document as no project management activities are budgeted under this component. The revised title better reflects the actual component intent, activities and budget.

**3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**Co-financing**

**4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**April 5, 2021:**

1. The amount reported from WWF-US in the Portal (\$1,125,127) is different from the co-financing letter (\$1,152,990). Please correct the Portal accordingly.

2. The co-financing letter from Molounou Coucil, Mintom Council, Ngoyla Council, Campo Council, Salapoumbe Council and Somalomo Council are in French. Please provide an unofficial translation in English.

3. Please write in table C the entire name of the co-financier "Tropical Forest and rural development".

4. The co-financing from Cameroon Ecology is \$250,000 in kind and \$50,000 in grant. Please amend the table C accordingly (including with the full name of the CSO).

**April 27, 2021:**

1. Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

2. The translation of the co-financing letter from Salapoumbe Council has a mistake and says the "that the Moloundou Council will provide its co-financing". Please correct.

3 and 4. Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

**July 14, 2021:**

Thank you for the amendment. Some co-financing letters are uploaded twice in the Portal (from Samalomo and Campo Councils). Please remove the duplicated versions.

**July 15, 2021:**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

**Agency Response**

WWF GEF Agency Response- 7.15.2021

Apologies, but it does not seem possible on our side to delete versions of the co-financing letter from the Roadmap section of the portal. The co-financing section of the CEO ER allows for only one upload and does not erase previous uploads.

WWF GEF Agency Response- 7.12.2021

1. n/a

2. This has been corrected in the translation.

3. n/a

WWF GEF Agency Response- 4.21.2021

1. The co-financing has been corrected in the Portal.
2. Translations provided in the Portal.
3. This has been corrected in the Table C.
4. The full name of the CSO is Cameroon Ecology or Cameroun ?cologie (Cam Eco).Table C in CER has been amended to specify that the co-financing from Cam Eco is both through grants and in kind.

#### **GEF Resource Availability**

**5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**April 5, 2021:**

The most expensive outputs are the outputs 2.1.2 (\$1,521,451) and outputs 3.1.2 (\$1,422,084) which will support training, workshops/meetings, equipment, small supplies, technical assistance, and exchange visits. As compared to the other components, they appear very expensive. We note that the components 2 and 3 are presented as 'Investments' in table B. As these only 2 components represent about 1/3 of the project budget and to assess the cost-effectiveness of the project, please clarify what expenses exactly are included in these outputs and quantify their expected concrete impacts/results on the ground.

**April 27, 2021:**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

#### **Agency Response**

WWF GEF Agency Response- 4.21.2021

The two components under which the referenced outputs are found, i.e., Component 2 on improving the management effectiveness of high conservation value forests and targeted interventions to protect their wildlife and Component 3 on models of SFM, are the largest of the project both in terms of budget and in terms of areas of intervention.

As opposed to components 1 and 4, which will both intervene in a single landscape, Component 2, including Output 2.1.1, will target both the CMRC and TNS landscapes while Component 3, including Output 3.1.2 will be implemented in all three of the project's landscapes.

These outputs are also composed of numerous intensive activities concerned with building and investing in stakeholder capacity. As opposed to the other outputs under Component 2, which are focused on specific areas of protected area management (e.g., targeted studies, developing and monitoring agreements, and zoonotic disease surveillance), Output 2.1.2 addresses broad areas of management improvement, including the: i) design, production and dissemination of communications materials; ii) costs for regular meetings of protected area governance bodies; iii) costs for regular meetings between key stakeholder groups, including park authorities or conservation services, IPLCs and the private sector; iv) the purchasing of logistical means (vehicle, boat, engine, motorcycles), field gear (tents, life vests, etc.) and small supplies (fuel, lubricants, batteries, rations, first aid supplies, sandals and communications) so conservation services can implement responsible community engagement and park administration; v) training and refresher courses for conservation services and IPLCs to strengthen their capacity for effective community engagement and administration of protected areas, including in the area of animation of multi-stakeholder meetings/consultative platforms, as well as for IPLCs to strengthen their capacity to meaningfully participate in park management; vi) training and refresher courses for conservation services of CMNP and LNP, as well as other key stakeholders (i.e., law enforcement organizations, magistrates, judges), to raise their awareness and strengthen their capacity to implement best practices for law enforcement, addressing wildlife crime, and respect human rights; vii) sensitization and training to ensure IPLCs, including women and youth, have access to GRM in TNS and CMNP and the necessary capacity to air, elevate and act upon any concerns; viii) the purchase office equipment and provide budget for communications, office supplies and transport for GRM in TNS and CMNP to facilitate the sharing of information and the effective mitigation, management, and resolution of concerns; ix) technical assistance, equipment (field gear, software, laptops, GPS, communication equipment, cameras), and supplies (fuel, lubricants, batteries, rations, first aid supplies, sandals, communications) to plan and execute large mammal surveys and in and around CMNP; and x) workshops to assess management effectiveness on a regular basis through the application of IMET and METT. This output will significantly contribute to Core Indicator 1 supporting improved management over 479,996 ha of terrestrial protected areas. .

Output 3.1.2 encompasses the major investments of the project to work with IPLCs to develop NTFP value chains, the highest priority identified by these stakeholders during the consultation process. It includes technical expertise, meetings, trainings and workshops, as well as other costs associated with: i) identifying engaged communities and undertaking gender inclusive consultations and capacity needs assessments of local organizations and IPLCs groups to develop or establish NTFP value chains; ii)

designing and implementing training and technical assistance plans to build the organizational, technical, and business management capacity of local organizations and IPLCs to develop, monitor and adaptively manage NTFP enterprises, including targeted capacity building to raise awareness and understanding of IPLCs on their rights (access, use, benefit-sharing, etc.) and ensuring these rights are recognized; iii) developing and implementing small grants mechanisms (totaling \$337,500) or other financial mechanisms to facilitate operations of local organizations or IPLCs groups to support the development of NTFP enterprises; iv) providing or facilitating access of local organizations and IPLCs groups to adequate inputs and equipment to support the production (harvest/cultivation, storage, primary and secondary processing, packaging, and commercialization) of NTFPs (totaling \$235,544.88); and v) organizing exchange visits with established NTFP enterprises, including exchanges designed specifically for women and youth (\$50,236.91). Under Outcome 3.1.2, 350 IPLCs are anticipated to directly benefit from increased monetary income and non-monetary benefits from NTFP value chain development.

A detailed spreadsheet on outputs 2.1.2 and 3.1.2 is attached (Outputs 2.1.2 & 3.1.2 Detail.xls) to the ProDoc (Appendix 9)

**Project Preparation Grant**

**6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**April 5, 2021:**

Out of \$327,000, the amount of \$150,270 has been spent and \$134,815 are committed. Cleared.

Agency Response WWF GEF Agency Response- 4.21.2021

**Core indicators**

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?**

**Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**April 5, 2021:**

1. The proposal should provide a qualitative description of the benefit provided to biodiversity through the change in management (core indicator 4.1). Please elaborate further on this aspect.

2. For the GHG emission mitigation benefits, the tools used for the calculation is said to be the Ex-ACT tool. Nevertheless we don't find this tool in the submission package. Please upload in the Portal the Ex-ACT tool.

**April 27, 2021:**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

### Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency Response- 4.21.2021

1. Additional clarification text has been added to Notes/Assumptions in the Project Results Framework as well as to Section 3.1 of the ProDoc on Incremental Cost Reasoning and GEBs and the CER.

In brief, the project aims to provide direct benefits to biodiversity by contributing to the conserving of the second-largest contiguous block of dense tropical rainforest in the world as well as its biological processes, which play a major role in the Earth's climate dynamics. It will also contribute to the conservation of its biodiversity, and intact assemblages of its endangered large forest mammals, such as forest elephant, western lowland gorilla, and chimpanzee. Furthermore, the project will contribute to maintaining the ecological functioning of this natural system, and the goods and services which are of importance to people, notably forest-dwelling populations, and national economies. Strengthening management and governance systems within and outside of protected areas is key to assuring these benefits.

In terms of wildlife, the project will tackle direct threats to wildlife by building the understanding and engagement of key stakeholders, the establishment of transparent agreements between key stakeholders on use rights, strengthening capacity for best practices in law enforcement, and/or establishing systems of zoonotic disease surveillance.

In addition, management that benefits biodiversity will be strengthened in the areas of Ngoyla and Mintom through increased knowledge and the mainstreaming of natural capital considerations in land use planning and decision making, thus reducing competing pressures on natural resources. The project assumes that land use plans will be developed and implemented taking into consideration national objectives/targets as concerns conservation of biodiversity and lead to measurable and sustainable improvements in practices.

Furthermore, in the CMRC and TNS landscapes, it is assumed that the development of sustainable value chains that are linked to the sustainable management of forests will reduce pressures on forests and avoid deforestation. It is also assumed that the engagement of stakeholders in value chains which are linked to forest management units

outside of protected areas will increase socio-economic benefits for rightsholders and incentivize and result in improved practices. Finally, the project will strengthen governance and management systems in areas outside of protected areas, including through mutually beneficial agreements with forest resource managers and the private sector.

2. The Ex-Act tool has been uploaded.

## **Part II ? Project Justification**

**1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**April 6, 2021:**

The title of this section "The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed" is missing. Please amend accordingly.

**April 28, 2021:**

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared

Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency Response- 4.21.2021

This has now been added in the CER.

**2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**April 6, 2021:**

1. Please use the correct title of this section: The baseline scenario and any associated baseline Programs.

2. As described, the baseline initiatives look comprehensive and already seem to address the environmental problems and barriers the project seeks to address. Please briefly indicate what is still missing and what needs to be done in the project intervention areas to help better understand the rationale of the proposed interventions and how they will articulate with the baseline.

3. The project considers under the output 2.2 the establishment of transparent management agreements with IPLCs and relevant stakeholders. Please clarify what experiences and/or enabling conditions already exist the project could build on.

4. In the baseline scenario, the existing transboundary agreements and associated protocols the project will strengthen in component 5 are unclear. Please elaborate further by briefly presenting these transboundary agreements and associated protocols.

5. Under the section on innovation, we learn that the project will provide an important opportunity for IPLCs to directly participate in 'decision-making bodies' in the LUP process. Please clarify what these decision-making bodies are (composition, functioning...).

**April 28, 2021:**

1. This comment is not addressed. Please correct the title.

2, 3, 4 and 5. Thank you for the clarifications provided. Cleared.

**July 14, 2021:**

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

**Agency Response**

WWF GEF Agency Response- 7.12.2021

1. The title has been changed.

2,3,4 and 5: n/a

WWF GEF Agency Response- 4.21.2021

1. The title has been corrected

2. Additional details have been added into section 1.5 Baseline Scenario of the ProDoc (and the same section of the CER) to better explain where there remain critical needs beyond the baseline what will be taken up within each of the project's strategies and the rationale of the proposed interventions.

First, despite being the main rural stakeholders in the forested region of Cameroon and increasing recognition of the need to develop systems that recognize their rights within the forest sector, IPLCs remain under-represented in governance systems concerned with land and resource planning and management from national to local levels. While

tools are being developed to integrate IPLCs and assure their rights are recognized more formally in governance systems (including within the national LUP framework and through formal agreements between IPLCs and other actors), the capacity to develop, implement and monitor these tools, as well as improve them through lessons learned, remains insufficient. Addressing this need is critical to strengthen the engagement of IPLCs in LUP, SFM and biodiversity conservation in more formal and meaningful ways.

In addition, despite considerable investments in establishing a national framework for LUP in Cameroon and the rolling out of this framework at the national level and within two sub-national regions, there remains a critical need to roll this process to the most local level (i.e. the council) where rural stakeholders are able to participate and assure their rights and interests are taken into consideration and feed back into land planning and management at the higher levels. This project will enable the rolling out of this process in the pilot councils of Ngoyla and Mintom.

Furthermore, despite the ongoing support to the protected areas targeted by this project through baseline initiatives, there remains a need to strengthen the governance systems of these protected areas and their peripheries to make them more participatory, and to strengthen the capacity of stakeholders to mitigate intense threats to their endangered species. This project will provide a means to significantly improve the participatory nature of governance systems, support the implementation of best practices for law enforcement, and provide targeted support to address other direct threats, including zoonotic diseases. As part of its strategy on ecotourism, this project will also build on baseline initiatives by addressing key needs associated with the responsible establishment of high-end tourism products that have not existed previously (i.e., gorilla tourism) and which are part of a coordinated ecotourism development strategy, supporting the development and implementation of a PPP for ecotourism, further strengthening the capacity of the park authorities and key stakeholders to engage in tourism, and establishing equitable benefit-sharing mechanisms.

Finally, there have been a wide range of projects to support the forest management, including the development of NTFP value chains, the support for IPLCs to engage and benefit equitably from such initiatives is insufficient to deal with the scale of the need as iterated by all stakeholders, and there remains a need to develop and test additional models for SFM that engage the private sectors and benefit local communities.

Additional details on the baseline for Component 5 are presented below under Comment 4.

3. Multiple examples of multistakeholder agreements and/or platforms exist that the project will build on and, in certain cases, strengthen. In particular the project will support the implementation and monitoring of the agreement between MINFOF and ASBABUK. and the Mamb?l? Convention (which empowers and safeguards interests of IPLCs in decision-making and benefit-sharing as regards wildlife as well as access rights and other benefits). In addition, business partnerships/agreements have also been

established previously between COVAREFs and professional hunting outfits renting community hunting areas; however, these agreements need to be reconsidered and strengthened to fully take into consideration the interests of COVAREFs. These partnerships also need additional technical assistance from MINFOF and technical partners who have knowledge of approved hunting quotas and recommended trophy fees for various wildlife species as well as basic wildlife management capacity to strengthen management effectiveness in these areas.

In addition, a coordination platform between forestry actors was previously set up in southeast Cameroon (including the Cameroon segments of TNS and art of TRIDOM), in order to federate their interventions towards the achievement of objectives for the sustainable management of forestry and wildlife resources. This platform, called the South-East Technical Operational Unit (UTO), was created in 1999 and brings together the heads of the deconcentrated services of the forestry administration, representatives of the main Community Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) organizations, international conservation partners and local NGOs working in the area, and the private sector (logging and sport hunting concessionaires).

In the Cameroon segment of the CMRC landscape, the same type of platform named UTO-Campo Ma'an was set up in 1999 and has contributed to achieving important advances in the sustainable management of forest and wildlife resources, but also requires revitalization, especially as several other new actors are intervening in the area (deep-sea port, Mem'vele dam and agro-industries). Moreover, in this landscape, an MoU was signed in 2011 between the Conservation Service of CMNP and the Bagyeli to facilitate the access of these populations to the park for their traditional rights.

No changes have been made to the document but the above information is detailed in section 1.3 under barrier 4, section 2.2 under Output 2.2.1. of the ProDoc.

4. Through a range of regional coordination efforts, the project is anticipated to support the continued development or upholding of transboundary agreements and associated protocols that form part of the project's baseline. More specifically, in the CMRC landscape, and in coordination with the EG national child project, this project will promote the establishment of a formal bilateral agreement and work to ensure coordinated interventions to address threats (e.g., enforcement of laws and policies governing adjacent protected areas and biodiversity) and take advantage of mutually-beneficial opportunities (e.g., tourism development) in the cross border region. In the TRIDOM landscape, the project will continue to promote the upholding of the 2005 collaboration agreement signed between the governments of Cameroon, RoC, and Gabon and subsequent agreements (e.g., 2014 anti-poaching agreement). The project will also work to ensure that efforts on natural capital accounting and LUP will be, as relevant, used to inform transboundary planning with RoC and Gabon and directly contribute to complimentary initiatives at national or regional levels (e.g., FIP, CAFI). In the TNS, the project will build on the framework established through the 2000 cooperation agreement signed between the three State parties creating the TNS and

laying out four initial protocols for cooperation on combatting poaching, the free movement of TNS personnel, the organization and functioning of a tri-national anti-poaching brigade, and the movement of tourists across borders. This project will coordinate with transboundary LUP efforts being led by the RCP, and ensure these efforts are aligned with and contribute to national policies, programs, and priorities.

The above points have been elaborated in the project document's Section 1.5 on the Baseline Scenario, and Section 2.2 under Component 5, Output 5.1.3. These agreements are also referenced in sectoral context in the ProDoc (section 1.4 national context, transboundary landscapes) and in the section on 'coordination with ongoing non-GEF initiatives' (Table 6).

5. Additional details have been inserted within the ProDoc under the sections on innovation and Component 1 to provide additional detail.

In brief, the guidelines developed for the elaboration of PLADDT describe the preliminary consultation process and the establishment of the coordinating and elaborating bodies of the PLADDT process at the Council/Municipal and Village levels, while respecting the principles of Free, Informed and Prior Consent (FPIC). The process involves the engagement of stakeholders at multiple levels (national, sub-national, local) as laid out in the 'Guide méthodologique de l'élaboration du plan local d'aménagement et de développement durable du territoire (PLADDT)' developed by MINEPAT.

Municipal Councils play an overarching role in LUP as they are the bodies mandated with leading preparation of PLADDT by law. The councils, along with the mayors, also have significant responsibility as regards facilitating agreements among stakeholders at various levels on zoning of communal space. The process itself is anticipated to be coordinated by a Steering Committee, a Multidisciplinary Technical Committee, and a technical support system. IPLCs will be represented in the Steering Committee, which is envisioned to be composed of: the mayor; the communal executive; representatives of the villages concerned (including women, youth and vulnerable groups); a sufficiently representative body of professionals; indigenous populations and vulnerable groups; other local elected officials - deputy, senator (recommended); and promoters of projects that have an impact on the area. The Multidisciplinary Technical Committee integrates sectors/departments with an interest in land use in the area in question.

At the most local level the primary decision-making bodies are Village Land Management Committees (Comité d'Aménagement des Terroirs Villageois - CATV). The CATV may be built on existing local structures, and are expected to represent and act on behalf of different social groups during data collection and analysis. In addition, it is understood that all proposals for future land use and management will be presented to the CATV and at the council/municipal level for review before final validation. Traditional leaders (who play an important role in the allocation of customary land under common ownership), IPLCs (key stakeholders as regards the use of rural space), other individual actors, civil society organizations, and the private sector, are also envisioned to play more specific roles at various stages of the LUP process. The role of

different bodies and actors will be defined through simple ToR during consultations and preparations for the LUP process.

**3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**April 6, 2021:**

1. The title of this section "The proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project" is missing. Please amend accordingly.
2. Land insecurity is mentioned as a key barrier. In the alternative scenario, it is unclear how the component 1 through the LUP process including the finalization of the PLADDT will secure IPLCs customary land and rights (only 'encouraging a process', as indicated, may not be enough). Please clarify how concretely land rights will be secured.
3. The component 1 only targets the TRIDOM landscape and the component 2 only targets the CMRC and TNS landscapes. In particular ILUP should also be necessary in the CMRC and TNS landscapes as a critical basis for sustainable use of lands. Please clarify in the Portal the reason for not implementing the same activities in all 3 landscapes and, considering the problems and barriers are the same, the possible environmental consequences of this strategy in the no-targeted landscapes.
4. Under the outcome 2.1, we learn that the project 'will systematically work with protected area conservation services and communities'. Please clarify what concrete activities this work entails.
5. The outcome 2.3 is missing under the component 2 in the Portal (in the alternative scenario section). Please complete the description as needed.
6. Through the outcome 2.2, the project will build models of sustainable forest and wildlife management and in component 3, the project will support the development of two different local-level models (or approaches) for SFM. Even if the former occurs in the peripheries of protected areas, the difference between the 2 models of SFM and the reason why the outputs are treated separately are unclear. Please explain.
7. The outcome 3.2 will expand within the TRIDOM landscape the public-private partnership between Taylor Guitars and MINEPDED. Beyond establishing PPP, please clarify what concrete activities and the ground will be implemented to allow the increase of IPLCs engagement in SFM techniques and of the medium-term value of reforested land for IPLCs.

8. In the context of an already existing important and relevant baseline, the success of the component 4 relies on the assumption that 'the inclusive and coordinated development of a successful sustainable tourism value chain would increase the number of visitors to the area'. Please clarify the added value of the project as compared to what has already been done to develop sustainable tourism value chains in the targeted area.

9. We learn that the project's Steering Committee (SC) and Project Management Unit (PMU) will be established under component 5. Please note that the associated cost should not be supported by a project component but rather by the PMC and Agency fees.

10. The activities supporting regional cooperation remain vague, including under the component 5. Even if the Regional Platform of the IP has not been finalized yet, please elaborate further on the topics and kind of activities that will be considered, taking into account where relevant the specificities of the 3 transboundary landscapes.

**April 28, 2021:**

Thank you for the clarifications and complements. Cleared.

**Agency Response**

WWF GEF Agency Response- 4.21.2021

1. This has been corrected.

2. The development of PLADDT is a process of judicious interpretation and refinement of national policies and strategies at the local level. The process also allows for local municipalities and their communities to share their ambitions and priorities with the government and have them considered in iterative regional and national LUP processes. As part of the PLADDT development all parties must agree on optimal land management solutions through a fully participatory process with the communes and local communities. It also requires following the FPIC principle when any decisions impact IPLCs lands. The overall aim is to assure that land use supports sustainable rural development and that the distribution of land at the local level responds in a coherent manner to different productive, cultural and protective uses and functions. As explicated by the GoC it is intended as a first step towards securing land for all stakeholders and actors in the rural space and aims to ensure social balance and avoid conflicts between the different groups of actors living in the commune, including all vulnerable and marginalized social strata. It also includes provisions on how local stakeholders should be engaged in the implementation of the PLADDT, in particular when any decisions affecting rural lands are made.

Revisions to the Project Document and the CER have been made under descriptions of Component 1.

3. Stakeholders consulted during project development generally recognized the value of participatory and integrated LUP to recognize stakeholders' rights, address land use conflicts, and support SFM and biodiversity conservation. They also stressed this project could provide real added value by addressing the need to pilot the rolling out of LUP at the most local level as defined under the law and build experiences on how the PLADDT development process can strengthen the participation of rural stakeholders and assure their considerations are feeding back up into iterative LUP decisions at higher levels and that they are consulted regarding decisions affecting rural lands. Presently, the enabling conditions to undertake such a process, which requires significant time, resources, and will from stakeholders, were strongest in the Ngoyla and Mintom councils. These two councils are within the two sub-national regions that have already been targeted as part of the LUP process being rolled out at different scales in Cameroon. They were also identified as priorities given an increasing potential for land use conflicts in the area and the potential for LUP at this time to play a key role in how LUP decisions are made moving forward.

Key enabling conditions, which are critical to the success of the project's LUP strategy, are not as apparent in the CMRC landscape. Many of the major land use decisions affecting CMRC (e.g., Kribi deep seaport) have already been made, and while they are undoubtedly resulting in environmental and social consequences, the political will to establish a transparent and participatory system for making such decisions has not been demonstrated. As such, the project aims to limit negative environmental and social consequences by focusing on working with stakeholders to improve management of areas already designated for protection or other sustainable use within this landscape.

In contrast, there will likely be a real opportunity to take the lessons learned from the pilot process in Ngoyla and Mintom to scale in TNS, where the land pressures are not as imminent but also important. While the project recognizes the value of completing this process in TNS and will work to assure lessons learned are shared to facilitate such a process, it is beyond the timeline of this project to rollout to completion the council level LUP process in TNS.

Component 2 will be implemented in CMNP and its peripheral zone in the CMRC landscape and LNP and its peripheral zone in the TNS landscape. These two areas met the overall project site selection criteria, including the potential for successful implementation of multiple project strategies, the presence of significant baseline projects and potential for co-financing; the potential to successfully manage all safeguard considerations, and the potential to contribute to the project's added value due to transboundary considerations (detailed in ProDoc Appendix 5). These areas also meet all or nearly all the specific criteria for Component 2, including the potential to achieve meaningful improvements in key areas of protected area management effectiveness. While all protected areas within the project's geographic scope face significant levels of threat to their biodiversity from wildlife trafficking and unsustainable practices, and meet overall project level criteria on their potential to

contribute to biodiversity conservation, protected areas in TRIDOM were not considered to meet all other project criteria. In particular, criteria related to co-financing could not be met because of the overlap of this project component with the thematic and geographic scope of the Integrated and Transboundary Conservation of Biodiversity in the Basins of the Republic of Cameroon (GEF Project ID # 9155). Certain protected areas in TRIDOM also lacked the partnerships that were considered critical to successfully manage safeguards and achieve meaningful improvements during the six-year project period.

The Project Document's Executive Summary, Section 2.1 and Section 3 of Part II of the CER have been edited to provide a stronger rationale and explanation, per above, for why the Component 1 and 2 intervention is applied differently in the different landscapes

4. As presented in the description of Outcome 2.1 in Section 2.2 of the ProDoc and the detailed workplan in Appendix 2 of the ProDoc, the activities to be implemented under Outcome 2.1. can be summarized as follows:

- Participatory assessment of standards, conditions, and accountability in key areas of protected area management to identify measures to improve management effectiveness of CMNP and LNP
- Developing key management tools, including updated management and business plan for CMNP based on a participatory process that involves IPLCs, including women and youth
- Strengthen the enabling conditions for co-management models in Cameroon and support the development of a co-management system for LNP
- Strengthen the design and operation of the GRM in TNS, and develop and establish of GRM for CMNP, and provide capacity to ensure their operationalization
- Raise awareness and understanding of IPLCs and other local stakeholders on their rights, the values of protected areas, and environmental laws and regulations
- Support organization of regular meetings of protected area governance bodies at CMNP and LNP (including Management Committees, Scientific and Technical Committees, and Local Consultative Committees)
- Support the organization of regular face-to-face meetings between local stakeholders to participatorily develop, coordinate, and adapt management strategies for CMNP and LNP and their peripheral zones

- Training and refresher courses for conservation services of CMNP and LNP to strengthen their capacity for effective community engagement and administration of protected areas, including in the area of animation of multi-stakeholder meetings/consultative platforms, as well as for IPLCs to strengthen their capacity to meaningfully participate in park management
- Training and refresher courses for conservation services of CMNP and LNP, as well as other key stakeholders (i.e., law enforcement organizations, magistrates, judges), to raise their awareness and strengthen their capacity to implement best practices for law enforcement, addressing wildlife crime, and respect human rights
- Targeted sensitization and training to ensure IPLCs, including women and youth, have access to GRM in TNS and CMNP and the necessary capacity to air, elevate and act upon any concerns
- Plan and execute large mammal surveys and in and around CMNP
- Participatory assessment of the management effectiveness on a regular basis through the application of IMET/MET4

5. This has been added.

6. It is true that the development of NTFP value chains under Component 3 may be linked to the equitable and transparent management agreements that are presented under Component 2. This is most true when those agreements pertain to rights concerning access and/or the use/sourcing of NTFPs that are part of the value chains being strengthened or developed.

However, the agreements referenced in Component 2, which include agreements pertaining to use/rights within protected areas and in other forest management units outside of protected areas, are anticipated to cover additional management and biodiversity issues (beyond NTFPs that figure in value chains). These agreements may work to secure different types of benefits for IPLCs and in some cases may involve different sets of actors. For example, some of the agreements that are anticipated to be strengthened under Component 2 pertain in large part to wildlife management, and not only NTFPs. Given we are talking about agreements that pertain to both national parks and other types of land use, the safeguards implications may not always be the same either, and will be assessed taking into consideration the specific context and benefits concerned.

7. First and foremost the GEF project will expand the number of communities, in particular women and youth, participating in the agroforestry model that has been developed through the PPP between Taylor Guitars and MINEPDED. Once new communities have expressed their interest in implementing the model and signed an

MoU, the Congo Basin Institute (CBI), with the support of this GEF project, will work with them to grow, plant, and tend native tree species on degraded land. The CBI team will also train these communities in different tree production methods, help the communities set up a locally-run nursery for native tree species, and provide technical expertise on growing saplings in a nursery. The IPLCs participants will grow a mix of tropical hardwoods (e.g., ebony) and locally valuable fruit and medicine trees that will be selected by the community (e.g., bush mango, safou, etc) based in part on their potential to deliver benefits over the short to medium term. Shortly before the long rainy season, the CBI team will work with local communities to identify degraded land for replanting. CBI will provide training on transplanting saplings and care of young trees, and will provide a silvicultural booklet documenting who planted what where, which is important for local tenure and may ultimately be used as evidence to support official tenure claims. Under the GEF financed project, communities will receive support for the three to five years it takes the trees become established. , Once he community is able to accrue benefits from its agroforestry efforts, it ?graduates? with reforested land. Past work by CBI has found that individuals participate both because the locally valuable fruit and medicine trees generate produce that can be consumed or sold ? a medium term benefit - and because planting the area and documenting it in the silvicultural booklet creates a sense of legacy. As such, the project will reforest degraded lands while also providing medium-term value to local communities. Changes have been made to the description of Outcome 3.2 in the ProDoc to provide additional clarityirst and foremost the GEF project will expand the number of communities, in particular women and youth, , participating in the agroforestry model that has been developed through the PPP between Taylor Guitars and MINEPDED. Once new communities have expressed their interest in implementing the model and signed an MoU, the Congo Basin Institute (CBI), with the support of this GEF project, will work with them to grow, plant, and tend native tree species on degraded land. The CBI team will also train these communities in different tree production methods, help the communities set up a locally-run nursery for native tree species, and provide technical expertise on growing saplings in a nursery. The IPLCs participants will grow a mix of tropical hardwoods (e.g., ebony) and locally valuable fruit and medicine trees that will be selected by the community (e.g., bush mango, safou, etc) based in part on their potential to deliver benefits over the short to medium term. Shortly before the long rainy season, the CBI team will work with local communities to identify degraded land for replanting. CBI will provide training on transplanting saplings and care of young trees, and will provide a silvicultural booklet documenting who planted what where, which is important for local tenure and may ultimately be used as evidence to support official tenure claims. Under the GEF financed project, communities will receive support for the three to five years it takes the trees become established. , Once he community is able to accrue benefits from its agroforestry efforts, it ?graduates? with reforested land. Past work by CBI has found that individuals participate both because the locally valuable fruit and medicine trees generate produce that can be consumed or sold ? a medium term benefit - and because planting the area and

documenting it in the silvicultural booklet creates a sense of legacy. As such, the project will reforest degraded lands while also providing medium-term value to local communities. Changes have been made to the description of Outcome 3.2 in the ProDoc to provide additional clarity

**8.** The project design took into consideration the work done to date on ecotourism development in the CMRC landscape and applied lessons learned from those efforts. Most importantly this project will provide added value by i) supporting the responsible establishment of high end tourism products that have not existed previously (i.e., gorilla tourism) and which have been identified in the new ecotourism development strategy of CMNP as key to establishing a sustainable value chain; ii) supporting the development and implementation of a PPP for ecotourism for ecotourism (engagement of private sector partners with experience was highlighted by all stakeholders as key to growing the number of tourists and the sustainability of the value chain); iii) further strengthening the capacity of the park conservation services, as well as IPLCs, to be key actors in the value chain and iv) establishing equitable benefit-sharing mechanisms that will ensure revenues are distributed equitably to stakeholders and contribute to the sustainability of tourism products (e.g., by covering some of the costs to maintain tourism products).

No changes have been made in the document

**9.** Ahead of the annual steering committee meetings, the project will organize annual reflection workshops which have been budgeted under M&E.

**10.** Among the topics that are anticipated to figure prominently in regional knowledge management and coordination are: establishing or strengthening agreements and protocols concerned with SFM and biodiversity conservation in transboundary landscapes, including as regards management of adjacent transboundary protected areas; methodologies for natural capital accounting and means to mainstream these considerations in planning and decision-making; integrated and participatory LUP, and land use trends; the recognition of IPLCs rights and their engagement in SFM; the surveillance of zoonotic diseases; biomonitoring; ecotourism; establishing capacity and coordination for human rights based law enforcement; the development of sustainable forest-based value chains, including improved incentives, sustainable sourcing, practices, etc.; and the engagement of the private sector in SFM.

As part of the project's knowledge management strategy under Component 5, the project will work with the RCP and other national child projects across these topic areas to promote the alignment of methodologies and tools, strategic approaches, and the sharing of lessons learned, data/results of thematic studies, and best practices.

This promotion will be achieved through various forms of media, regular participation in meetings (bilateral, transboundary landscape, regional), and exchanges. These events will also be used to identify opportunities for scaling up and promoting best practices and to coordinate strategies across transboundary landscapes.

In addition to the knowledge management activities proposed under Component 5, targeted activities have been integrated under different project components to document and share experiences, as well as to organize and participate in transboundary coordination meetings/exchanges that are integral to specific project strategies, i.e., Activities 1.1.1.6, 1.1.2.11, 2.1.1.5, 3.1.4.2, 3.2.3.2, and 4.1.2.5.

Most of the topics mentioned above are relevant to coordination across boundaries of all the project's landscapes, as well as at national and regional levels. These include: coordination to establish or strengthen agreements and protocols associated with the project's three transboundary landscapes (as detailed above in response 8.4); best methodologies for natural capital accounting and means to mainstream these considerations in planning and decision-making; integrated and participatory LUP, and land use trends; the recognition of IPLCs rights and their engagement in SFM; establishing capacity for human rights based law enforcement; the development of sustainable forest-based value chains, including improved incentives, sustainable sourcing, practices, etc.; and the engagement of the private sector in SFM. Topics that are of particular relevance to certain landscapes (in the context of this project) include: the management of adjacent transboundary protected areas and threats to these areas in the CMRC and TNS landscapes; opportunities to coordinate on the surveillance of zoonotic diseases in the Cameroon segment of the CMRC landscape and all three segments of the TNS; cross-border tourism in the CMRC landscape.

The project document and CER has been revised to better specify the above activities under Component 5 in the Alternative Scenario.

**4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**April 6, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**April 6, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**April 7, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**April 7, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**Project Map and Coordinates**

**Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**April 5, 2021:**

Thank you for the maps provided, including those more detailed in the Prodoc. As not all the existing protected areas will be targeted by the project, it would be helpful to clarify on the overview map called "Congo IP Cameroon Child Project" where are the 4 protected areas under improved management (core indicator 1.2). Please consider amending the overview map accordingly in the Portal.

**April 28, 2021:**

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

#### Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency Response- 4.21.2021

The map has been amended as suggested.

#### **Child Project**

**If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**April 6, 2021:**

The description of the contribution of this child project is unclear as it is not well detailed nor related to the different components of the Program Framework Document. Please elaborate further on how this project contributes to each of the Impact Program components, including the cooperation with the regional Platform and with the other countries sharing protected areas with Cameroon.

**April 28, 2021:**

Thank you for the complement. Cleared.

#### Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency Response- 4.21.2021

Amendments have been made to Section 2.1 of the ProDoc and Section 3 of Part II of the CER to better precise alignment with PFD and the RCP. In addition, an assessment of the alignment between the Congo IP PFD and the Cameroon child project has been added as Appendix 13 of the ProDoc.

#### **Stakeholders**

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?  
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**April 7, 2021:**

Yes, a comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement Plan is uploaded in the Portal. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**April 7, 2021:**

Yes, a comprehensive Gender Action Plan is uploaded in the Portal. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Private Sector Engagement**

**If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**April 7, 2021:**

In addition to the general description under this section, the private sector engagement is included in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?**

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

### **April 7, 2021:**

1. We note that the climate risk rating is considered as low but analysis of this risk is too limited. At this stage, more clarification on threats and impacts are needed to be able to consider appropriate mitigation measures. Please outline the key aspects of the climate change projections/scenarios at the project location or at country level if not available at local scale (including a time horizon, ideally 2050, if the data is available) and list key potential hazards for the project that are related to the climate scenarios (including the coastal area for the CMRC landscape). For further guidance, the Agency may want to refer to STAP guidance available here: <https://www.stapgef.org/stap-guidance-climate-risk-screening>.

2. The COVID-19 analysis is limited to risks and mitigation measures. Please complete with an analysis of the possible opportunities this project can provide to enhance the resilience of the beneficiaries, in particular against possible future pandemics.

3. In addition, we acknowledge here the ESS risks analysis has been uploaded in the Portal and the overall Project Risk Classification is assessed as Medium/Moderate. Thank you.

### **April 28, 2021:**

1. Thank you for the complement. The climate risk assessment is uploaded twice in the Portal. Please remove one version.

2. Thank you for the complement. Cleared.

### **July 14, 2021:**

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

## Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency Response- 7.12.2021

1. One version has been removed from the portal

2. n/a

WWF GEF Agency Response- 4.21.2021

1. A climate risk assessment has been annexed to ProDoc (Appendix 15) as well as uploaded in the "Risks" section of the CEO ER

2. Opportunities to strengthen Cameroon's response to the COVID-19 pandemic and enhance the resilience of project beneficiaries are detailed in section 3.4 of the ProDoc and have been added to the CEO ER. Among the opportunities identified are the potential of the project to:

- ? maintain forest and freshwater ecosystems and their ecological functionality;
- ? support sustainable land and natural resource management that recognizes and protects natural capital;
- ? engage the private sector in sustainable practices, which over the long-term contribute to reducing greenhouse gas emissions and climate change mitigation;
- ? mitigate negative socioeconomic impacts, including for vulnerable groups that may be more adversely affected, by supporting the development of inclusive value chains for NTFPs, ebony, and tourism products in and around CMNP; and
- ? promote zoonotic disease surveillance systems that have the potential to contribute to early warning systems for emergent diseases and reduce their impacts.

#### **Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**April 6, 2021:**

1. The letter from the OFP requests WWF-Cameroon to execute several activities for a total amount of \$1,608,572 (16.7% of the project budget). Nevertheless, in the budget table (last column), we see that WWF-Cameroon is the executing agency for the whole project (100% of the project budget). Please explain that inconsistency and amend the budget as needed.

2. About the direct execution by WWF-Cameroon: please clarify the amount of the agreement with WWF-Cameroon for strengthening effectiveness of forest and wildlife management in the periphery of Campo Ma'an and Lobeke National Parks.

On the budget table:

3. What will the expenditure category "Grants/ Sub-grants" be used for exactly under component 3 (\$1,322,017)? Please clarify in the budget.

4. Vehicle cost: We learn from the budget the following expenditures: purchase of 4 4x4 vehicles for \$190,000 + \$176,934 of running costs + \$197,018 of vehicle in lease + drivers (\$208,311) + motorbikes purchase (43,800) + running costs (7,893)? The budget for the vehicles (without counting the additional boat expenses) is \$816,063 which is 9%

of the project budget. Please note that, as per GEF guidelines: "The use of GEF funds to purchase vehicles is strongly discouraged. Such costs are normally expected to be borne by the co-financed portion of PMCs. Any request to use GEF funding to purchase project vehicles must be justified by the exceptional specific circumstances of the project/program. The Secretariat assesses such requests and decides whether to approve them, based on following criteria: type of project, operating environment, contribution to achievement of project results, and share of costs covered by co-financing, among others". Please amend and justify accordingly any remaining request.

5. Please clarify what are Finance Administrator Fees (10%) (\$873,562, equivalent and in addition to the Agency fee). The GEF funding will not pay additional fees.

6. About the Outcome 2.3 related to the long-term zoonotic disease surveillance system, a budget of \$420,000 is mentioned and for the Outcome 4.1 related to the Gorilla habituation program, an amount of \$314,000 is mentioned in the letter from the OFP. However, we cannot find easily these amounts in the excel budget. Please clarify and confirm these amounts.

7. Please clarify what 'Field costs' (\$265,270) mean.

8. Some expenses are assigned to technical components while they should be covered by the PMC: office equipment, IT equipment, Office supplies, office software, health supplies in addition to COVID-10 personal protective supplies, internet access, office maintenance, phone credit. Please amend accordingly.

9. Please clarify what is a mass media fee? If needed, such expense should appear as a contract.

10. We don't understand why the procurement specialist is charged under the component 2 and 3. Please, clarify.

11. Please clarify what kind of expenses are considered under the item 'Small grants (Marine turtle)'.

12. The item 'Adaptive Management' is charged under the component 5. Please explain what is this expense for and if it is about the project management, please consider it under the PMC.

**April 28, 2021:**

1. The executing partner is the one who undertake the activities (procurements, contacting consultants...). We don't find in the submission package the overall budget table including the last column with the executing entities. Please upload it in the Portal. Also, please copy and paste this budget in the Portal under "ANNEX E: Project Budget Table". In the Portal, this table should at least include the columns M&E, PMC, and executing entities along with the project components.

1bis. The PMU is not an executing agency. Please indicate in the last column of the budget the entities responsible for executing the activities.

2. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

3. In the table 34, we find executing partners which are not reported in the last column of the budget. Please explain why.

4. Thank you for the justification provided. In addition to the 4 vehicles and motorbikes, we find the item "Vehicle Lease" with a budget of \$197,018. Please explain what is this expense exactly considering the cost of the vehicles is covered by other items in the budget. In addition, please clarify the share of vehicle costs in the other budget lines and notably under "field cost".

5. The overall budget is missing in the Portal but it is accessible through the Prodoc. In this budget, there is still the item "Finance Administrator Fees (10%)". GEF doesn't pay ?Finance Administrator fees? ? this item has to be removed.

6. Considering the relatively important cost of the outcome 2.3, please clarify and justify how the activities implemented for this outcome address the identified drivers of the environmental degradation and contribute to the objectives of component 2. This project is not about the surveillance of zoonotic diseases and this component was not in the PFD.

7. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

8. The budget notes remains unclear on this regard as under "Other operating costs", we find together vehicle running cost, audit, IT equipment... Please clarify all the costs related to the offices (in Yaounde and sub-offices in the various landscape). Also, we note that the costs related to the offices (IT services, equipment?) are charged under the components. They should be charged under the PMC. Please adjust accordingly.

9. Thank you for the clarification. The amount corresponding to this item has been removed in the overall budget. Please clarify how this expense is funded.

10. The procurement specialist is still charged under component 2 and 3 in the overall budget. It should be charged under the PMC. Please amend accordingly.

11. Thank you for the information. Please clarify how this activity will address the identified drivers of the environmental degradation and reduce the impacts of unsustainable natural resource use.

12. The project proponents need to identify all the activities to be charged and estimate their cost. This item should be removed from the budget. Please amend accordingly.

**July 14, 2021:**

1. Thank you for attaching the budget table under the Annex E. Unfortunately, part of the budget table goes beyond the limit of the Portal entry page. It may be a bug in the Portal. Please attach a table which stays within the margins of the Portal entry.

3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12. Thank you for the clarifications and amendments. Cleared.

**July 15, 2021:**

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

**Agency Response**

WWF GEF Agency Response- 7.15.2021

Thank you for this observation, a smaller image of the budget table has now been uploaded into Annex E.

WWF GEF Agency Response- 7.12.2021

1. The budget XL with the executing entities has been uploaded as an XL sheet and is also pasted into the Annex E of the CEO endorsement and appendix 9 of the ProDoc.

The last column in the budget spreadsheet has been revised and now shows the budget lines to be executed by WWF Cameroon and the budget lines to be executed by MINEPDED.

2. n/a

3. Executing partners (sub grantees) have now been included in the Annex E budget XL in the ?description? column under the grant/sub-grant expenditure category and in the ProDoc (table 7). The Table 34 matches and gives more information to the sub-grant section in Annex E

These partners will be sub-grantees under MINEPDED, and as such, MINEPDED is listed as the executing entity in the last column of the budget.

4. Vehicle rent has been reduced to 23,699. It is likely that there will be times that site visits during the 6-year implementation need more vehicles than are available and it will be necessary to rent additional vehicles.

Please note also, that the project will have access to 5 WWF vehicles and 5 project partner vehicles as co-financing. The additional GEF-budget requested vehicles are required as these existing vehicles are not enough to cover the amount of field work included in the 3 landscapes, and there is not available budget within MINEPDED to purchase additional vehicles.

The vehicles and vehicle running costs are all under Vehicles expenditure category and the vehicle rent line.

5. The finance administrator fee has been removed.

The budget XL has been uploaded into the Portal and also pasted into Annex E of the CEO endorsement request and the budget is fully described in appendix 9 of the ProDoc

6. To clarify the budget for Outcome 2.3 is USD 245,622.

The overall objective of Component 2 is to address threats (e.g., unsustainable exploitation of resources and its impacts) to high conservation value forests and their wildlife by strengthening their governance and management systems and undertaking targeted interventions to address specific threats to wildlife. Outcome 2.3 contributes to this objective in multiple ways. First, the outcome serves as a targeted intervention to protect the endangered species (in particular great apes) of CMNP and LNP by minimizing the potentially negative impacts that economic migration following concession development and tourism bring in increasing the probability of interspecies disease transmission. Specifically, it will support the costs for regular surveillance of wildlife health through zoonotic testing (Activity 2.3.1.1). The activities proposed under this outcome are also critical to ensure that other conservation activities aimed at strengthening the governance and management systems of these protected areas can be implemented in a way that minimizes the risks from disease transmission between wildlife and conservation staff. As such, a key activity under this outcome is regular outreach, training, and testing of park staff and other stakeholders that are in close proximity to wildlife (Activities 2.3.1.2, 2.3.1.4).

Furthermore, this outcome will help to ensure that activities under Component 4 (USD 309,594), i.e. activities associated with the development of a sustainable tourism chain which aims to address both threats (e.g., unsustainable practices) and underlying drivers of degradation (e.g., poverty), are undertaken responsibly and are as low-risk as possible to great apes and other wildlife. Gorilla trackers (IPs) will be key targets for training and screening. In addition, educational outreach that promotes behavior change will also be undertaken for civil society, government employees, private workers, and IPLCs bordering CMNP (Activity 2.3.1.4).

During project development the decision was made to move these activities from under Component 4 to an outcome under Component 2 to better align with the structure of the RCP, and because of the potential for the Cameroon project to add value to regional efforts - in particular in conjunction with the proposed Output 2.1.2 of the RCP which also aims to strengthen long-term zoonotic disease surveillance systems ? in both the CMRC and TNS landscapes

7. n/a

8. ?Other operating costs? has been revised accordingly.

Other operating costs include annual audits, communications and KM material, training and communications material, internet access, office (maintenance), phone credit, field cost.

Costs related to the offices have been taken out from the components and are charged to PMC.

9. This has now been included in the Local Consultants for short-term technical assistance.

10. Procurement Specialist has been removed from the budget. This role will now be covered by the finance manager.

11. The causes of degradation ? non-sustainable consumption or trade of fuel wood, NTFPs and wildlife; conversion of forest for agriculture; are driven (in a significant part) by a lack of sustainable income opportunities for IPLC. A key part of the project strategy, in component 4, is to develop a suite of ecotourism products to provide such opportunity for IPLC, and a model that could be replicated.

The benefits accrued by IPLCs and other stakeholders from this nature-based, alternative value chain, aim to serve as an incentive to reduce unsustainable practices, while also addressing the expressed needs of IPLCs representatives and contributing to their overall empowerment.

According to the findings of the ecotourism development strategy for CMNP, the development of a nature-based tourism value chain in the CMRC landscape is contingent on having a ?package? of multiple tourism products that appeals to a diverse market of national and international tourists. Forest-based gorilla tracking, once established, is anticipated to be the primary ?high-end? tourism product for CMNP; however, the development of complementary nature-based and cultural tourism products in and around CMNP remains critical to establishing the overall value chain and increasing its sustainability (i.e., by widening its product base, expanding its market appeal, maximizing the number of visitor days, enlarging the visitor experience, etc). Given that turtle nesting sites associated with the coastal Atlantic forest from Campo to Ebodj? have already proven to attract visitors and have played a central role the development of some basic community-led tourism initiatives, this tourism product has been identified by stakeholders as a priority for further support and development as part of the CMRC landscape ecotourism package. The importance of a package of multiple products has been added to the strategy narrative in the ProDoc and CER.

Supporting the development of a suite of tourism products is also important to maximize the potential number of IPLCs the project can engage through this strategy and increase

its total number of potential beneficiaries. In particular, developing this unique tourism attraction will provide a means for the project to engage actively with multiple community-based organizations in which women and youth play important roles, and to tackle issues of equitable benefit sharing. Also, as part of a sequenced approach to developing the tourism value chain, the further development of this tourism product will provide a framework for the project to engage key stakeholders in this value chain while the development of gorilla tracking is still underway.

Finally, the project recognizes that the link between economic incentives and behavior change is often very complicated, especially in areas where livelihoods are often directly linked to natural resource use. As such the project will work with local communities to examine potential means of making these links more direct (e.g., through community agreements) as part of the product development process. The project is also committed to establishing participatory means of monitoring monetary and other benefits accrued by the communities through the development of this value chain and how economic or other incentives impact community behaviors, notably unsustainable practices associated with natural resources. Activity 4.1.1.8 has been modified to reflect this intention more explicitly. Key lessons learned will be shared at various levels and with various target audiences (e.g., local stakeholders, national tourism development sector, conservation community) through the project's communication and knowledge management strategy.

Noting that the term small grants (marine turtle) may sound like a marine focus, rather than a focus on creating a suite of tourism products that engage IPLC, we have renamed this to "small grants IPLC ecotourism" under the sub-grants

**12.** This budget has been removed and reallocated.

WWF GEF Agency Response 4.21.2021

**1.** Our interpretation of the last column in the budget template is the entity that is receiving the funding directly from the GEF Agency. Per the implementation arrangement, the WWF GEF Agency will send the funding directly to WWF Cameroon as the Project Administrator. This column has now been revised to indicate instead who will be executing each line in the budget to clearly show those budget lines executed by the Project Management Unit and those that will be executed by WWF Cameroon

**2.** The attached spreadsheet: "WWF Cameroon Execution Budget" shows both a summary of the budget to be executed by WWF Cameroon as well as the budget by component, Outcome, Output, Activity. This does not include WWF Cameroon Salaries that will manage these activities. These are covered by co-financing. The total amount

of funding that will be transferred to WWF Cameroon, which will then be granted on/contracted out is USD 9,608,257 and the amount that will be directly used by WWF Cameroon for financial management and administration costs and for delivery of activities under outputs 2.1, 2.3, and 4.1 is 738,538. Additional details can be found under question # 14.6

3. - University of California ? Los Angeles (UCLA) for delivery of Outcome 3.2: Public-private partnership (i.e., Ebony Project) to create a sustainable and socially-responsible value chain for tropical hardwood species is expanded and delivering tangible benefits, including restoration and income generation, in the TRIDOM landscape.

- Specialized organizations with expertise in developing equitable and sustainable NTFP value chains in Cameroon or the broader Congo Basin which will work with MINFOF, MINAS, representatives of IPLCs, and the PMU to coordinate and provide technical assistance for the realization of Outcome 3.1: Strengthened and/or established sustainable NTFP value chains that engage IPLCs and the private sector reduce the impacts of unsustainable natural resource use and deliver benefits to at least 30 communities (IPLCs) in the Cameroon segments of three transboundary landscapes on in each of the three project landscapes. These organizations will be identified through a competitive process during project implementation based on a set of agreed upon criteria.

See Table 34 in the budget notes

4. The geographic scope of this project centers on Cameroon's southern trans-frontier forest belt and encompasses the Cameroon segments of three transboundary forest landscapes: (i) the Campo Ma'an-Rio Campo (CMRC) landscape (769,446 ha), (ii) the Tri-National Dja-Odzala-Minkebe (TRIDOM) landscape (4,949,174 ha) and (iii) the Sangha Tri-National (TNS) landscape (1,490,552 ha). It also includes a 695,916 ha interzone between the CMRC and TRIDOM landscapes. These landscapes cover a vast area and in addition to the large geographic scope the climate is characterized by two rainy seasons which complicate any transportation and shortens the lifespan of vehicles. The budgeted four vehicles and motorcycles is at a minimum necessary for the implementation of the project during its six years, taking into account the contribution of the various partners in the framework of their co-financing. These vehicles were not counted as in-kind co-financing but will be necessary considering the very large distances in the different areas of implementation. To work effectively it is critical to have brand new vehicles for the duration of the project.

See attached the excel sheet (existing vehicle-project-area) presenting the existing vehicle in the different landscapes.

See attached the excel sheet (existing vehicle-project-area) presenting the existing vehicle in the different landscapes. Justification is also provided in the Budget Notes in the ProDoc.

No changes have been made to the budget regarding the vehicle costs.

5. We agree that the term "fee" related to the financial administration project work is misleading, and it should not be conflated with GEF Agency supervision role, as it is for project delivery. We have revised the budget such that it says "Financial Administration Service".

Early in project development, it was determined that the Government of Cameroon did not meet the WWF US GEF Agency Minimum Fiduciary Requirements. At the request of The Ministry of Environment, Protection of Nature and Sustainable Development (MINEPDED), WWF Cameroon was invited to provide this service to the project after the Government reviewed other options. In doing so, the project will have access to the systems, controls, policies, procedures, and expertise required for successful project execution. This service includes training for the PMU on policies and procedures, cash management and disbursements to beneficiaries, coordination of the annual audit, Human Resources, compliance assurance and the burden of risk. Given that this project will increase the responsibilities of WWF Cameroon's organization, finance and administration infrastructure by approximately 25%, it was determined that, this service would be costed at 10% of the overall project budget. This has been budgeted across the components given that these services will apply to all activities.

6. Outcome 4.1 related to the Gorilla habituation program will be executed by WWF as well as a local NGO. The spreadsheet labeled 4.1 Gorilla Habituation Program Budget detail is attached.

Regarding the \$420,000, this is actually a combination of 2.1, 2.3, as further detailed in the attached spreadsheet, "Long-term zoonotic disease surveillance system detailed budget".

7. Field costs are associated to the running materials (camping, batteries, sandals, field clothing, machete, vehicle running cost, lubricant for car?), field rations, field allowance for temporary local assistants (trackers, porters, ?), first aid supplies for participants in large mammal surveys and gorilla trackers for the implementation of the following activities:

- ? large mammal surveys and in and around CMNP;
- ? tracking of gorillas for their habituation; and
- ? maintenance of key trails, tracks, and signage for park access points in CMNP.

It was not possible to provide a costing for one item so it is a package representing the costs mentioned above. The attached spreadsheet provides additional details (Detailed Estimated Budget for Field Costs)

**8.** The project executing partners are expecting to have a main office at the central level in Yaounde and sub-offices in the various landscape for staff implementing project in the areas in relationship with the implementing partners. This is the reasons why those expenses are assigned to these technical components. No changes have been made to the budget, but the budget notes now specify where these expenses relate to technical, field based implementation.

**9.** It is rather expenses related to expand awareness and education campaign to maintain continuous health control and strengthen long-term zoonotic disease prevention under Output 2.3.1 using workshops, meetings, and community radios (such as community radio) on health issues (hygiene measures, risk of disease transmission, and preventive measures) to target civil society, government employees, private workers, and IPLCs bordering CMNP. This is now budgeted under Third Party Fees.

**10.** The procurement specialist has been charged in all components where s/he will be needed in terms of purchasing or contract management.

Component 2:

? S/He will be in charge of purchasing supplies and equipment related to this component in the categories direct costs and equipment.

Component 3:

? Apart from purchasing NTFP equipment and supplies, s/he is also in charge of preparing and following up grants & Agreements with the various partners in the component.

This is detailed in Table 32 of the ProDoc in the budget notes section

**11.** The small grants made to community-based organizations are intended to engage IPLCs in the development of a sustainable tourism value chain based on a set of tourism products in the CMCR landscape. Specifically they will support community participation in the conservation and monitoring of the endangered marine turtle population (a key eco-tourism product for CMRC) along the Campo-Ebodje coastal area (about 34 km).

Among the items these small grants may include are:

? Supplies for construction/rehabilitation of hatcheries;

? Development of a pond for observation and resuscitation of marine turtles captured accidentally in fishermen's nets

? Purchase of small equipment for patrols and data collection during community monitoring of marine turtle nesting (coats, multifunctional gangs, headlamps, android phones, batteries, field clothing ...);

? Purchase of android phones for data collection;

? Environmental education in schools

? Awareness campaigns in villages: 4 in the Ebodj? area (Beyo, Ebodj?, Mbendji and Bouandjo) and 3 in the Campo area (Enyengue na manga; Bokombe; Campo - beach);

? Field rations, field allowance for temporary local marine turtle trackers; and

First aid supplies.

**12.** Adaptive Management is a budget allocation for project costs not yet identified. This could include additional safeguards mitigation measures or modifications that may need to be made to how the project achieves the project outcomes as a finding from the mid-term evaluation or the annual supervision missions. As such, it is not a project management cost, but technical delivery. This has now been explained in the budget notes section of the ProDoc in Table 33 on Third Party Fees.

#### **Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**April 7, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?**

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**April 6, 2021:**

The component 5 does include Knowledge Management but the Knowledge Management Approach of the project remains unclear in terms of timeline, concrete deliverables and budget. Please provide in the Portal a budgeted KM approach including clear timeline and deliverables.

**April 28, 2021:**

Thank you for providing the Appendix 14. Nevertheless the table 36 is not complete. Please complete the 2nd line of this table (titled "Implementation of knowledge management and communications strategy") adding the timeline and budget and copy this table in the portal under the section 8. Knowledge Management.

**July 14, 2021:**

Thank you for the additional information. Part of the content of the first table "Project communication targets and examples of communication tools" is not readable (some text overlaps) and the table goes beyond the limit of Portal entry page. Please arrange the table so that it is fully readable and it fits within the margins of the Portal entry.

**July 15, 2021:**

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

### Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency Response- 7.15.2021

A new, smaller version of the table has been added to fit within the portal limits.

WWF GEF Agency Response- 7.12.2021

The budget for KM has been included in Appendix 14, in table 39 and the general project timeline has been added.

This table has been copied into the portal under section 8.

WWF GEF Agency Response- 4.21.2021

A Communications and KM plan has been developed and annexed to the ProDoc (Appendix 14)

### **Monitoring and Evaluation**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**April 5, 2021:**

1. The budgeted M&E plan is not clear. Please indicate the cost of the different items of the M&E plan and not only the total cost of the plan.
2. The finance manager/administration costs should be charged under PMC but not under project components and M&E as currently shown in the budget table. Please amend accordingly.

**April 28, 2021:**

1. Please provide the M&E budget table in the Portal under "9. Monitoring and Evaluation". In addition, the Financial Reports should be charged under the PMC. Please adjust the M&E budget table accordingly.
2. Not addressed. The finance manager/administration costs should be charged under PMC. Please amend the budget accordingly.

**July 14, 2021:**

Thank you for the additional information and amendments. Cleared

Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency Response- 7.12.2021

1. M&E budget table is now provided in the Portal under section 9

The M&E budget has been revised such that it no longer includes financial reporting (now under PMC).

2. Budget has been revised such that finance manager is under PMC.

WWF GEF Agency Response- 4.21.2021

1. An M&E budget table with costs for different items has been added to Section 2.7 on M&E as Table 8

2. The Congo IP Cameroon project is being implemented across three landscapes by multiple executing partners. All partners will have to be evaluated as to their capacity and additional and ongoing monitoring is anticipated to ensure that financial operations are in compliance with minimum fiduciary standards. In addition, they will be working alongside the M&E Officer to track the annual execution of the workplan, achievement of targets, and ongoing assessment of risk and identification of risk mitigation. This, in turn, contributes to the annual project ratings for implementation progress and risk rating. The Financial Manager is considered a critical member of the M&E function and therefore has been budgeted 30% under the M&E Component

Administrative Costs are associated with M&E, Knowledge Management and Coordination staffing and activities.

No changes have been made to the budget.

**Benefits**

**Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**April 6, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**April 6, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

## **Project Results Framework**

### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**April 6, 2021:**

1. The area of terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use (sub-core indicator 1.1) is different in the Project Results Framework (952,573 ha) and in the project description including the core indicator table (952,564 ha). Please correct and ensure the information provided is consistent throughout all the documents provided.
2. Please clarify how 3.3 t/ha/yr at year 6 lead to 26.2 million tCO<sub>2</sub>eq over a 20-year period.

**April 28, 2021:**

- 1 and 2. Thank you for the correction and clarification. Cleared.

### Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency Response- 4.21.2021

1. The correct figure is 952,573 ha. The inconsistency has been corrected in the core indicator table in the ProDoc and the CER.
2. Please see attached EX-ACT tool for more details on the calculation of these figures. The rules used to arrive at the figures are presented on the "Calculations" spreadsheet of the tool. As presented in the ProDoc current deforestation and forest degradation rates across the project landscapes are low, and anticipated emissions reductions are expected to come primarily from project interventions in and around CMNP and in LNP, as well as the area of reforestation under Component 2. At this point in time, it is not feasible to reliably predict what may be the impact of LUP on greenhouse gas emissions under Component 1.

### **GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

### Agency Response

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**April 7, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**April 7, 2021:**

Please complete the table with STAP comments relevant to the child project (instead of a reference to the entire document).

**April 28, 2021:**

Thank you for the complement. Cleared.

Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency Response- 4.21.2021

All STAP comments pertain to the Congo IP PFD. Within these comments, there are no specific references to the Cameroon child project.

The response matrix to Council and STAP comments in the CER has been updated to present more fully the STAP comments to the Congo IP PFD. Brief responses to STAP comments to the Congo IP PFD that are also generally relevant to the Cameroon child project have been included

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**April 5, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**April 5, 2021:**

Please see the above comment on the overview map.

**April 28, 2021:**

Cleared.

Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency Response- 4.21.2021

Thank you, the map has been adjusted

**Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

**Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)**

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

### Agency Response

#### **Responses to "Is CEO Endorsement Recommended?"**

##### **WWF GEF Agency 8/2/21:**

?1. The additional text was copied erroneously and has been deleted in the project objective retaining only the first sentence.

We have revised the ?increase economic opportunities and livelihoods" to: "increase economic and livelihood opportunities" in the CEO endorsement request and in the ProDoc of the project.

We have added the METT score for Lob?k? NP (based on the IMET of July 2020) For the other PAs we plan to have the participatory IMET done at project start and will provide the corresponding METT data then. We have added a short explanation on this issue, in the section just below the Core Indicators section in the Portal entry.

The Lob?k? METT data have been included it in the core indicator table plus a notes that the table will be updated with the data of the other PAs when the project starts.

2. One co-financing letter has been changed to ?in-kind? contribution and we have added a description on the investment mobilized for the other co-finance.

3. The summary of the gender analysis has been uploaded in the relevant section in the Portal

4. The child project?s table D has been corrected.

#### **GEFSEC DECISION**

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

**Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)**

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**April 7, 2021:**

Not yet. Please address the comments raised above on the proposal.

**April 29, 2021:**

Not yet. Please address the remaining comments.

**July 14, 2021:**

Not yet. Please address the last comments.

**July 27, 2021:**

Not yet. Last checking revealed issues that still need to be addressed to endorse the project. Please address the following last comments:

**•1. PDO and Core Indicators:**

•- Please consider only retaining the first sentence of the project objective and removing the rest. This is because the rest of the objective is actually a repeat of the project component, not the project objective itself (as articulated clearly in Annex 3 of the Results Framework). This suggestion is in line with the Evaluation Policy requirement: "The objectives and intended results of GEF-financed activities should be specific and measurable, so as to make it possible to monitor and evaluate the project and program effectively." In doing so, please also consider rewording "increase economic opportunities and livelihoods" to: "increase economic and livelihood opportunities".

•- For Core Indicator 1.2, please add the METT score baseline as required at CEO endorsement for the two Protected Areas named: Campo Ma'an Maan and Lob'k NP (we noticed the comment that they METT scores are still being determined).

•

**•2. Co-financing:** Description of "Investment mobilized" ? As there are 2 sources of IM, please identify these 2 entities and provide some info about the plans for the funding (below table C). Some info is already in the co-financing letter, but it would be helpful to record any further info or plans.

**•3. Comment on Gender Equality:** It is well noted that a gender analysis and action plan has been attached. This GAP provides sufficient information, but please provide a summary of the findings of the Gender Analysis and gender responsive actions in the portal section

**•4. Table D** of the child project shows some differences in fee from table D of the parent PFD as following, please correct the child project's table D to match with its parent PFD:

PFD							
D. Indicative Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds							
Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area: Programming of Fun	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)	
WWF-US	GET	Cameroon	Biodiversi BD STAR Allocation	6,405,505	576,495	6,982,000	9.00%
WWF-US	GET	Cameroon	Multi Foc: IP SFM CongoSet-As	3,202,752	288,248	3,491,000	9.00%
				9,608,257	864,743	10,473,000	9.00%
Child project							
D. Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds							
Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area: Programming of Fun	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)	
WWF-US	GET	Cameroon	Biodiversi BD STAR Allocation	6,405,505	579,378	6,984,883	9.05%
WWF-US	GET	Cameroon	Multi Foc: IP SFM CongoSet-As	3,202,752	285,365	3,488,117	8.91%
<b>Total Grant Resources(\$)</b>				<b>9,608,257.00</b>	<b>864,743.00</b>	<b>10,473,000</b>	<b>9.00%</b>

- 
- **August 3, 2021:**
- 
- Thank you for addressing the last comments. We note the proposal to update and complete the METT information at the start-up of the project due to the lack of data and taking advantage of the IMET planed in December with the Ministry of Forestry and Fauna (MINFOF) which is a reasonable way forward and one that supports data accuracy. The CEO endorsement is now recommended.

#### Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>First Review</b>	4/7/2021	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	4/29/2021	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	7/14/2021	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	7/27/2021	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	8/3/2021	

#### CEO Recommendation

#### Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations