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**part i: project Information**

**GEFSEC Project ID:** 4084

**gef agency Project ID:** **P**118018

**Country(ies):** CAMEROON

**Project Title:** **CBSP-CONSERVATION AND SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT WITHIN THE NGOYLA MINTOM FOREST**

**GEF Agency(ies):** World Bank , ,

**Other Executing partner(s):** Ministry of Forests and Wildlife (MINFOF)

**GEF Focal Area(s):**

**GEF-4 Strategic program(s)**: SP#1 and SP#3

**Name of parent program/umbrella project:** **STRATEGIC PROGRAM FOR THE SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT IN THE CONGO BASIN**

1. **Project framework** –

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Objective**: To improve the conservation and management of core areas within the Ngoyla Mintom forest massif and improve access to income-generating activities for local communities |
| Project Components | Inv, TA, or STA2 | **Expected Outcomes** | Expected Outputs  | GEF Financing1 | **Co-Financing1** | **Total ($m)**c=a+ b |
|  |  |  |  | ($m) a | % | ($m) b | % |  |
| 1. Strengthen government and civil society capacity for participatory planning and management of the core areas. | TA and Inv | Strengthened capacity of (a) relevant government entities - and (b) civil society organizations - to support participatory forest management and community-based natural resource management.Carrying out of studies of the socio-economic implications of, and (b) confirmation of Local Communities’ acceptance of, proposed classification and management of the core area for conservation and low impact community usePreparation of Classification proposals, and draft management plans prepared for “core areas” proposed for permanent forest status within the Ngoyla-Mintom Forest massif | Multi-stakeholder consultation platforms reinforced.Institutional and operational capacity of MINFOF to manage core aeas of the Ngoyla-Mintom massif and implement the project strengthened (facilitate establishment of a Technical Operations Unit).Infrastructure developed (with counterpart in-kind contributions) and equipment procured.Capacity of Local Civil Society Organizations / NGOs to perform watchdog / whistleblower functions strengthened.Communication & Outreach program designed and implementedA Socio-economic analysis carried out of the likely financial, social, environmental and other costs / benefits that result from different classification and management options for priority conservation and community use areasSurveys conducted to assess broad community acceptance of the classification proposals before adoptionPreparation and implementation of management plans for State forests within Ngoyla-Mintom Forest block.Classification process, and draft management planning process supported. | 1,571,000 | 16.9 | 7,736,309 | 83.1 | 9,307,309 |
| 2. Design and implement a Livelihood Support Mechanism (LSM) | Inv & TA | A Livelihood Support Mechanism that will address immediate social and development needs of the local communities and indigenous peoples designed, and piloted;The LSM is evaluated with a view to developing subsequent scale-up recommendations.  | Competent Management Contractor to manage the Livelihood Support Mechanism contracted and Operational procedures for Livelihood Support Mechanism designed “Local Management Committees” supported to prepare or refine local development plans.Selected micro-projects funded and implemented in accordance with the Manual of Procedures. Livelihood Support Mechanism evaluated with a view to developing subsequent scaling-up recommendations. | 1,406,000 | 22.7 | 4,792,621 | 77.3 | 6,198,621 |
| 3. Design and implement a long term Monitoring and Evaluation System for the Ngoyla-Mintom Forest Massif; and Project Management  | TA | *3.1 Monitoring and Evaluation:* (i) M&E Expert / body contracted to design and implement a long term M&E system with baseline data. Mandates for monitoring clearly defined between different partners. (ii) Coaching provided to data collectors through classroom and practical field training by M&E expert; (iii) data collected and analyzed.  | M&E Expert / body contracted to design and implement a long term M&E system with baseline data. Mandates for monitoring clearly defined between different partners.Provide coaching to data collectors through classroom and practical field training by M&E expert.M&E System established, tailored training packages designed and delivered to relevant MINFOF and other GoC staffs, and data collected.(Cost of M&E System is $346,000) | 346,000 | 48.8 | 363,598 | 51.2 | 709,598 |
| 4.       |     |       |       |       |    |       |    |       |
| 5.       |     |       |       |       |    |       |    |       |
| 6.       |     |       |       |       |    |       |    |       |
| 7.       |     |       |       |       |    |       |    |       |
| 8. Project management (part of component 3) | 177,000 | 6.1 | 2,518,816 | 93.9 | 2,695,816 |
| **Total Project Costs** | 3,500,000 | 18.5 | 15,411,345 | 81.5 | 18,911,345 |

 **1** List the $ by project components. The percentage is the share of GEF and Co-financing respectively of the total amount for the component.

 **2** TA = Technical Assistance; STA = Scientific & Technical Analysis.

**B. Sources of confirmed** [**Co-financing**](http://gefweb.org/Documents/Council_Documents/GEF_C21/C.20.6.Rev.1.pdf) **for the project**.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Name of Co-financier (source)*** | ***Classification*** | ***Type*** | ***Project***  | ***%***\* |
| Government of Cameroon (in kind) | Nat’l Govt | In-kind | 2,072,600 | 13.4 |
| WWF | NGO | Grant | 4,338,745 | 28.2 |
| SNV | NGO | Grant | 600,000 | 3.9 |
| IUCN | NGO | Grant | 200,000 | 1.3 |
| Rainforest Alliance & OPFCR | NGO | Grant | 500,000 | 3.2 |
| IDA Mining Sector Cap Bldg Project | Multilat. Agency | Soft Loan | 6,700,000 | 43.5 |
| IDA PACA and PNDP projects | Multilat. Agency | Soft Loan | 1,000,000 | 6.5 |
| **Total Co-financing** |  | 100% |

 \* Percentage of each co-financier’s contribution at CEO endorsement to total co-financing.

**C.**  F**inancing Plan Summary For The Project ($)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ***Project Preparation a*** | ***Project*** ***b*** | ***Total******c = a + b*** | ***Agency Fee*** | ***For comparison:******GEF and Co-financing at PIF*** |
| GEF financing | 76,700 | 3,500,000 | 3,576,700 | 357,670 | 3,500,000 |
| Co-financing  | 117,000 | 15,411,345 | 15,528,345 |  | 6,500,000 |
| **Total** | 193,700 | 18,911,345 | 19,105,045 | 357,670 | 10,000,000 |

**D.**  **GEF Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Focal Area(s) and Country(ies)1 Non -Applicable**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  ***GEF Agency*** | ***Focal Area*** | ***Country Name/******Global*** | ***(in $)*** |
|  |  |  |  ***Project (a)*** | ***Agency Fee ( b)*2** | ***Total c=a+b*** |
|  |  |       |       |       |       |
|  |  |       |       |       |       |
|  |  |       |       |       |       |
| **Total GEF Resources** |       |       |       |

 1 No need to provide information for this table if it is a single focal area, single country and single GEF Agency project.

 **2** Relates to the project and any previous project preparation funding that have been provided and for which no Agency fee has been requested from Trustee.

**E. Consultants working for technical assistance components**:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Component* | *Estimated person weeks (GEF)* | *GEF amount ($)* | *Co-financing ($)* | *Project total ($)* |
| Local consultants\* | 511 | 767,000 | 443,652 | 1,210,652 |
| International consultants\* | 33 | 98,000 | 93,641 | 191,641 |
| Total | **544** | **865,000** | **537,293** | **1,402,293** |

\* Details to be provided in Annex C. N.B. Includes cost of 3.1 – M&E System.

**f. Project management Budget/cost**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Cost Items* | *Total Estimated person weeks (GEF)* | *GEF amount****($)*** | *Co-financing ($)* | *Project total ($)* |
| Local consultants\* | 33.3 | 50,000 | 112,081 | 162,081 |
| International consultants\* | 10 | 30,000 | 0 | 30,000 |
| Office facilities, equipment, vehicles and communications\* |  | 36,000 | 334,746 | 370,746 |
| Travel\* |  | 36,000 | 44,524 | 80,524 |
| Others\*\* (detailed below) |  |       |       |       |
| * Training Workshops, Platform and other meetings
 |  | 25,000 | 51,032 | 76,032 |
| * MINFOF Staff
 |  | - | 60,000 | 60,000 |
| * NGO Staff & Operating Costs
 |  | - | 1,916,433 | 1,916,433 |
| **Total** |  | 177,000 | 2, 518,816 | 2,695,816 |

 \* Details to be provided in Annex C. \*\* For others, it has to clearly specify what type of expenses here in a footnote.

**G.** **Does the project include a “non-grant” instrument?** yes [ ]  no [x]
 (If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex E an indicative calendar of expected
 reflows to your agency and to the GEF Trust Fund).

**H. describe the budgeted m&E PLAN:**

A Project Implementation Unit (PIU) established by MINFOF will be responsible for the overall management and implementation of the project results and output level M&E framework, to evaluate project performance. This will include managing the flow of information from the field to the Ministry, and producing periodic monitoring reports. The results framework presented in Annex 1 outlines key performance indicators, data collection methods, database maintenance, a timetable for collection, and responsible agencies to supervise and monitor the implementation of the project and its progress towards meeting its objectives.

Sub-component 3.1 will contract a specialist national M&E consulting bureau / institution to design and implement a monitoring system that tracks social, economic, and ecological information to better assess progress made toward the project objective. Since there are a number of projects operating in the area, the first step will be to harmonize M&E plans into a Joint M&E Framework and clearly define responsibilities for monitoring different indicators. The project will use the GEF Tracking Tool for Biodiversity Projects for Strategic Objective 1 to monitor quality of management of the core protected area. The Joint M&E Framework will also establish a baseline for monitoring faunal biodiversity, forest cover, socio-economic wellbeing of affected persons, and assess social impacts of the project on the level and equity of benefits (in particular employment, and benefit from micro projects) attained by different target groups. The envisaged investment in M&E system is therefore greater than would normally be required for monitoring Project implementation and performance. Please refer to Annex 3 for further details.

The estimated budget for the M&E is US$ 0.710 m (GEF: US$ 0.346 m and co-financing of US$ 0.364 m)

The estimated budget for the Project Management is US$ 2.696 m (GEF: US$ 0.177 m and co-financing of US$ 2.519 m)

part ii: project justification:

1. State the issue, how the project seeks to address it, and the expected global environmental benefits to be delivered:

***Biodiversity context:*** Cameroon’s Protected Area network expanded from almost 2.25 million hectares in 1995 to over 3.7 million hectares in 2011 accounting for 8.11% of the country’s land area[[1]](#footnote-1). By 2011, the total area classified as permanent forest reached 8.72 million hectares (including the above-mentioned Protected Areas). A further 3.12 million hectares have been declared as permanent forest, but are pending classification and an additional 1.5 million hectares are planned to become permanent forest. Once completed, this will bring the total Permanent Forest estate to 13.4 million hectares. Approximately 4.1 million hectares are allocated for commercial logging, an additional 3.2 million hectares are in the process of competitive attribution for industrial logging, and a further 641,000 hectares are planned for logging (which will result in a total of 8 million hectares of production forest).

In terms of biological diversity, the country is second only to the Democratic Republic of Congo in Africa, with some 335 species of mammals (including half of Africa’s 52 species of higher primates), 848 species of birds, nine thousand species of vascular plants (of which at least 156 are endemic), 171 species of amphibians, 210 species of reptiles, and 138 species of fish.

***Background context and Issues:*** The Ngoyla Mintom forest is a largely pristine rainforest block of about 900,000 ha in the southern part of Cameroon, located between the Dja Faunal Reserve (a UNESCO World Heritage Site) and the Nki National Park in Cameroon, the Minkebe National Park in Gabon, and the Odzala National Park in Congo. Due to its location, the Ngoyla Mintom forest forms an important part of a regional green corridor, with very diverse and rich ecosystems reported to contain an important stock of biodiversity, including 228 species of fish in the waterways, 37 species of large and medium sized mammals – among them about 4,000 endangered gorillas, 1,500 chimpanzees, elephants and mandrills – and likely to contain several extremely valuable tree species (see Annex 9). Beyond its importance as a natural habitat, and a link between neighboring conservation areas, Ngoyla Mintom – like many rainforests – is also an important carbon sink and store, helping to mitigate the effects of global climate change. In addition to these global goods, the area provides local communities with many environmental and social services essential to maintaining their way of life. The local population, numbering around 10,200 people[[2]](#footnote-2), consists of an indigenous population of Baka pygmies, as well as a number of Bantu tribes.

The abundant mineral resources present in the Ngoyla Mintom forest block and its close vicinity, have now been surveyed and proven under long-standing exploration mining permits. High mineral prices, has resulted an increased likelihood that investors are now ready to bring these mining operations to the exploitation phase Though the mines are not yet operational, the exploratory activities are already opening up the area and reducing transport costs for all commodities to markets. As soon as the mines become operational, the investors construct a railway, initially to transport iron ore to a deep-water port to be built on the Atlantic coast, which will improve access and reduce transport costs to the Ngoyla Mintom forest zone. Other infrastructure projects, in particular the ongoing upgrading of the N9 road from Sangmelima to Ouesso in the Republic of Congo, are expected to further compound the environmental and social impacts of economic development. These developments are rendering the area more attractive to commercial loggers, medium and large commercial farmers, particularly for cocoa, oil palm and rubber, and new settlers in search of work, cheap land and new economic opportunities. Such settlers will typically all engage in small scale commercial and subsistence agriculture, hunting, and will stimulate artisanal timber extraction for house construction. As a result, the natural resources in the area face growing threats. In the absence of appropriate investments in conservation, sustainable management, effective monitoring and enforcement, the increase in a wide range of economic activities will lead to fragmentation of habitat, over-hunting of wildlife, rapid and irreversible degradation of the area’s unique forests ecosystems, as well as indirect impacts such as sedimentation and pollution of freshwater ecosystems. These changes and impacts have far-reaching consequences for the indigenous populations and their fragile society.

A 1995 indicative zoning plan[[3]](#footnote-3) designated the Ngoyla Mintom forest block to become permanent forest for commercial timber production. Since then, development partners have repeatedly encouraged Government of Cameroon to seek conservation organizations to lease the areas for ‘conservation concessions’, which have not been forthcoming. In 2009, an international call for expressions of interest published by the Government of Government resulted in several expressions of interest for commercial timber exploitation, and a number of other proposals for ‘conservation concessions’ in the area, combining biodiversity conservation and carbon finance. However till today, none of the forest massif has been gazetted, or allocated for logging, or conservation. Two feasibility studies are under way to explore the potential for REDD+ projects in the region: one specifically for the Ngoyla Mintom forest, and the other for the Dja Biosphere Reserve and its buffer zone, which overlaps with Ngoyla-Mintom. There are two mining companies active in the area: CamIron (an iron ore mining company based to the South East of the Ngoyla Mintom Forest Block) has prepared an Environmental and Social Management Plan for the area, which envisages establishment of a conservation offset component as compensation for the environmental damage that their operations are projected to cause, and a fund for local development initiatives.; and Geovic (a Cobalt and Nickel mining company) who have included similar conservation and local development initiatives in their ESMP, linked to their mine to the North East of the Ngoyla-Mintom Block. However till today, none of the forest massif has been gazetted, or allocated for logging.

***Rationale:*** The Government of Cameroon has requested technical and financial assistance from their development partners to analyze, assess and compare the various proposals, and inform a final meso-zoning of the Ngoyla Mintom forest massif to define specific areas for conservation, commercial timber production and other uses. Analysis of forest management options and meso-zoning is expected to be completed with support from other projects. The GEF Project will support the preparation of documents for legal classification and participatory management of core areas identified for conservation and low impact community use.

***Approach:*** The GEF project aims to support the Government of Cameroon to: strengthen its capacity on the ground for participatory planning and management of selected core areas; to design and test a livelihood support mechanism that provides immediate benefits to the local communities; and to monitor long-term the quantity and quality of the forest protection areas supported by the project area. It will achieve this through close consultation with, and participation of, all concerned stakeholders. Please refer to the Incremental Cost analysis annex in the project document for greater details.

The precise external boundaries, appropriate legal status and fine grained micro-zoning for the protection and management of selected priority forests will be defined during the preparation of classification proposals and drafting of management plans. In areas whose protection and management will be supported by this project, the needs of local communities and the economic, social, and environmental impacts of future protection and management status will be analyzed. Positive and any potential negative impacts of the classification process will be clearly communicated to all stakeholders. A livelihood support mechanism will be designed and piloted, with the specific aim to address any potential negative impacts of the proposed classification and management proposals on affected groups, and in particular will encourage and enable sustainable economic development of the area’s natural resources while safeguarding its rich biodiversity and local communities’ interests. The decision to proceed with proposed classification and management activities will be taken after there is evidence of broad support for such proposals among affected communities.

1. Describe the consistency of the project with national and/or regional priorities/plans:

Cameroon’s development ambitions, as expressed in its Vision 2035 document are to a large extent based on its natural resource wealth, while remaining conscious of the risks of over-exploitation, negative environmental impacts of development, and climate change. The proposed project is aligned with Vision 2035, which recognizes that land use planning and management is essential to secure integrated and sustainable development, and to put in place contractual obligations for joint management of space by the state and decentralized authorities. It is also aligned with the “Rural Sector” component of Cameroon’s Strategy Document for Growth and Employment (DSCE in French) 2010-2020, which includes programs and sub-programs to: develop forestry production, through management and regeneration of production and permanent forests, and the valorization of forest and faunal resources; to improve the quality of life through improved socio-economic infrastructure, community development and community management; and to ensure sustainable management of natural resources through management of humid zones, environmental management of rural activities and management of biodiversity; and to improve the institutional framework through strengthening of information systems, review of legal and regulatory framework, ensuring coherence of interventions, reinforcement of capacities, and development of financing mechanisms.

The project is fully consistent with the FY10-13 Country Assistance Strategy Framework whose foundation is improved governance. In particular, it is aligned with Strategic Theme One: “Increasing Cameroon’s Competitiveness”, whose sub-component 1 aims to “improve transparency, equity and sustainability in the use of natural resources, including protected areas”. The Ngoyla Mintom project serves as a pilot project by: testing participatory planning approaches; demonstrating how natural resource revenues can be shared transparently and equitably for sustainable local development; and strengthening the capacity of local Civil Society to perform a watchdog role vis-à-vis illegal forest activities and management of natural resource revenues thereby stimulating demand-side governance

1. **Describe the consistency of the project with** [**gef strategies**](http://gefweb.org/uploadedFiles/Projects/Templates_and_Guidelines/C31-10%20Revised%20Focal%20Area%20Strategies-07-23-07_Final.pdf) **and strategic programs:**

The project primarily contributes to GEF-4 Strategic Objective 1 (SO1 - Catalyzing the Sustainability of Protected Areas Systems). In particular the project is fully aligned with the Strategic Program 3 (SP3: Strengthening terrestrial Protected Area networks), and Strategic Program 1 (SP1 – Sustainable financing of PA systems at the national level). Key activities that contribute to SO1 include strengthening institutions and providing training for consultations; community based natural resource management, and communications under sub-component 1.1; the detailed socio-economic analyses of protected area management options under sub-component 1.2 which will help appreciate the impact of scenarios on different stakeholders; and support to the preparation of classification proposals and drafting of management plans for priority conservation areas within Ngoyla-Mintom Forest block under sub-component 1.3. Significantly in alignment with SP1, the proposed project is piloting a Livelihood Support Mechanism (developed under Component 2) since this is conceived as a critical component of a future Sustainable Financing Mechanism being supported by the TRIDOM project.

This project is also fully consistent with the current GEF4 Sustainable Forest Management Framework - supported through the existing biodiversity strategic programs, and in line with the GEF’s mandate of protecting global environmental goods.

This project falls under the larger regional framework of the Strategic Program for Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) in the Congo Basin. The Strategic Program for SFM presents a programmatic approach aiming to deliver multiple global environmental benefits across the Congo River ecosystem and adding value to a proposed portfolio of projects envisioned under the Strategic Program. The project contributes to all three Strategic Program components: Program Component 1 (Maintaining Ecosystem functions and values, especially biodiversity and carbon-based capital in the regional network of protected areas) and Component 2 (Fostering Sustainable Management and use of forest and water resources in the larger productive landscape of the Congo Basin), and 3 (Strengthening the policy, regulatory, institutional and sustainable financing framework for sustainable ecosystem management). The project’s investments in: capacity building in sustainable management, biodiversity conservation, strengthening the rights of local people for community based natural resources management; and improving the livelihood of local communities, forest dwellers and vulnerable groups whose livelihoods depend on the natural resources of the Congo Basin, contribute to most of the Strategic Program’s 12 expected outcomes.

1. **justify the type of financing support provided with the gef resources.**

The project will use GEF financing for **investments** such as establishment and equipment (office equipment, vehicles, field clothing and equipment, opening of limits and initial demarcation of protected area) of a field based Technical Operations Unit in an area that currently has very few staff; **technical assistance** activities such as: training workshops for Government and Non-Government agents operating in the area in participatory natural resources management and in particular for NGOs to perform a watchdog role; technical support to the preparation of classification proposals and management plans for the core area(s) including technical studies of potential socio-economic impacts of different legal options for classification; support communications and consultations with local stakeholders during classification and management planning; establishment and management of a Livelihood Support Mechanism; design and implementation (satellite imagery purchase and field data collection) of a long term ecological and socio-economic monitoring program; and **operational costs** such as the additional costs of eco-guards’ camping allowances, running costs of vehicles and offices which are critical to field operations.

1. **Outline the Coordination with other related initiatives:**

The project will complement and closely collaborate with three related initiatives:

* A GEF funded Project « Conservation de la Biodiversité transfrontalière dans l’interzone Tri-National du Dja, Odzala, Minkébé » covers Cameroon, Gabon and Congo. The project is implemented by UNDP / UNOPS with a budget of $10m from GEF. It became effective in 2008 and will run for seven years.
* The National REDD+ preparation process (with MINEP) managed by the World Bank , and
* At regional level with the GEF Regional REDD+ Capacity Building Project, executed by the World Bank.
1. **Discuss the value-added of GEF involvement in the project demonstrated through** [**incremental reasoning**](http://gefweb.org/uploadedFiles/Documents/Council_Documents__%28PDF_DOC%29/GEF_31/C.31.12%20Operational%20Guidelines%20for%20Incremental%20Costs.pdf):

Inthe absence of GEF assistance, with limited support from other donors for conservation oriented management within the massif, the Government of Cameroon would likely undertake interventions that would prioritize national economic development objectives over local community interests, or international conservation priorities. In the absence of more investment in participatory planning and control, illegal logging and mining activities will likely be greater, and the resulting increase in in-migration will lead to the rapid fragmentation of wildlife habitat, further increases in hunting pressure, in particular when planned investments in large scale mining and new infrastruture networks (road and rail) become reality. It is likely that current forest zoning that favors timber production would remain the preferred option, over management for community use, and the environmental benefits such as biodiversity, carbon sequestration, and other ecosystem services may not be optimized. Although the direct impact of mining and infrastructure development is usually localized, indirect impacts such as increased in-migration and associated increases in timber cutting, hunting and agricultural expansion will not be addressed without concrete measures to secure priority conservation areas through their classification and management. In the absence of any significant investment to identify and support alternative livelihoods, efforts to control hunting, in particular, will create conflicts.

With GEF support, as designed the project will contribute to securing part of the forest massif for conservation and sustainable community use, through improved collaboration with stakeholders, participatory planning, and substantial investment in livelihood support mechanisms for the local communities and indigenous people living in the area. Significantly, it is anticipated that the project will secure wide stakeholder support for more conservation oriented forest management than would be possible in the without-project scenario. The GEF financing will add value through providing the funds to prepare classification documents and manage core areas for conservation and low-impact community use, thereby securing key corridors that link other existing Protected Areas. Investment in community based management should ensure long term sustainable use of forest and wildlife resources, and reduce the pressure on endangered species that reside within the area.

With the GEF financing, incremental global environmental benefits expected include: the preparation of Classification dossiers and management plans for substantial core areas of the Ngoyla Mintom humid tropical forest biome. This core area will be managed for conservation and low impact community use, meeting criteria for an IUCN Category VI Managed Resource Protected Area, and will explicitly exclude logging.

Importantly, the lessons generated under this Project will help demonstrate how the participatory preparation and implementation of land use plans can be scaled up at the national and regional levels, and how to establish Livelihood Support programs as a key component of future sustainable financing mechanisms.

1. **Indicate risks, including climate change risks, that might prevent the project objective(s) from being achieved and outline risk management measures:**

The detailed risk analysis including the proposed mitigation measures to address them, are summarized in the Operational Risk Assessment Framework (Annex 4 of the Project Document). Key risks are highlighted below.

**The imminent construction of a new international highway, and likely construction of an iron ore mine and associated railway and energy infrastructure** in the area within the project lifetime, will greatly alter the local social dynamics and economics of land use, increasing the risk that both local and external stakeholders will challenge the adoption and implementation of a forest management options geared towards conservation and low-impact community use.

**The existence of multiple donors and investors in the area** is both a risk, due to increasing complexity of coordination multiple interventions, and an advantage, because it can provide the capacity and resources to transform the area, and ensure that there is close third party monitoring of the Ministry’s GEF funded operations. The establishment of a Technical Operations Unit (UTO) to manage the Ngoyla Mintom massif, , and regular coordination meetings between all project teams will address this risk.

**Weak MINFOF capacity for community based conservation**. This risk is addressed by the project through institutional strengthening (support to the the creation and operations of a UTO and targeted training) and also by simultaneous investments by various other support projects in the area.

**The Government has sent contradictory signals over the past few years** on uses it intends to promote in the Ngoyla-Mintom Forest massif. While the Ngoyla-Mintom was under the “Productive forest” category under the 1995 zoning plan, the MINFOF earlier considered pioneering the “Conservation Concession” concept in this area. A back-and forth dialogue with the international community (donors as well as conservation NGOs) has been on-going for the last 10 years without reaching a firm commitment from the Government. In 2009, the Government of Cameroon launched a call for expressions of interest for the Ngoyla-Mintom Forests: while several proposals were submitted for commercial timber exploitations, others presented biodiversity conservation and carbon finance options. In addition, as indicated above, infrastructure developments are planned in this area. There is thus a risk that the Government takes an early decision to allocate parts of the Ngoyla-Mintom Forest massif for industrial logging and/or a REDD deal. The risk is that such a decision is taken before local stakeholder s have been adequately informed and consulted, and before they have provided broad support for the proposals. The Project will therefore work towards securing core areas for conservation and low-impact community use and ensure that all project funded activities are compliant with Bank safeguard policies.

**Risk of not implementing the project:** The existence of valuable natural resources in the Ngoyla Mintom forest and expansion of road infrastructure through the area will in itself likely lead to widespread development of industrial and artisanal logging, expansion of commercial cocoa plantations, and potentially the installation of large scale agricultural plantations in the area. These developments would in turn stimulate rapid immigration to the area, thereby increasing pressure on its natural resources, particularly wildlife for bushmeat to feed the expanding population, and contributing to degradation of habitats, loss of biodiversity, reduction of environmental services and undermining indigenous communities’ way of life. While the planned iron ore mining will not extend beyond the known deposits, artisanal gold mining is already expanding into the Ngoyla-Mintom forest. By contributing to the establishment of protected areas, the project can limit environmental degradation and loss of biodiversity in core areas. Therefore, the risks of not implementing the project are perceived as much greater than those entailed in project implementation.

1. **explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design**:

The cost effectiveness of the project can be examined through a comparison of the alternatives that were considered during development of the project: (i) Allocation of the entire area for logging and other extractive industries; or (ii) Allocation of the entire area for Conservation / REDD projects. The option to log the entire area has been rejected by the Ministry because of the high conservation value of the area and substantial international interest in securing its protection as a green corridor to link the three adjacent protected areas. The option of conserving the entire massif without any economic activities was also rejected by all partners as being unrealistic, in the absence of a sufficiently large offer to pay for the conservation of the area that would compensate for the foregone revenues and job-creation opportunities from resource extraction – in particular logging under state, council and community ownership and management. Communities have expressed their need for economic development activities in the area, having benefited very little from their forests in the past. The project envisages a balance between conservation and economic activities in the area.

Further, the proposed project, albeit with limited resources, has been strategically designed, as it will serve as a valuable case study to test alternative approaches to natural resources management and revenue sharing that learn from past experiences, and may be applicable in future World Bank investments in Cameroon’s forestry and biodiversity sectors. The country assistance strategy envisages that any such investments will “improve transparency, equity and sustainability in the use of natural resources” and seeks to strengthen public and private efforts to achieve socially, economically, and ecologically sustainable use of national forest and wildlife resources, including protected areas. A set of parallel investments also aim to develop the capacity for “Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation” (REDD) initiatives, including a regional project (using GEF resources) to strengthen Congo Basin countries' capacities on REDD issues, and the national level REDD Readiness process (using Forest Carbon Partnership Facility funds). GoC sees Ngoyla Mintom as a priority site for potential REDD projects and the area therefore serves the area as a laboratory for designing and testing such mechanisms.

Coordination with the IDA funded Mining Technical Assistance project is also strategic, since this project has put some focus on the development of the so-called ‘southern corridor’ which passes through Ngoyla Mintom area, and *inter alia* will put emphasis on “integration of mining into local/regional development.” The project will also work closely with two other World Bank projects: The Agricultural Competitiveness Support Project (PACA) and the Participatory Development Project (PNDP) both operate in the South Region and have the potential to fund activities and investments in the Ngoyla Mintom region.

In summary, future Bank investment will build directly on the experiences derived from this modest but critical GEF investment in securing and managing Ngoyla Mintom.

**part iii: institutional coordination and support**

**A. Institutional arrangement:**

The project will be implemented by the Ministry of Forests and Wildlife (Ministère des Forêts et de la Faune, MINFOF). The institutional arrangements have been developed on the basis of in-depth consultation with the senior staff of the Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife[[4]](#footnote-4), the Ministry of Environment and Nature Protection[[5]](#footnote-5), and the Ministry Economic Planning and Territorial Administration[[6]](#footnote-6) during project preparation. These were validated at a meeting at which all three ministries and the two existing projects operating in the area were represented at a high level, and during a field mission to validate the project design with all partners..

A National Inter-ministerial Steering Committee for Ngoyla-Mintom chaired by MINFOF / MINEPAT, will be responsible for ensuring cooperation between relevant government ministries and Civil Society, provide general oversight and enable efficient project implementation. This Steering Committee will meet at least once a year to: (a) provide overall supervision for project implementation; (b) approve the annual work plans and budget; (c) review the annual implementation performance report to be prepared by the Project Implementation Unit, and (d) oversee the implementation of corrective actions as and when necessary.

A Project Implementation Unit (PIU) will be responsible for implementation of project activities on the ground on behalf of MINFOF. It will also assure the technical secretariat functions for the Steering Committee meetings. Please refer to Section III A of the Project Appraisal Document for details.

**B. Project Implementation Arrangement**:

Please refer to Annex 3 of the Project Document for detailed implementation arrangements.

**part iv: explain the alignment of project design with the original PIF**:

Most elements of the PIF remain the same in the revised Project design. However, during project preparation, with PPG funding, various safeguard reports were commissioned and public stakeholder consultations undertaken. The preparation team also consulted with the wide range of actors planning or already implementing projects in the area, including donor-funded NGO implemented projects, and private sector investors (mining companies, REDD project developers, and timber companies). These studies and consultations identified that since the approval of the PIF various new developments needed to be taken into account in the final project design: (a) the Government has prepared and published new Policies and Strategies (Vision 2035 and the Strategy Document for Employment Creation) with strong emphasis on growing the economy through job creating activities, (b) the international Sangmelima-Ouessou road, which passes through the Ngoyla-Mintom forest massif, is being upgraded to an tarred highway with funding from the African Development Bank which will substantially disenclave the area; (c) CamIron is currently being purchased by a Chinese investor has increased the likelihood that the Iron Ore deposit to the south of the Ngoyla-Mintom area will be developed during the project lifespan, including the construction of a railway through the Ngoyla-Mintom massif; and (d) increased interest from Government to initiate industrial logging in up to half of the forest massif. Combined, these factors have substantially altered the likely outcomes of the land use planning process and future management of the massif.

In addition, various new NGO and Donor funded initiatives in the Ngoyla-Mintom area have been planned and funded, requiring coordination of external conservation interventions and a clear division of labor. Some activities envisaged in the PIF were found to be already included in the project design of other projects that are currently active on the ground, so have been dropped from the final GEF project design, but will still be achieved.

In consultation with the government counterparts, the project structure and design was adjusted to reflect the current realities and a more pragmatic approach to managing the Ngoyla-Mintom massif.

The overall objective of protecting a core area of the massif remains the same, but the extent and level of protection of the core areas is likely to be smaller than envisaged in the PIF, to reflect new realities on the ground.

In addition, consultations with local communities highlighted the need for the project to deliver immediate socio-economic benefits that have been promised by many previous interventions but have never been realized. The final project design includes the design and implementation of a Livelihood Support Mechanism (LSM) under Component 2. The likely arrival of a number of logging operations in the area also emphasized the need to ensure that the revenue sharing mechanisms envisaged in the forest law will work in Ngoyla-Mintom – an achievement which has so far unfortunately escaped both Mintom municipality, and many other forest-adjacent communities. To this end, the LSM will be managed along similar lines to the legal procedures for managing logging revenues, to ensure that local capacities and transparent accountable systems are in place that can secure and manage such revenues before logging, and potentially mining revenues become available.

Based on advice from the WB Monitoring & Evaluation specialist and legal department, the appraisal team attempted to sharpen and simplify the project structure, define more clearly the outcomes, outputs and components keeping in line with the general substance of the project. The team has defined more realistic and pragmatic targets, with results that are under the project control and has worked intensively with other projects to define clear and specific roles and interventions for each to ensure harmonization and logical chronology of activities by the different projects and avoid duplication in activities. As a result, the two existing and already operational projects will focus on land use planning, and the GEF Ngoyla-Mintom project will support the preparation of classification documents and drafting of management plans for the core areas identified in this land use plan, once agreed. The team also ensured that results indicators had a proper baseline/target while being attributable and realistic. Finally, the project has learned from the experiences of previous IDA and GEF investments in the Forest & Environment Sector Program. A key consideration was that signature for official classification is a political decision taken at the highest level of government that cannot be guaranteed by the implementing Ministry alone and therefore following extensive consultations with the government it was agreed that it is not likely to be achievable within the timeframe of the project. Consequently the project design was adjusted to reflect this reality and support preparatory activities to ensure the final classification of the core area.

In terms of design, the main consequence is that the number of components goes from four (at PIF stage) to three. Activities from PIF-stage Component 1 and 2 are partially regrouped in Component 1 and partially transferred to PIF-stage Component 4. In terms of the design please see below the justification matrix highlighting the changes since PIF.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | **PIF Stage** | **Project Document (CEO stage)** | **Justification for changes** |
| **PDO/PGO** | To establish a core Protected Area within the Ngoyla- Mintom forest , through an approach based on land use planning and, fostering public-private partnerships.  | To contribute to improve the conservation and management of core areas within the Ngoyla Mintom forest block and improve access to income-generating activities for local communities. | The PDO was rephrased during the review process to capture a more targeted scope of activities that have been designed under the project to ensure realistic impacts on the ground, and to focus on activities that are under the project control.  |
| **Co-financing** | **USD 6,600,000**: Government (USD 2,500,000) GTZ (USD 1,000,000)Private Sector (USD1,000,000)WWF (USD 2,000,000) | **USD 15,411,345** : Government (USD 2,072,600) WWF, IUCN, SNV, Rainforest Alliance, IDA (USD 13,338,745).  | Overall the cofinancing has increased since PIF stage. Financing expected at the PIF stage from GTZ and Private sector has been replaced by additional resources from WWF, which committed more that initially anticipated, parallel World Bank IDA projects and other NGO projects (see cofinancing letters). |
| **Components and Budget distribution** | 4 components 1. Promotion of SFM within the entire Ngoyla-Mintom forest block. $2.6m (GEF$1.0m)2. Establishment and operationalization of a Ngoyla-Mintom core " Protected Area " $4.4m (GEF $1.5m)3. Establishment and experimentation of a sustainable funding mecanism for the Ngoyla-Mintom core Protected area. $2.15m (GEF $0.65m)4. Project Management. $0.85m (GEF $0.35m) | 3 components: 1. Strengthen government and civil society capacity for participatory planning, and management of the core areas. $9.31m (GEF $1.571m)2. Design and implement a Livelihood Support mechanism (LSM). $6.2m (GEF $1.41m) 3. Design and implement a long term Monitoring and Evaluation System and Project Management. $3.405m (GEF $0.523m – of which $0.177 is for project management). | Component 1 no longer covers land use planning. It will be done by two already funded projects (GEF TRIDOM and WWF / EU Ngoyla-Mintom projects). The revised Component 1 merges PIF stage Cpts 1 and 2. PIF stage Cpt 3 “Establishment of a sustainable financing mechanism” has been removed from the project design. It will instead be addressed through future, larger IDA investments. The project management component (PIF stage Cpt 4) has been merged with new Component 3. The components were reorganized and activities were regrouped for more effective implementation. These changes simplify the project and align better its focus on the PDO.In line with the above, the budget for the components have been revised to reflect realistic implementation requirements.  |
| **Outcomes component 1** | 1.1 A special status is adopted for the Ngoyla-Mintom forest block1.2 The Ngoyla-Mintom forest block is gazetted as a " Managed Resources Protected Area" of about 988,000ha equivavent to IUCN Category IV | 1.1 Strengthened capacity of (a) relevant government entities - and (b) civil society organizations - to support participatory forest management and community-based natural resource.1.2 Classification dossiers, and draft management plans for “core areas” within the Ngoyla-Mintom Forest block | Revised sub-Component 1.1 strengthens the capacity of MINFOF to implement the project, and to manage the Ngoyla-Mintom massif. Revised sub-Component 1.2 integrates PIF Stage sub-Components 1.1 and 1.2, but reduces the extent, and level of protection of the core areas to be gazetted (legally classified) in light of the newly identified realities: forthcoming road and mining developments in the area. The project no longer commits to achieving the actual classification of ”Core Areas” because experience shows that this is a long process whose outcome cannot be guaranteed by MINFOF alone during the project lifetime.A legal status compatible with IUCN Category VI is targeted, instead of Category IV to reflect the economic realities of the area and valid development expectations of its communities. |
| **Outcomes component 2** | 2.1 Mezo-Plan for land use and its components are developed and mapping completed.2.2 A gazetting Decree is adopted for a core Protected Area of about 160,000ha corresponding to IUCN Category I within the Ngoyla-Mintom forest block.2.3 Management of the Ngoyla-Mintom core Protected area is effective.2.4 Forest Management Plans adopted and implemented for all other permanent forests units witin the Ngoyla-Mintom forest block. | 2.1 A Livelihood Support Mechanism that will address immediate social and development needs of the local communities and indigenous peoples designed, tested, evaluated and improved.2.2 Local capacity to manage and access the Livelihood Support Mechanism built2.3 Micro-projects funded and implemented in accordance with the Manual of Procedures. | PIF stage component 2 has been merged with new Component 1. Land Use Planning has been removed, since it is being undertaken by the existing two projects already on the ground.New Component 2 aims to deliver immediate benefits to communities, considered essential after consultations with communities during preparation.Note that Component 1 provides funds for classification and management of State Forests only, and that those funds are managed by MINFOF. Funds are provided to support the operational costs of community groups and Community Forest management under Component 2 via the LSM, rather than Component 1, because a) Community Forests and Community Hunting Zones are essentially community enterprises; and b) it is more practical to channel funds for such activities through the LSM;  |
| **Outcomes component 3** | A sustainable and replicable financial mechanism is operational to support the costs of biodiversity conservation in the Protected Area | 3.1 Long –term M&E system that tracks social, economic and ecological information for Ngoyla Mintom forest massif designed and implemented.3.2 Project Management  | PIF stage Cpt 3 to establish a long-term sustainable funding mechanism has been dropped because a) the legal establishment of a Conservation Trust Fund goes beyond what is realistically feasible within the scope of this project, and b) the establishment of longer term sustainable financing mechanisms is already being addressed by other projects (GEF TRIDOM, and the GEF Regional Protected Area Sustainable Financing Projects). Future IDA funds will provide additional support .New Component 3 is essentially the same as PIF stage Cpt 4 but with more investment in M&E. The scope of the M&E activities has been increased to establish good baselines for longer-term monitoring, in particular on forest cover in the area, and on socio-economic impacts of the project. New Component 3 includes Project management activities. |
| **Outcomes component 4** | Project progress and results are measured  | None | PIF-stage outcome 4 (Project progress and results measured) is now included in the M&E sub-component of revised sub-Component 3.1. |
| **Outputs from component 1** | a) An institutional body similar to the Technical Operational Unit (TOU) is set up to ensure integrated management requirements. b)Limits of the TOU defined -final mapping of the Ngoyla-Mintom forest block-actual coverage known     c) Sensitization workshops held with all the stakeholders both a the central and local leveld) Boundaries of the Ngoyla-Mintom "Managed Resources Protected Area" are discussed with all the stakeholders and confirmede) Administrative procedure undertaken for the creation of the TOU | GEF Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) score has increased by 50% over baseline value (26) for the core area by project closure**.**Conservation & management of Core Area:***(a):*** Draft Decree for Classification of core area is prepared, validated and submitted by MINFOF to Prime Minister’s Office for endorsement.***(b):*** Draft Management Plan for core area is drafted, validated and submitted to Ministry of Forestry for adoption.Stakeholder platform(s) meetings at which key stakeholders are adequately represented.Communications strategy is developed and adopted and is being implemented. | PIF stage Cpt 1 outputs remain essentially the same. The PIU will be established before project effectiveness.More emphasis has been put on building the capacity of local civil society to participate in the project, and hold Government administrations and private sector to account.Stronger emphasis has been put on better communications during classification and management planning process .The revised Component 1 includes a study of the socio-economic implications of different legal status and management options to ensure that communities are likely to support the plans before they are implemented. The identification, demarcation and surveying of boundaries will be done as envisaged in the PIF but actual classification (signature of the gazettement decree) is not promised in the revised Project Design because final signature is beyond MINFOF direct control. |
| **Outputs from component 2** | a) Various land uses defined, and negotiated with stakeholders.b) Boundaries of various forest land uses defined and demarcated including for the core Protected Area area c) Role and rights of communities defined for each forest usesd) Concessions and permits awarded for logging, mining, sport hunting etc… e) Surveillance and control systems developed and effective for all forest blocksf) A M& E system is established and operationalg) forest management plans prepared for all permanent forests unitsh) infrastructure is developed in the whole Ngoyla Mintom forest block to preserve the core protected area | 30 villages have a Local Development Plan (LDPs) adopted by a duly formed “Local Committee.”Five successful community based Natural Resource Management pilot initiatives with key forest user groups financed by the Livelihood Support Mechanism.500 people benefiting from alternative income generating activities and 500 people benefiting from socio-economic infrastructure. 30% of these beneficiaries will be indigenous people. | PIF Stage Cpt 2 Outputs (b), (c), (d), (e), and (g) are part of revised Component 1. Output (f) has been made part of Component 3.1.PIF stage Output (a) will instead be achieved by two parallel projects (TRIDOM, WWF), which will advise GoC on conservation implications of different land uses during the land use planning phase.New Cpt 2 Outputs now reflects the beneficiaries of the Livelihood Support Mechanism. |
| **Outputs from component 3** | a)Results from studies on relevant mechanisms to ensure participation of private sector in the financing of biodiversity conservationb)Partnership contracts signed between Government and private sector for economic uses of natural resources and products. b) Contribution from various land uses to conservation of biodiversity defined | Long term, socio-economic and ecological change monitoring and evaluation framework established including baselines, and progress data that monitors functioning in the core area. | PIF stage Cpt 3 outputs have been dropped, because they will instead be achieved by the WWF project which has a component on working with Private Sector conservation financing, and works with Mining Companies and various REDD project developers. However, the Livelihood Support Mechanism designed under revised Component 2 sets out to establish a mechanism which can also be used by the private sector to channel private sector revenues to local communities.Revised Cpt 3 Outputs relate to the long-term Monitoring & Evaluation Framework that will track socio-economic and ecological indicators of change as a result of various interventions in the project area. |
| **Outputs from component 4** | a) A M&E system is established and operational for the projectb) Sequenced reports from project implementation are produced. | None | PIFStage Cpt 4 outputs are now under revised Cpt. 3. |

**part v: Agency(ies) certification**

|  |
| --- |
| This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO Endorsement. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Agency Coordinator, Agency name | Signature | Date *(Month, day, year)* | Project Contact Person | Telephone | Email Address |
| Karin ShepardsonGEF Agency Executive Coordinator | KarinSignature | 01/31/2012 | Paola AgostiniRegional CoordinatorAfrica Region | (202) 473 7620  | pagostini@worldbank.org |

**Annex A: Project Results Framework**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Development Objective (PDO):**  | ***The Project Development Objective is to improve the conservation and management of*** ***core areas within the Ngoyla Mintom forest massif and improve access to income-generating activities for local communities.*** |
| **Indicator** | **Core** | **Unit of Measure** | **Baseline** | **Cumulative Target Values\*\*** | **Frequency** | **Data Source/****Methodology** | **Responsibility for Data Collection** | **Description (indicator definition etc.)** |
| **YR 1** | **YR 2** | **YR3** | **YR 4** | **YR5** |
| **PDO LEVEL RESULTS INDICATORS\*** |
| ***Indicator One:***GEF Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) score has increased by 50% over baseline value (26) for the core area by project closure**.** | [ ]  | # | 26 | 26 |  | 32 |  | 40 | Biennial | METT evaluation reports. | MINFOF PIU team / WWF. | GEF Biodiversity Project Tracking Tool for SO1 will be used. Baseline METT is 26. 50% improvement means METT = 40 by project closure.  |
| ***Indicator Two:*** Conservation & management of Core Area:***(a):*** Draft Decree for Classification of core area is prepared, validated and submitted by MINFOF to Prime Minister’s Office for endorsement.  | [ ]  | Yes/No |  | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | End of Project | Draft Classification Decree. Reception letter from authorities | MINFOF PIU team. | Draft Decree is prepared by MINFOF, validated according to legal procedure and submitted by MINFOF to Prime Minister’s Office for endorsement.  |
|  ***(b):*** Draft Management Plan for core area is drafted, validated and submitted to Ministry of Forestry for adoption. |  | Yes/No |  | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | End of Project | Draft Management plan. Reception letter from Minister. | MINFOF PIU team. | Draft Management Plan is prepared, validated according to legal procedure and submitted MINFOF for adoption. |
| ***Indicator Three:*** Direct project beneficiaries  | [x]  | #  | 0 | 200 | 400 | 600 | 800 | 1,000 | Annual | Records of No. people benefiting from all components of the project; | As above | 10% of population is expected to benefit from the project.  |
|  | of which female | [x]  | % | 0% | 50% | 50% | 50% | 50% | 50% | Annual | As above | As above  | Approx 50% of local population are female. |
| **INTERMEDIATE RESULTS** |
| **Intermediate Result (Component One): Strengthen government entities and civil society capacity for participatory planning and management of the core areas;** |
| *Intermediate Result Indicator One:* Number of stakeholder platform(s) meetings at which key stakeholders are **adequately represented**.  | *[ ]*  | # | 0 | *2* | *4* | *6* | *8* | *10* | Annual | Meeting reports including analysis of participation at each meeting.  | Contracted project Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist.  | Minimum of one meeting per divisional platform (Ngoyla and Mintom) per year. Number of meetings of multi-stakeholder Platform(s) at which an assessment of levels of participation of stake-holder groups meets target participation levels.Adequate representation means: At least 30% of participants are women. At least 20% of participants are indigenous people. |
| *Intermediate Result indicator Two:* Communications strategy is developed and adopted and is being implemented. | [ ]  | Yes/No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Annual | Strategy; Minutes of meeting to adopt the strategy; progress reports.  | Contracted project Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist.  | Strategy will be endorsed by members of multi-stakeholder platforms and adopted by MINFOF.  |
| **Intermediate Result (Component Two):** **Design and implement a Livelihood Support Mechanism (LSM*)***  |
| *Intermediate Result indicator One:* Number of villages that have a Local Development Plan (LDPs) adopted by a duly formed “Local Committee.”  | [ ]  | # | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 25 | 30 | Annual | Minutes of Local Committee’s Planning Meetings. Copies of adopted LDPs.  | Livelihood Support Mechanism Manager with Contracted project M&E Specialist.  | LDPs adopted by Local Committees (sensu Arrêté 520) in 30 out of the 60 villages in the project area. NB 1 LDP may cover more than one village. |
| *Intermediate Result indicator Two:* Number of successful community based Natural Resource Management pilot initiatives with key forest user groups that have been financed by the Livelihood Support Mechanism. | [ ]  | % | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Annual | Activity reports. Technical audit of LSM (1 at mid-term and one at end of project) to assess the success of the pilot initiatives funded by LSM in terms of sustainability and replicability. *NB see also PDO level results indicator No.3 for monitoring of LSM impacts.*  | Livelihood Support Mechanism Manager with contracted Project M&E Specialist.  | 1 pilot Community based Natural Resource Management initiative launched with priority forest user group per year. **Hunters are a priority group that must be included from start of project.** |
| *Intermediate Result indicator Three:* Number of people benefiting from the Livelihood Support Mechanism, in the form of:alternative income generating activities (IGAs) | [ ]  | # of people | 0 | 100 | 200 | 300 | 400 | 500 | Annual | Socio-economic monitoring data, census data, local population surveys / interviews.Records of beneficiaries and type / value of benefits from LSM. | Contracted project M&E Specialist, who may obtain data from multiple sources, including WWF socio-economic surveys | 10,200 community members live in the vicinity of Ngoyla Mintom. 10% will benefit directly from the Livelihood Support Mechanism: 5% in form of IGAs |
| Socio-economic infrastructure  | [ ]  | # of people | 0 | 100 | 200 | 300 | 400 | 500 | Annual | As above | As above | 5% in form of socio-economic infrastructure |
|  | of which indigenous people. | [ ]  | % | 0% | 30% | 30% | 30% | 30% | 30% | Annual | As above | As above | Approx 30% of local population are IPs. Screening must ensure that they benefit equitably from LSM. |
| **Intermediate Result (Component Three): Design and implement a long term Monitoring and Evaluation System for the Ngoyla-Mintom Forest Massif; and Project Management.** |
| *Intermediate Result indicator Two:* Long term, socio-economic and ecological change monitoring and evaluation framework established including baselines, and progress data that monitors functioning in the core area. . | *[ ]*  | Yes/No | No |  | *Yes* |  |  |  | At mid-term review | M&E framework. Baseline data and re-measurement data and analysis reports | MINFOF PIU team and contracted Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist. | Socio-economic and ecological change M&E framework designed. Baseline and progress data collected by end of Years 1, 3 and 5. Re-measurement and analysis of socio-economic change done by end of project. M&E results will continue to serve as a baseline for long-term monitoring. |

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

1. **Comments in the GEFSEC Review Sheet**

***Part 1 - (Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion*** *(September 08, 2009)*

*Comment 1: Please, confirm and increase the cofinancing. The average ratio for a FSP under the CBSP is at least 1:3. Depending on the involvement of private partners and NGOs, the ratio should be improved at CEO endorsement.*

**Response: The cofinancing ratio has been increased.**

*Comment 2: Confirm the budget breakdown per component;*

**Response: The budget per component is indicated clearly in the project description annex (Annex 2) and the Incremental cost annex (Annex 7) of the project document.**

*Comment 3: Confirm partnerships for the implementation;*

**Response: Confirmed and detailed in the Project document and CEO Memo.**

*Comment 4: Provide an M&E plan with a baseline.*

**Response: M&E is now a key feature in the project. Please refer to component 3 and Annex 3 of the project document. The Results framework which is central to the M&E includes baseline and target indicators. A draft M&E plan will be prepared by the beneficiary with the other projects active on the ground during the remainder of the project preparation, with a view to harmonizing the M&E Framework and distributing responsibilities for specific data acquisition and analysis between project partners.**

*Comment 5: Include the BD METT.*

**Response: Tracking Tools are included.**

*Comment 6: Include a particular attention to the indigenous people issue.*

**Response: An Indigenous People’s Plan was prepared, and has highlighted the limited benefits that IPs have received from previous interventions. The Livelihood Support Mechanism establishes an explicit quota for investment of 30% of the project funds to support projects that benefit IPs that will be closely monitored under the M&E system. Further, the project is designed to make particular efforts to communicate the benefits and potential risks of the project to IPs so that they can participate in consultations relating to the selection of classification and of management options for the area with a clear understanding of the potential implications.**

*Comment 7: Confirm the consistency with other GEF projects (UNDP/Sustainable financing, WB/REDD).*

**Response: Clear linkages have been drawn to both the above mentioned projects.**

**At the national level, there are close links with the National REDD+ preparation process and the project will benefit from coordination with the Regional REDD+ Project[[7]](#footnote-7) whose Component 3 will support REDD+ project developers in the region with targeted capacity building and information exchange. There are opportunities for Cameroon as a participating country to benefit from capacity building initiatives at both the national and regional level. Formal links with other parallel projects in the area (GEF TRIDOM, and the GEF Regional Protected Area Sustainable Financing Projects) will be secured to explore potential long-term financing mechanism for Ngoyla-Mintom.**

*Comment 8: Include explanations on the way to involve the Private Sector (logging and mining companies).*
**Response: During project preparation, the Task Team has consulted regularly with mining companies operating in the area, and with the Cameroon Syndicate of Wood Industries about their members’ interest in the area.**

**Further, the project has developed close cooperation with the forthcoming World Bank Mining Sector Capacity Building Project (see also Part 2, Section E above). Coordination with the IDA funded Mining Sector Capacity Building project is strategic, since this project has put some focus on the development of the so-called ‘southern corridor’ which passes through Ngoyla Mintom area, and *inter alia* will put emphasis on “integration of mining into local/regional development.”**

**Both the WWF and TRIDOM operations are committed to securing sustainable financing mechanisms for the Ngoyla Mintom forest, and WWF is already working closely with the Mining Sector to explore potential financing of conservation offsets in the Ngoyla-Mintom area.**

***Part 2 - Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement (FSP)/Approval (MSP)*** *(Jan 20, 2012)*

Response to outstanding issues:

Qu.5. Does the Agency have a comparative advantage for the project?

Comment:

Information about the WB resource and the staff in-country have been provided. Details on how the team will assist the country in the project implementation will be useful.

**Response: the team in country will assist the Government on a weekly basis during project implementation. In fact supervision by staff based in the field allows for continuous support to GoC.**

9. Is the project design sound, its framework consistent & sufficiently clear (in particular for the outputs)?

Comments:

The expected outcomes and outputs of the request for CEO endorsement are not well formulated. For example, it is expected

from the outcomes to be measurable. A rewording will be higlhy appreciated. The indicators developed in Annex A are interesting.

- Component 1: all outputs linked to capacity building have been included in the component 1. Please, provide the rational

and the added-value of the Socio-economic analysis suggested in this component with regards to the long-term M&E developed in

component 3.

- Component 2:The GEF contribution is almost the same (increased of $6,000 from the previous proposal) but $1.1 million of

this amount will be dedicated to the financing of micro-projects.

- Component 3: On the Request for CEO Endorsement, remove the project management activity from the project

framework. A specific table (table F) is dedicated to it

**Response: A special task force from the Bank M& E group worked on the indicators to make sure they were SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound).**

**Component 1 Socio-economic analysis is different from the work done under M&E, since the former is a study to look at the potential impact on livelihood of different management option for the protected areas, while the latter is just measuring actual impact of the project.**

**Component 3. Project Management has been removed from the framework.**

19. Is the GEF funding level of project management budget appropriate?

Comment: We understand that the GEF amount for Project Management Cost is now $177,000. Clarification are required concerning the $25,000 allocated to training workshops, platform as the cost of these activities have already been allocated in

component 1 and 2

**Response: . The training under Project Management, relates to Project Management specific skills such as Project Cycle, Indicators, Disbursement, Financial Management, Procurement and so it is different from the training under Component 1 and 2.**

20. Is the GEF funding level of other cost items (consultants, travel, etc.) appropriate?

Comment: Addressed but the rational to not use the project vehicles to transport local consultants should be provided

**Response: The number of project’s cars will not be enough to be used also by short term consultant. For the short term consultant use if a lot more efficient to rent a car for the few weeks needed, than buying a car to drive them around.**22. Are the confirmed co-financing amounts adequate for each project component?

Comment: With regards to the GEF Guidelines for Project Financing, approved by the GEF Council last October, the cofinancing from IDA, UICN, OPFCR, SNV, and WWF are not elligible. In their official letters, we understand that these

organiszations will provide parallel financing. Please, clarify this point, check the accuracy of the amount suggested in the official letter with the amount presented in Table B of the Request for CEO Endorsement and send the adequate cofinancing letters. A clarification is also requested in the project proposal as these organizations are both quoted as cofinancier and as other related initiatives.

Response

**Response:**  **Parallel finance as used by the Bank just refers to co-financing managed "in concert with" the Bank managed funds but under separate disbursement arrangements. There has never been an issue with cofinancing needing to flow directly through World Bank disbursement mechanisms to be included in a GEF project. Even in "fully" blended Bank projects (same disbursement systems), the Bank funds are often not the only cofinancing. IDA baseline funds in this case are provided through two World Bank IDA credits supporting work in the Ngoyla Forest as described in provided letters. All the cofinancing is fully supported by letters, which spell out in some detail how the activities are relevant for underpinning the GEF part and where a set of donor and government activities act in concert around the Ngoyla Mintom Forest, without which the GEF support would not be able to proceed.**

26.Items worth noting at CEO Endorsement.

Comment:As mentioned in the project proposal, there are a number of projects operating in the area, in this regards more information on the partnerships and the way to optimize the implementation would be appreciated. The indigenous peoples and gender issues should be better addressed.

**Response. The World Bank task team working on this project is also working on the National REDD Strategy and the Regional REDD GEF projects, so the partnership is embedded in the project itself. The Team helds also regular meetings with Donors where all other related initiatives are coordinated. A full Indigenous People (IP) Development Plan and a Social Assessment have been prepared for this project in accordance with World Bank safeguard policies. These documents have been disclosed at World Bank Infoshop and in country. They addresses IP issues and gender issues.**

1. **Comments from STAP**

*Comment 1. The Panel stresses the importance of coordination amongst agencies as they develop project concepts and full proposals under the CBSP program in order to add value compared to project-by-project programming. For example, this project refers to its parent program only briefly and the full project proposal should expand on this, including how this project will link with the proposed project on “A regional Focus on Sustainable Timber Management in the Congo Basin” (PIF 3822, UNEP), which envisages including Cameroon in its regional activities.*

**Response: The Project is not going to invest in the parts of the Ngoyla-Mintom forest which are designated for industrial timber harvesting in the proposed Land Use Plan (being prepared by MINFOF with WWF and GEF TRIDOM project support).**

**However, there is a strong consensus between project partners, including the Ministry, that any company that is allocated a forest concession in the area to commit to certification of their operations early on. All such concession holders, and any council forests established within the area will be encouraged to work with the Regional Project, but noting that there a number of new national and regional certification initiatives that may also be able to support private sector, council forests and community forests to work towards certification (such as the new Congo Basin Program (**[**www.congobasinprogram.com**](http://www.congobasinprogram.com)**). Note that support to Community Forests to pursue Certification in the project area is already well funded through other initiatives (SNV, Rainforest Alliance) with which the project has established co-financing agreements.**

*Comment 2. The full project should include an account of the methodology to be used in defining the core zone, on a basis of its high global biodiversity benefits, from the rest of the Managed Resource Protected Area.*

**Response: The initial definition of the proposed core zone will be done during the Land Use Planning / Zoning process that will be completed by the already existing (WWF/EU and GEF TRIDOM) projects. Their approach is based on data collection and analysis of its biodiversity (coverage of any unique or vulnerable habitats, and faunal populations) and the contribution of the core zone to the connectivity with the neighboring three protected areas.**

**Within the context of this GEF Project, the final definition of the precise boundaries and legal status of the core zone will be based on detailed consultations with local communities, analysis of potential socio-economic impacts of the project on their livelihoods and customary rights. These consultations will be based on clearly presented prior information that will be made available to all stakeholders prior to and during consultations. The methodology is laid out in Component 1.**

1. **Comments from GEF Council**

 ***COMMENTS FROM FRANCE***
**Opinion: favourable, with the following remark to take into account during project preparation:**

*Comment 1: The involvement of the WWF and World Bank is a guarantee of success, but the cost effectiveness of the overall project will need to de strongly improved.***Response: The Project cost-effectiveness has been improved by ensuring a clear distinction of roles between the different project partners, and through commitment to the establishment of a single Steering Committee and annual planning process, to ensure that priority activities are funded, without overlaps, and that there is an efficient structure for project management. Finally, the available budget for the project (even including all project contributions) is relatively limited (less than $2 per ha per year) and long-term success will only be achieved by securing much more significant and sustainable sources of funding. Such opportunities will be explored by sister projects with private sector (REDD financiers, Mining Companies, Logging Companies)**

*Comment 2: Indeed, it’s not clear as for now that the private sector investments in the region could sufficiently contribute to the sustainable financing of all the conservation activities required conserving the Ngoyla Mintom Forest complex.*

**Response: The EIA and ESMP of the Iron Ore Mine to the south of the area makes a commitment to invest about $0.7m per annum into conservation of at least part of the Ngoyla-Mintom Forest massif. Other mining companies to the East and West of the Ngoyla-Mintom massif are also showing interest and have included similar commitments to funding biodiversity offsets within their ESMP. REDD project developers are already preparing feasibility studies for the Ngoyla-Mintom massif. This does not guarantee that the final funds will be available but there is strong interest from the private sector to take part in some form of conservation offsets of their operations, with conservation investments focusing on Ngoyla-Mintom.**

*Comment 3: Assess the sustainable financing need to conserve the Ngoyla Mintom Forest complex and the capacity of the private sector to effectively contribute to the amount needed.*

**Response: Sustainable financing needs will be addressed during project implementation (drafting Management Plan - sub-Component 1.3). The activities relating to establishment of a Sustainable Financing Mechanism have been dropped, since they are already being addressed by other already funded projects, and will need more resources than this project can provide, given more immediate needs to build Government and Civil Society capacity to secure and manage the area. The potential of Mining companies to contribute effectively to conservation depends on them becoming active, but the Iron Ore mine to the south envisages a $1.5billion annual surplus after year 4. Negotiation of a good mining convention and cultivating a strong commitment from the Mining Industry will be instrumental in securing adequate financing for conservation. Close linkages are therefore being built with the WB’s Mining Sector Capacity Building project, which is critical in this regard.**

***COMMENTS FROM GERMANY***

*Comment 4: Specific measures should be conceived that take into consideration that land-use planning and classification of protected areas and forests go beyond the mandate of the ministry in charge of forests. The government of Cameroon could outline how the institutional sustainability of land-use planning results can be achieved (e.g. improved classification process and attribution of land titles).*

**Response: The team agrees with the observation that this Project cannot guarantee the final classification of the forest. The Ministry responsible for Land Use Planning (Ministry of Economy, Planning and Regional Development - MINEPAT) have been consulted with closely during project preparation and will be permanent members of the Project Steering Committee, which will also oversee the implementation of the Land Use Planning phase that will be funded by the GEF TRIDOM and WWF / EU Ngoyla-Mintom Projects. MINEPAT see Ngoyla-Mintom as a pilot area to test and interpret the recently promulgated Law on Land Management.**
Annex c: consultants to be hired for the project using gef resources

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Position Titles*** | ***$/******person week\**** | ***Estimated person weeks\*\**** | ***Tasks to be performed*** |
| **For Project Management** |  |  |  |
| *Local* |
| Technical and Financial Audits | 2,000 | 50 | Undertake Annual Financial Audits (lumpsum payment). Conduct technical evaluations (at mid-term and closure)  |
| *International* |
| Financial management and Procurement specialists | 3,000 | 10 | Train PIU and other project staff in Bank Financial Management and Procurement Procedures (before Project start and ongoing)  |
| *Justification for Travel, if any:* No travel costs are required for project management beyond in-country travel which will be assured by project vehicle whenever available. Travel allowances of HQ based management team to the field will be covered by MINFOF counterpart funds.  |
| **For Technical Assistance** |  |  |  |
| *Local* |  |  |  |
| 1.1 Participatory natural Resource Management Specialists  | 1,500 | 30 | Train MINFOF and other key Agencies in WB Safeguard Policies and the National legal framework for Environmental and Social Protection; effective consultations during classification processes; participatory natural resource management;  |
| 1.1 Civil Society Capacity Building Specialist | 2,000 | 10 | Strengthen institutional capacity of Local Civil Society Organizations / NGOs to perform watchdog / whistleblower functions |
| 1.1 Participatory Wildlife Management specialist | 2,000 | 4 | Definition and implementation of a local convention on organization of hunting which clearly defines how hunting will be regulated by the project in the Ngoyla-Mintom massif - required by Indigenous People's Plan. |
| 1.1 Communication Specialists | 1000 | 48 | a) Prepare and implement a Consultation Framework - Study of existing frameworks for land use planning, classification, management planning, and Project Monitoring / Evaluation to prepare a roadmap and identify appropriate processes and mechanisms for consultation consistent with Cameroon Law and Bank Policies.b) Prepare and implement a Communications Strategy that disseminates relevant information to all stakeholders (local, national, international) about the project. |
| 1.2 Socio-economic analysis specialist | 2000 | 1020 | 1. Conduct Socio-economic analysis of the likely financial, social, environmental and other costs / benefits (participation, sense of ownership, changes in access rights, etc) that result from different land tenure and use options.
2. Conduct surveys to assess broad community acceptance of the classification proposals and draft management plans before adoption
 |
| 1.3 Participatory Management Planning specialists | 1,600 | 120 | Support to the classification process: material, labour and professional costs of opening, demarcating and surveying of boundaries; Support to the forest management planning process for priority areas forest (inventory costs; participatory mapping and all activities related to the preparation of management plans for the priority sites selected for classification). |
| 1.3 Archaeologist / Cultural heritage expert | 1,600 | 6 | Conduct a study for the identification and protection of sacred and archaeological sites and (from ESMP). |
| 2.1 Rural Development Specialist / Management Agency (full time staff + Management fees) | 1,000 | 240 | Contract a Rural Development Specialist / Management Agency to manage the Livelihood Support Mechanism (all of Component 2). |
| 2.2. Independent Technical and financial Auditor (National Consultant) | 2000 | 16 | Independent Technical and Financial Audit of Component 2 (Livelihood Support Mechanism) with a view to developing subsequent scaling-up recommendations. |
| 3.1 Monitoring & Evaluation Specialist | 2,000 | 18 | Hire M&E specialist to set up M&E system and provide Coaching to data collectors |
| 3.1 M&E field data collectors | 600 | 50 | Baseline and subsequent data collection in (changes in forest cover and quality) and Socio-economic monitoring |
| *International* |  |  |  |
| 1.2 Socio-economic analysis specialist | 3000 | 10 | Conduct Socio-economic analysis of the likely financial, social, environmental and other costs / benefits (participation, sense of ownership, changes in access rights, etc) that result from different land tenure and use options.  |
| 2.2. Independent Technical and financial Auditor (International Consultant) | 3000 | 16 | Independent Technical and Financial Audit of Component 2 (Livelihood Support Mechanism) with a view to developing subsequent scaling-up recommendations. |
| Justification for Travel, if any: Travel costs included in above consultancy costs for all consultants. An additional $22,500 budget for international travel is included to allow Project Staff to attend international trainings, coordination meetings and short study tours relating to innovative conservation management |

\* Provide dollar rate per person week. \*\* Total person weeks needed to carry out the tasks.

N.B. Local consultants cost on average between $300 and $500 per day, depending on level. Any perdiems during field missions have to be added to this.

**Additional Information requested:**

Detailed breakdown of costs for HQ office facilities and equipment under sub-Component 3.2

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Unit** | **Unit Cost** | **Number** | **Total** |
| Furniture | Lumpsum |  |  | 4,000 |
| Computers | Computer | 1,000 | 3 | 3,000 |
| Printers |  | 500 | 3 | 1,500 |
| Software licenses (MS Office, Tompro accounting | Lumpsum |  |  | 4,000 |
| Photocopier | Item | 2,000 | 1 | 2,000 |
| Internet connection installation | Item | 500 | 1 | 500 |
| Miscellaneous | Lumpsum |  |  | 3,000 |
| HQ Office operational costs (Stationery, Communications, etc) | month | 300 | 60 | 18,000 |
|  |  |  | TOTAL | 36,000 |

**Annex d: status of implementation of project preparation activities and the use of funds**

1. **explain if the ppg objective has been achieved through the ppg activities undertaken.**

The proposed preparatory activities aimed to determine the most effective and cost-efficient design to achieve the project objectives, which has been achieved. The context analysis has been done by the Ministry in consultation with the Task Team preparing the project, and co-financed studies done by partners (WWF, TRIDOM). The results of the preparatory activities led to the adjustment of the project design to ensure that client needs were being met and impacts were measurable at the end of the project. A draft Prime-Ministerial Decision to create a Technical Operations Unit has been drafted.

Four Environmental & Social management safeguard instruments have been prepared in consultation on both the Project Design, and the content of the associated safeguard instruments. These consultations required a substantial investment in preparation and additional consultancy time to allow the authors of the reports to return to the field. Two public meetings were held in the field to present the project and all safeguard documents to all project stakeholders for their comment and adoption.

Consultants have been contracted to draft the Project Implementation Manual, which is being prepared in full consultation with the Project Implementation team before project start date. Consultants are preparing a draft manual for the Long-term M&E Framework, and a draft set of guiding principles for the Operational Procedures of the Livelihood support mechanism, (foreseen under 2 below). All PPG funds have been committed and will be disbursed by Bank Board approval.

1. **describe findings that might affect the project design or any concerns on project implementation, if any: N/A**
2. **provide detailed funding amount of the ppg activities and their implementation status in the table below:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Project Preparation Activities Approved*** | ***Implementation Status*** | ***GEF Amount ($)*** | ***Co-financing******($)*** |
|  |  | ***Amount Approved*** | ***Amount Spent To date*** | ***Amount Committed*** | ***Uncommitted Amount\**** |  |
| **1. Context Assessment & Gap Analysis** | Complete | 0 |       |       |       | 25,000 |
| **2. Technical Studies** (draft Manual for M&E system & Livelihood Support Mechanism) | Yet to be completed | 54,950 |       | 4,500 |  | 45,000 |
| **3. Environmental and Social Management** | Complete | 14,500 | 40,532 | 1,197 |  | 37,000 |
| **4. Consultative Participatory Process** | Complete | 7,250 | 16,170 |  |       | 10,000 |
| Prepare Project Implementation Manual | Yet to be completed |       |       | 14,300 |       |       |
| **Total** |  | 76,700 | 56,703 | 19,997 |  | 117,000 |

\* Any uncommitted amounts should be returned to the GEF Trust Fund. This is not a physical transfer of money, but achieved through reporting and netting out from disbursement request to Trustee. Please indicate expected date of refund transaction to Trustee.

**annex e: calendar of expected reflows - Non Applicable**

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

1. By 2011, Cameroon had established 18 National Parks covering 2.9m hectares, 7 Wildlife Reserves covering 702,000 hectares, and 4 Wildlife Sanctuaries covering 142,000 hectares. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Based on recent estimates made by WWF, and studies conducted during project preparation, the population of the Ngoyla-Mintom massif is approximately 10,200 persons in 60 villages, of which 30% are Baka Pygmies. This is much larger than was originally estimated in the Project Identification Form (PIF): 10,200 rather than 1,000 people. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Indicative land use Framework for the Southern Forested Area of Cameroon (1995). Decree No.95-466-PM. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. MINFOF staffs consulted include the Secretary General, the Director of General Affairs, Director of Forestry, Director of Wildlife & Protected Areas, and the Director of the Cooperation and Programming. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. MINEP staff consulted include the Secretary General, the Director of Norms and Control [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. MINEPAT staffs consulted include the Directorate of Cooperation, and the Director of Land Management. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The GEF funded *Congo Basin: Enhancing Institutional Capacities on REDD Issues for Sustainable Forest Management* (P113167). The Project development objective is “to strengthen the capacities of the Congo Basin countries on REDD+ issues and on forest carbon stock measurements”. It includes 3 components: Improving knowledge and coordination on REDD + in the Congo Basin; Building technical capacities for measurement & monitoring of carbon stocks in the Congo Basin forests; Mainstreaming REDD+ concept in SFM projects. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)