



GEF-6 REQUEST FOR PROJECT ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: FULL SIZE PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TF

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

| | | | |
|--|--|---|-----------------|
| Project Title: Participative Integrated Ecosystem Services Management Plans for Bakassi Post Conflict Ecosystems (PINESMAP-BPCE) | | | |
| Country (ies): | Cameroon | GEF Project ID: ¹ | 4739 |
| GEF Agency (ies): | UNEP | GEF Agency Project ID: | 00855 |
| Other Executing Partner(s): | Ministry of Environment, Nature Protection & Sustainable Development (MINEPDED) in partnership with: CHEDE Cooperative Union Ltd., Participatory National Development Programme (PNDP) | Re-Submission Date: | October 5, 2016 |
| GEF Focal Area (s): | Biodiversity | Project Duration (Months) | 48 |
| Integrated Approach Pilot | IAP-Cities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Commodities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Food Security <input type="checkbox"/> | Corporate Program: SGP <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Name of Parent Program | NA | Agency Fee (\$) | 252,032 |

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

| Focal Area Objectives | Expected FA Outcomes | Expected FA Outputs | Trust Fund | Grant Amount (\$) | Cofinancing (\$) |
|---|---|---|------------|-------------------|------------------|
| BD2-Mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes, and seascapes and sectors | Outcome 2.1: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation | Output 2.1: Policies and regulatory frameworks for production landscape in Bakassi ecosystems Output 2.2: Land-use plans that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation for Bakassi ecosystems | GEF TF | 2,652,968 | 13,600,000 |
| Total project costs | | | | 2,652,968 | 13,600,000 |

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

| Project Objective: To ensure biodiversity conservation and sustainable use and improved management of Bakassi ecosystems through integrated ecosystem management plans including ecosystem valuation | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|---|---|------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Project Components / Programs | Financing Type ³ | Project Outcomes | Project Outputs | Trust Fund | (in \$) | |
| | | | | | GEF Project Financing | Confirmed Co-financing |
| 1. Institutional and stakeholder capacity building to be able to engage in the development and implementation of the IESMP | TA | 1.1. An enhanced policy, institutional and technical environment to develop Integrated Ecosystem Services Management Plans (IESMP) in Bakassi mangrove ecosystems | 1.1.1 – Policy, regulatory and institutional frameworks are amended to integrate sustainable management of mangrove ecosystems into the existing Forest Law, and regulations governing fisheries and land zoning and use 1.1.2 - At least 1 inter-institutional coordination mechanism for integrated management of Bakassi area is established 1.1.3 – A conflict risk and mitigation plan is developed and implement and the capacity the | GEFTF | 678,102 | 4,200,000 |

¹ Project ID number remains the same as the assigned PIF number.

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

³ Financing type can be either investment or technical assistance.

| | | | | | | |
|--|----------|--|---|-------|-----------|------------|
| | | | existing Land Consultative Committees is enhanced | | | |
| 2. Participative and inclusive development and implementation of IESMP | TA / INV | 2.1. Integrated Ecosystems Services Management plans that include mangrove forests conservation and mainstreaming in Bakassi forest ecosystems developed and implemented through cross sectorial participatory processes that facilitate increased investments and adoption by local communities | 2.1.1 - Integrated Ecosystem Services Management Plan (IESMP) developed and under implementation, that increases the % of mangrove land cover and the conservation of aquatic biodiversity 2.1.2 - Livelihood options that enhance ecosystem management and biodiversity conservation are tested and promoted in at least three different sites 2.1.3 – Bakassi Ecosystem Foundation established in order to support of implementation of the IESM plan 2.1.4 - One viable and sustainable multi-stakeholder consultation, communication, interaction and decision-making framework that links clearly to IESMP is established in the Bakassi area | GEFTF | 1,505,318 | 6,100,000 |
| 3. Knowledge management, monitoring and evaluation | TA | 3.1. Increased knowledge products, inter-stakeholders sharing of knowledge and understanding of mangrove forest and terrestrial ecosystem services to foster the development and implementation of the IESMP. | 3.1.1 - IEC plan is developed, learning and necessary knowledge development established, training package developed to build capacity for IESMP implementation 3.1.2 – Key indicators to monitor changes in socio-economic impacts and environmental conditions under the Bakassi IESMP developed, tested and approved by all stakeholders 3.1.3 - Project monitoring and evaluation system in place | GEFTF | 343,216 | 2,050,000 |
| Subtotal | | | | | 2,526,636 | 12,350,000 |
| Project Management Cost (PMC)⁴ | | | | GEFTF | 126,332 | 1,250,000 |
| Total project costs | | | | | 2,652,968 | 13,600,000 |

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

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form.

| Sources of Co-financing | Name of Co-financier | Type of Cofinancing | Amount (\$) |
|-------------------------|--|---|-------------|
| Recipient Government | Government of Cameroon (MINEPDED) | In-Kind | 1,500,000 |
| Recipient Government | Participatory National Development Programme (PNDP) | Grants | 3,000,000 |
| Recipient Government | Regional Department of Mines | In-Kind | 25,000 |
| Recipient Government | Regional Department of Planning (MINEPAT/SE) | In-Kind | 1,550,000 |
| UNEP Programme of Work | Disaster and Conflict Africa Coordination | In-kind | 125,000 |
| Councils | Centre Technique de Foresterie Communale (CTFC) | In-kind | 750,000 |
| CSO | Nature Cameroon (South West Region) | In-kind | 200,000 |
| CSO | Cameroon Wildlife Conservation Society (CWCS) | Grants | 500,000 |
| CSO | Cameroon Wildlife Conservation Society (CWCS) | In-Kind | 1,000,000 |
| CSO | Organisation Pour l'Environnement et le Développement Durable (OPED) | In-kind (Offices, Technical Staff, vehicle) | 1,000,000 |
| CSO | Cameroon Ecology | Grants | 350,000 |
| CSO | Cameroon Ecology | In-kind | 500,000 |
| CSO | FIDEPE | In-kind | 600,000 |
| CSO | Environment and Rural Development Foundation (ERuDeF) | In-Kind | 500,000 |

⁴ For GEF Project Financing up to \$2 million, PMC could be up to 10% of the subtotal; above \$2 million, PMC could be up to 5% of the subtotal. PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project financing amount in Table D below.

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|---------|-------------------|
| CSO | Environment and Rural Development Foundation (ERuDeF) | Grants | 500,000 |
| Private Sector | CHEDE | Grants | 500,000 |
| Private Sector | CHEDE | In-kind | 1,000,000 |
| Total Co-financing | | | 13,600,000 |

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

| GEF Agency | Trust Fund | Country Name/Global | Focal Area | Programming of Funds | (in \$) | | |
|------------------------------|------------|---------------------|------------|----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | | GEF Project Financing (a) | Agency Fee ^{a)} (b) | Total (c) = a+b |
| UNEP | GEF TF | Cameroon | BD | | 2,652,968 | 252,032 | 2,905,000 |
| Total Grant Resources | | | | | 2,652,968 | 252,032 | 2,905,000 |

a) Refer to the Fee Policy for GEF Partner Agencies

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

| Component | Grant Amount (\$) | Co-Financing (\$) | Project Total (\$) |
|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| International Consultants | 100,000 | 40,000 | 140,000 |
| National/Local Consultants | 272,000 | 650,000 | 922,000 |

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? N/A

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

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF⁵

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

The adoption by the Government in January 2015 of the National Strategy for the Sustainable Management of Mangroves: The Strategy which has an Action Plan has as vision stated as “By 2035, the mangroves and all coastal ecosystems of Cameroon are conserved, protected and managed in participative manner and contribute to maintain the ecological balance and the population livelihoods. The objective is the sustainable management of mangrove and coastal ecosystem and to stop and reverse the degradation trend of these ecosystems to sustain and develop their ecological, social and economic functions.

The existing Rural Development Strategy prioritizes food security, green agriculture, improving management of protected areas, and implementation of Environmental and Social Impact Assessments (ESIA) for integrated ecosystem management. The Growth and Employment Strategy Paper (GESP) focuses on biodiversity promotion and conservation as one of the targets to achieve Sustainable Development Goals (SDG), in particular the *Goal 1* relating to the ending of poverty in all its forms everywhere, and *Goal 5* relating to gender equality an empowerment of women and girls. Cameroon’s National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) identify the need to reinforce knowledge of biodiversity resources and their potential for sustainable management by local communities. The National Protected Areas and Wildlife Strategy and the Biodiversity Vision for Cameroon both put emphasis on the protection of mountain, coastal and marine ecosystems that are insufficiently represented in the protected areas network. The National Plan for Environmental Management (PNGE) seeks to develop policies, strategies and actions for environmental protection and rational management of resources to contribute to sustainable development, and identifies five priority areas: Participatory Land use Management, Sustainable Management of Natural Resources, Restoration of Degraded Land and Improvement of Soil Fertility, Capacity Building, and Concerted Management of Shared Resources at the sub-regional level. Cameroon

⁵ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF , no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

has produced its 5th Report to the CBD and its 2nd Report to the UNCCD. With the support of UNDP, a National Action Plan for Climate Change (PANA) has been adopted.

The new “Plan de Convergence” of COMIFAC 2015-2025, which has been adopted by Cameroon, promotes sustainable and consultative management of forest resources and the establishment of a network of representative protected area systems and ecosystems for livelihood and global environment conservation. The proposed project will contribute to several priority areas of the COMIFAC plan, including Axis 3 relating to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity; Axis 5 relating to socio-economic development and multi-actor participation; Axis 6 relating to sustainable financing; and to Cross-Cutting Axis 1 on training and capacity building and Cross-Cutting Axis 3 relating to communication, awareness raising, information and education. The 2009 Strategic Plan of the Central African Protected Area Network (RAPAC), an organ of COMIFAC, identified six priority programs, of which the following are supported by the proposed project: 1) Improving the overall quality of PA management; 3) Harmonization of management instruments and promotion of good governance; 4) Relevance and coherence of the PA network; and 5) Contribution of PAs to socio-economic development.

UNEP focus on integrating environmental sustainability in the UN Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs) and UN common country programming processes and some ongoing and planned projects. UNEP will take the opportunity to ensure full consideration of Bakassi Integrated ecosystem services management plan and therefore create opportunities for more resources from UN Agencies and their partners in support of the project long term objective and its contribution to SDG in Cameroon. The UNDAF Cameroon has been developed for the period of 2013 – 2017. In line with this framework, the project contributes to the Cooperation Axe No1: Support to a strong growth, sustainable and all-inclusive growth. The project contribute particularly to Outcome 1: By 2017, the national institutions develop and implement in participative manners policies and strategies favourable to sustainable development and the inclusive growth. The project will contribute to this outcome by supporting the Government of Cameroon to develop IESMP. The Government will therefore having adequate policy in place to managed sustainably the Bakassi landscape.

Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs): The international community has adopted in September 2015, through resolution of the General Assembly, the SDGs. The project through the planned development of Integrated Ecosystem Services Management Plan will contribute to SDG Goal 15: “Sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, halt and reverse land degradation, halt biodiversity loss”. The project will particularly contribute to the indicator 15.9 “by 2020, integrate ecosystems and biodiversity values into national and local planning, development processes and poverty reduction strategies, and accounts”. According to the stakeholders’ consultation group on SDG, even the developed countries have a mixed record in terms of protecting land, soil, forests, biodiversity and ecosystems both within their own countries and in the impact of their trade and investment in other parts of the world. More effort will be needed to achieve a sustainable situation and the specific targets proposed in this goal. Target 15.5 which urges countries to take urgent and significant action to reduce degradation of the natural habitat and halt biodiversity loss was identified as being particularly relevant and important.

The proposed project will contribute to a number of Aichi targets, as presented in the table below:

| Strategic goal | Indicators | Baseline | Project Target |
|--|---|---|---|
| <i>Goal A: Address the underlying causes of Biodiversity loss by mainstreaming biodiversity across government and society</i> | | | |
| Target 1: By 2020, at the latest, people are aware of the values of biodiversity and the steps they can take to conserve and use it sustainably. | <i>Trends in awareness and attitudes to biodiversity and ecosystem services (C)</i> <i>Trends in public engagement with biodiversity (C)</i> | Limited knowledge of socio-economic and environmental values within the Bakassi ecosystems. | Information management and sharing system established, and knowledge products (reports, lesson learned, policy briefs, etc.) developed and disseminated Biological and socio-economic indicators and monitoring methods developed and applied within local plans |
| Target 2: "By 2020, at the | <i>Trends in integration of</i> | Council Development | Council and Bakassi |

| Strategic goal | Indicators | Baseline | Project Target |
|---|---|--|---|
| latest, biodiversity values have been integrated into national and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes and are being incorporated into national accounting, as appropriate, and reporting systems" | <i>Biodiversity and ecosystem service values into sectoral and development policies (C)</i> | Plans and Bakassi development programme in place | development plans and programmes strengthened to reflect ecosystem services / biodiversity priorities Collaborative management enabled through Integrated Ecosystem Services Management Plan (IESMP) |
| Target 3: By 2020, at the latest, incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity are eliminated, phased out or reformed in order to minimize or avoid negative impacts, and positive incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity are developed and applied, consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other relevant international obligations, taking into account national socio economic conditions. | <i>Trends in identification, assessment and establishment and strengthening of incentives that reward positive contribution to biodiversity and ecosystem services and penalize adverse impacts (C)</i> | Penalties / incentives for conservation of biodiversity do not exist | Conservation incentives policy prepared and validated within the framework of the IESMP |
| Target 4: By 2020, at the latest, Governments, business and stakeholders at all levels have taken steps to achieve or have implemented plans for sustainable production and consumption and have kept the impacts of use of natural resources well within safe ecological limits. | <i>Ecological limits assessed in terms of sustainable production and consumption (C)</i> | No available information about natural resource extraction (mines, oil, gas, forest, fishing, etc.) in the project area, that could conflict with ecosystem management goals | Participatory and detailed mapping of land uses in the Bakassi area; analyses of ecosystem services and their potential economic value in the Bakassi area |
| Strategic Goal B. Reduce the direct pressures on Biodiversity and promote sustainable use | | | |
| Target 5: By 2020, the rate of loss of all natural habitats, including forests, is at least halved and where feasible brought close to zero, and degradation and fragmentation is significantly reduced | <i>Trends in condition and vulnerability of ecosystems (C)</i> <i>Trends in the proportion of natural habitats converted (C)</i> | Overharvesting of mangrove forests for energy and food production (smoking of fish) | Certification process on fish production, focused on the utilization of fish dryers and technologies for fish smoking that use less mangrove wood; establish community mangrove nurseries for reforestation of degraded areas |
| Target 7: By 2020 areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity. | <i>Trends in area of forest, agricultural and aquaculture ecosystems under sustainable management</i> <i>Trends in proportion of products derived from sustainable sources (C)</i> | Unsustainable levels of mangrove harvesting; agricultural expansion into natural habitats, due to lack of alternative livelihoods options | Farming practices and other livelihood activities supported by the project are more sustainable and profitable At least 50 CBOs confirm they have directly benefited from sustainable livelihood support At least 5 profitable and sustainable livelihood activities identified, tested and promoted in at least 3 pilot sites. |
| Strategic Goal C. To improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity, with | | | |

| Strategic goal | Indicators | Baseline | Project Target |
|--|---|---|---|
| <i>particular relevance to and</i> | | | |
| Target 11: By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes. | <p><i>Trends in extent of marine protected areas, coverage of key biodiversity areas and management effectiveness (A)</i></p> <p><i>Trends in representative coverage of protected areas and other area based approaches, including sites of particular importance for biodiversity, and of terrestrial, marine and inland water systems (A)</i></p> <p><i>Trends in the delivery of ecosystem services and equitable benefits from protected areas</i></p> | <p>Ndongore NP and Ramsar site are not gazetted and do not have management plans</p> <p>There are no adequate Environment and Social Safeguards to guide the establishment or management of protected areas</p> | <p>Gazettement of Ndongore NP and Rio del Rey Ramsar Site</p> <p>Guidelines for PA Management Plans that identify social impacts adopted and submitted to MINFOF for approval and action.</p> |
| Target 12: By 2020 the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has been improved and sustained. | Trends in abundance of selected species | <p>Ndongore NP and Ramsar site are not gazetted and do not have management plans</p> <p>There are no adequate Environment and Social Safeguards to guide the establishment or management of protected areas</p> | <p>Gazettement of Ndongore NP and Rio del Rey Ramsar Site</p> <p>Guidelines for PA Management Plans that identify social impacts adopted and submitted to MINFOF for approval and action.</p> |
| <i>Strategic Goal D: Enhance the benefits to all from biodiversity and ecosystem services</i> | | | |
| Target 14 - By 2020, ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being, are restored and safeguarded, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable. | <p><i>Trends in benefits that humans derive from selected ecosystem services (A)</i></p> <p><i>Trends in delivery of multiple ecosystem services (B)</i></p> <p><i>Trends in health and wellbeing of communities who depend directly on local ecosystem goods and services (B)</i></p> <p><i>Trends in the condition of selected ecosystem services (C)</i></p> | No specific guidelines for preparation of IESMP in context of preparing ecosystem management plans | IESMP developed and implemented in a participatory manner for sustainable management of natural resource and enhanced livelihoods |
| <i>Strategic Goal E: Enhance implementation through participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity-building</i> | | | |
| Target 18 - By 2020, the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and their customary use of biological resources, are respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations, and fully integrated and reflected in the implementation of the | Trends in land-use change and land tenure in the traditional territories of indigenous and local communities (B) | Existence of traditional modes of conflict resolution, but not adapted to the context of multi- use of natural resources management, a context characterised by the presence of several nationalities | Best practices on conflict management, including traditional mechanisms, are documented and serve as models for conflict resolution at local level |

| Strategic goal | Indicators | Baseline | Project Target |
|--|--|--|---|
| Convention with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, at all relevant levels. | | | |
| Target 19 - By 2020, knowledge, the science base and technologies relating to biodiversity, its values, functioning, status and trends, and the consequences of its loss, are improved, widely shared and transferred, and applied. | Trends in coverage of comprehensive policy-relevant sub-global assessments including related capacity-building and knowledge transfer, plus trends in uptake into policy (B) | Limited knowledge of the ecosystem services and environmental values within the Bakassi ecosystems | IEC (Information, Education and Communication) plan documents prepared, validated and implemented |

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

N/A

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage.

N/A

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

Based on documents review, findings of field review and various consultations conducted during project preparation, this section has been substantially modified since the PIF. In general terms, the approach of the project remains as proposed in the PIF with the same major Components. That said, the detailed incremental / additional cost reasoning for the project, and the sub-components have been adapted to the more in-depth analysis of the baseline situation that has been possible with the PPG, in particular the identification of substantial new funding for the project area that was not programmed at the time that the PIF was prepared; a rationalisation of proposed activities to fit with the limited budget for such a large area; and a careful analysis of the appropriate role of MINEDPED, which is the National Executing Agency for the Project.

1) The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addresses

Cameroon's geography ranges from Sahelian semi-desert in the north to the humid rainforest biome of the Congo Basin in the south, with a range of climatic and vegetative zones in between. Cameroon is endowed with significant natural resources, including oil, high value timber species, and agricultural products (cocoa, coffee, cotton, palm oil). Within Africa, the country is second only to the Democratic Republic of Congo in terms of biological diversity, with some 409 species of mammals (including half of Africa's 52 species of higher primates), 848 species of birds, 9,000 species of vascular plants (of which at least 156 are endemic), 171 species of amphibians, 210 species of reptiles, and 138 species of fish. Since 1995, Cameroon has expanded its protected area network from almost 2.25 million hectares to over 3.7 million ha. accounting for 8.11% of the country's land area. As of 2011, Cameroon had formally classified 8.72 million hectares as "Permanent Forest"; in addition, 3.12 million ha. have been declared as permanent forest but are still awaiting formal classification, and another 1.5 million ha. are planned to become permanent forest. Once completed, this would bring the total Permanent Forest estate to 13.4 million ha. In addition, the country has designated approximately 8 million hectares as "Production Forest", including 4.1 million ha. allocated for commercial logging, 3.2 million ha. that are in the process of competitive attribution for commercial logging, and a further 641,000 ha. planned for logging.

The project site is the Bakassi Peninsula, a cluster of islands located in the South West Region of Cameroon along the border with Nigeria (see Map 1). Bakassi is on the Gulf of Guinea and is sited between the Rio del Rey estuary in the east

and the Cross River estuary in the west. The population of Bakassi is estimated to be between 150,000 and 300,000 people. The primary productive sectors of the local economy are agriculture (commercial and subsistence farming), collection of NTFPs, hunting, fishing, livestock rearing and forestry. For the most part, men engage in fishing, while women predominate in agriculture (cultivating cocoyam, potatoes, cabbage, carrots, egusi, plantain, colocasia, maize, beans, etc.) and the collection of non-timber forest products.

Considering that decision-making seems to be based on, among other factors, economic power, income earnings is likely to confer a certain degree of decision-making power on women (Ngome 2003). In South West Region as in the entire Cameroon, child care, household care (cooking, cleaning, fetching wood and water, etc.) are activities ascribed to women. As the men are responsible for the whole households, the benefit from economic activities are earned more by men. They have more control over income and resources in a household and they tend to make decisions as they are considered by the nation as responsible for the status of the family. In communities, Women have more power than in households; they are more autonomous through women organizations. That autonomy through women organizations influence also sometimes the decision-making in the household because by commanding some money income, it gives women some say in decision-making in their homes (Ngome 2003). But, this remains weak in terms of real power owned by women. Education plays a big role in enabling women to break down barriers to some socialization factors giving rise to the division of household labor⁶. The more educated a woman is, the more likely it is she is going to venture into spheres traditionally considered male areas (Ngome 2003). Women are incorporating a market-oriented dimension to their economic activities. They are mostly involved in farming and small economy roadside, smoked fish, etc. The men farm what has been traditionally known as cash crops – cocoa, coffee – while the women farm what the family consumes, hence the appellation, subsistence farming. Although what the woman farms is crucial to the survival of the household, only the excess is sold, thus giving the woman limited control over the ability to buy what she does not produce. In general, Women who are more involved in income earning activities participate more in decision-making within the household than those who are mostly involved only in household consumption activities. Women with some income-earning power are consulted more often by their husbands, especially on issues that require their (women's) financial contribution.

Although Cameroon has ratified a number of international conventions and instruments related to human rights, one of which is the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), signed on the 6 June and ratified on the 23 August, 1994, government policy do not integrate as well women-empowering activities into various projects and programs, and to facilitate their access to labor-augmenting resources (finance, technology, etc)The government's policy on natural resource management, agriculture, fishing, etc. does not reflect gender considerations as well because policy does not focus on women as group to be reinforced or render autonomous. Government's policy considers women as stakeholder in the same way as youth or other social components.

The primary economic activity is fishing, although this is largely carried out by outsiders and only on a smaller scale by the local population. For the local population, farming for subsistence needs and cash crops is the most important economic activity. Farming is done primarily in close proximity to villages, but as competition for land increases, people walk or even travel by vehicle a considerable distance to open farms wherever land is available. In addition, wealthier town dwellers also invest in food crop production. In the absence of strict controls, this increasing demand for agricultural land has resulted in encroachment into existing or proposed PAs. Most local farming systems are characterised by low productivity and profitability due to poor road infrastructure and difficult access to markets making it difficult to purchase agricultural inputs or to sell produce. In addition, a lack of electricity has hindered the development of processing activities, and the inefficiency of current crop drying techniques increases the demand for fuel wood. Hunting has declined due to the dwindling wildlife population in the region. Timber harvesting is mostly limited to artisanal tree cutting carried out by few specialized dealers, made up of mostly of persons who are not native to the area. Although commercially viable deposits have yet to be discovered in the Bakassi peninsula, the area has generated considerable interest among oil companies due to the rich oil reserves in neighbouring areas of Nigeria, and at least eight multinational oil companies have participated in the exploration of the peninsula and its offshore waters.

⁶ Ngome, Angella N., 2003, 'Gender Division of Labor and Women's Decision-Making Power in Rural Households: The Case of Mbalangi, Ediki and Mabonji Villages of Meme Division', Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Buea, Department of Women and Gender Studies.

Map 1: Nigeria – Cameroon coastal border area



Map 2: Bakassi Area Map



The Bakassi Peninsula consists of a number of low-lying; largely mangrove covered islands occupying an area of around 665 km² (see Map 2). However, 25,000 ha of this mangrove ecosystem and 10% of other biomes (marine, terrestrial) will be covered by the project. Bakassi is situated at the extreme eastern end of the Gulf of Guinea, where the warm east-flowing Guinea Current meets the cold north-flowing Benguela Current; the interaction of these two ocean currents and the underlying marine geology has created marine and coastal ecosystems rich in fish, shrimp, and a wide variety of other marine life forms. The southwest region of Cameroon is a biodiversity hotspot of global significance that supports a high

diversity of animal and plant species, including large numbers with restricted ranges and many species that are threatened⁷. Of 59 species of water birds represented in 11 conventional groups that have been identified in Cameroon's coastal wetlands, 29 species are found in the Rio del Rey site, making it the most important wetland site in the country⁸. The mangrove ecosystems of the Bakassi peninsula are globally important habitat areas for birds⁹, and the 100,000 hectares of mangroves in the Rio Del Rey site constitute half of the total 200,000 ha. of mangrove forest ecosystems in Cameroon, which are considered the most important in Central Africa and the 6th in Africa (UNEP, 2007; Ajonina 2008). Mangrove ecosystems in the Bakassi Peninsula are composed of six indigenous species, namely *Rhizophora racemosa*, *Rhizophora harrisonii*, *Rhizophora mangle* (*Rhizophoraceae*), *Avicennia germinans* (*Avicenniaceae*), *Laguncularia racemosa*, and *Conocarpus erecrus* (*Combretaceae*), as well as one exotic species *Nypa fruticans* (*Arecaceae*). Although not well studied, 32 species of mangrove phytoplankton have been identified in the Rio Del Rey, which can be grouped into three classes -- *Bacilliophyceae*, *Dinophyceae* and *Cyanophyceae*. 24 species of zooplankton within six groups, and more than 20 species of fish, have been identified within the mangrove ecosystem. Aquatic biodiversity include more than 13 species of Mollusc, more than 10 species of shellfish, five marine turtle species, the marine Otter and African manatee (*Trichechus senegalensis*). The Rio del Rey mangrove ecosystem is recognised to be an important reproduction area and environment for both migratory and resident birds, and 70 species of birds visit the Rio del Rey mangroves and coastal zone (Ajonina et al, 2003; Ajonina et al, 2004).

The Cameroon-Nigeria cross-border area is more floristically diverse than other forests in the Guineo-Congolian region (Sunderland et al, 2003). Faunal diversity is also high, and there are a number of Red List species of mammal in the project area, including forest elephants (*Loxodonta africana cyclotis*), buffalo (*Syncerus caffer nanus*), Cross River gorilla (*Gorilla gorilla deihli*), Nigeria-Cameroon chimpanzee (*Pan troglodytes ellioti*), leopard (*Panthera pardus*), drill (*Mandrillus leucophaeus*), Preuss's Guenon (*Cercopithecus preussi*), and the giant pangolin (*Manis gigantea*). The easternmost and most isolated population of Cross River gorillas occurs in the proposed Tofala Hill Wildlife Sanctuary, which lies within the project area. IUCN lists the Gorilla and the Chimpanzee as two of the most endangered great apes in the world. Experts believe there are approximately 300 Cross River gorillas living along the Cameroon – Nigeria border (Sarmiento and Oates, 2000, Sunderland-Groves et al, 2003, Bergl and Vigilant, 2007), while the P.t. ellioti chimpanzees, the least numerous sub-species, number about 6,500. Both species could face extinction within the next decade in Cameroon at the current rates of decline, as they are threatened by habitat destruction and human encroachment, as well as a sophisticated and rapidly expanding illegal trade in live great apes and great ape meat that is closely linked to organized crime is accelerating the conservation crisis.

Researchers have recently identified eight new species of Tilapia that are strictly endemic to Lake Beme / Bermin, and small seasonal forest pools and streams throughout the Bakossi lowlands support at least five endemic species of killifish (*Aphyosemion spp*). The world's largest frog, the Goliath frog (*Conraua goliath*) is present in the eastern tributaries of Kupe and Muanenguba, and there are also a number of endemic amphibians such as the frog species *Leptodactylodon wildi* and *Hyperolius dintelmanni sp. nov.*, both of which are listed by IUCN as Endangered. Muanenguba and Bakossi host the richest assemblage of Chameleon species in Africa (seven species found at Muanenguba alone). Among the many bird species found in the landscape are endangered species such as the Mount Kupe Bush-shrike (*Telophorus kupeensis*), White-throated Mountain-babbler (*Kupeornis gilbert*) and Bates's Weaver (*Ploceus batesi*); vulnerable species such as the Bannerman's Weaver (*Ploceus bannermani*), Yellow-casqued Wattled Hornbill (*Ceratogymna elata*), Grey-necked Picathartes (*Picathartes oreas*) and Green-breasted Bush-shrike (*Malaconotus gladiator*); and near-threatened species such as the Grey-headed Greenbul (*Phyllastrephus poliocephalus*), Cameroon Montane Greenbul (*Andropadus montanus*), White-tailed Warbler (*Poliolais lopezi*), Crossley's Ground-thrush (*Zoothera crossleyi*), Ursula's Sunbird (*Nectarinia ursulae*), White-naped Pigeon (*Columba albinucha*), and Monteiro's Bush-shrike (*Malaconotus monteiri*) (Birdlife International Database of Important Bird Assessments). The presence of such a wide range of endangered and near-threatened bird species resulted in the designation of the Bakassi Mountains, Mt Kupe, Banyang Mbo and Muanenguba all as Important Bird Areas by Birdlife International.

⁷ Cameroon 4th CBD National Report, Chap1. Section 1.1, , 2009.

⁸ Inventory of Coastal Wetlands of Cameroon, (Cameroon Wildlife Conservation Society – CWCS & Wetlands International, 2004)

⁹ Water birds Census of Coastal Cameroon and Sanaga River, WIWO Report , 2007.

Threats

The biodiversity and ecosystem services of the Bakassi area, as well as the human livelihoods that depend on such services, face a variety of severe threats:

Overharvesting of biodiversity and natural resources: The coastal and marine environments of the project area are characterized by abundant mangrove forests, estuaries, coral reefs, and other ecosystems, and the availability of marine resources is directly related to the health and integrity of these ecosystems. However, many fishing practices in the region are unsustainable, for example the over-exploitation of selected fish species to supply trans-boundary markets, and the frequent use of dynamite, cyanide, and illegal gear. In addition, many large commercial fishing boats fish in areas where they are not allowed to be (e.g. in traditional fishing waters) because the government does not do anything to support traditional claims to these areas or to enforce no-commercial-fishing limits. The Bakassi peninsula also suffers from widespread indiscriminate harvesting of mangroves trees to meet demand for fuel wood (smoking of fish), for building materials (housing construction) and for export as timber to neighbouring countries, especially to Nigeria.

Habitat Destruction: As described in Cameroon's 4th National Report to the CBD, habitat destruction and ecosystem change constitute the single greatest threat to biodiversity in Cameroon. Comparative studies of the CEMAC (Economic and Monetary Community of Central Africa) region showed that Cameroon had lost 59% of its primary habitat by 1986. In the Bakassi area, agricultural expansion into coastal forest areas and the widespread harvesting of mangroves have been the primary forms of habitat destruction, with significant negative impacts on local terrestrial and coastal biodiversity.

Pollution: The aquatic and marine ecosystems of the Bakassi area, in particular the coastal estuaries, are degraded by organic pollution (e.g. human waste), agricultural chemical (especially pesticides), and petrochemical pollution. Poor hygiene and sanitary conditions in local communities degrade ecosystem functions and threaten biodiversity, while also contaminating groundwater and endangering human health in the region.

Resource Extraction: As noted above, there is significant interest in exploring and exploiting the potential oil deposits in the Bakassi area. In addition, the area also contains significant mineral deposits. As a result, both oil drilling and mining activities pose a significant potential threat to the area, which implies the urgent need to develop land use and natural resource management plans to ensure sustainable exploitation of natural resources, and the livelihoods of local communities, while avoiding conflicts between the various stakeholders.

Barriers

Insufficient policy, legal and institutional frameworks and capacity to undertake integrated ecosystem management: Current government policy in Cameroon recognizes the need to decentralize development planning and action and to empower communities to contribute to and manage their own development processes, but a number of barriers stand in the way of this goal. At present, land management and environmental protection regulations and guidelines are insufficient for guiding development planning in such a way as to simultaneously promote sustainable development and protect environmental values. Existing Council Development Plans do not incorporate conservation aspects, there are no policies for the management of natural resources that are specific to Bakassi ecosystems, and although there are laws and regulations to support conservation and sustainable development, enforcement capacities are very weak. A report by the Bakassi Development Committee identifies a number of institutional weaknesses, including the absence of sub-regional or field representation of MINEPDED in the region, the lack of divisional and sub-divisional agriculture and rural development institutions and technical posts, and the need to transfer technical staff and create training centres. Institutional coordination is also inadequate; while the various ministries pursue their respective development plans, the cross-cutting role of MINEPDED to enforce regulations and coordinate efforts to protect environment and nature and promote sustainable development has not yet been fully clarified or operationalized at the field level due to a lack of specific regulatory instruments, limited resources, weak capacities and inadequate institutional arrangements to ensure enforcement. Frameworks for conflict resolution are also problematic; while traditional modes of conflict resolution endure to some extent, they are not adapted to the context of multi-sectorial oversight and exploitation of natural resources, or to the current situation where several nationalities are significant users of natural resources in the area.

Lack of demonstrated models or experience with integrated management of ecosystem services: Cameroon has very limited experience with integrated ecosystem management, and at present technical capacities for planning of priority actions, experience with participatory management, integrated landscape management, or collaboration among sectors for biodiversity conservation are insufficient at both the national level and in the Bakassi area. The Priority Programme for Sustainable Management and Development of Bakassi, as well as the Council Development Plans, do not provide any guidelines for ecosystem management, and are based on limited knowledge of the socio-economic and environmental values within the Bakassi ecosystems. Environmental and social safeguards are not integrated into planning processes, and protected areas are generally absent from development and land use plans. In terms of livelihoods, the Bakassi Council Development Plan addresses the improvement of livelihoods opportunities but does not provide any funding for such activities, and institutions and agencies in the area generally have weak technical, financial and institutional capacities for the development of livelihood improvement activities. Financing for ecosystem management, biodiversity conservation and sustainable development objectives is very limited, and the 2007 NCSA Report (section II-1.4) identified insufficient financing for the implementation of projects and programs as one of the key barriers to sustainable development and environmental conservation in the country. Finally, stakeholder collaboration is generally weak although mechanisms exist for transboundary coordination these have not been effective in guiding planning and resource management activities.

Inadequate knowledge and understanding of ecosystem services and values in the Bakassi area: Information on ecosystem functions and services, threats and threat drivers, and long-term trends in environmental conditions in the Bakassi area is very limited and generally insufficient to support effective land and resource use planning. For example, at present there are no extensive studies on the natural resource based drivers on conflict in the area; there is no available information on mineral or oil and gas deposits in the project area and how these might overlap geographically with official protected areas and/or other critical ecosystems; and environmental indicators have not been developed for policies and plans governing the region. While there is some data collection on land and resource uses, this is not widely shared or available in the absence of any substantial information management systems. The lack of scientific and socio-economic data is compounded by the high rate of illiteracy in the area and a widespread lack of understanding among local residents of the ecosystem services provided by mangroves and other habitats and their direct positive impacts on livelihoods.

2) The baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects

Government interventions in the Bakassi area prioritize providing basic social services to a region that was poorly developed and supported until the conflicting land claims over the area were resolved between Cameroon and Nigeria. Since the Government of Cameroon took full administrative responsibility for the area in 2013, it has focused on providing services such as improved education and the construction of schools, roads and other infrastructure so that communities in the area feel a sense of belonging and a stake in the country. In Cameroon generally, important development initiatives are conducted by government through the National Participatory Development Programme (PNDP), which supports the preparation and implementation of Council Development Plans (CDPs). In the Bakassi area, government baseline activities are carried out primarily under the framework of the Priority Programme for Sustainable Management and Development of Bakassi, which encompasses the activities of different sectorial ministries. The main objective of the programme is to ensure that Cameroon takes full responsibility for the Bakassi area, which was recognized as part of the country following a judgment of the International Court of Justice as the result of a territorial dispute between Nigeria and Cameroon. One of the key projects within the framework of the Priority Programme is the project titled “Special project for the support of the development of fisheries and livestock production in Bakassi area and Lake Chad”, which is being executed by the Ministry of Fisheries, Livestock Production and Animal Industries (MINEPIA). One of the specific objectives of this project is to preserve and ensure sustainable natural resources management. The project is in its second phase, with a budget of approximately USD4 million. The Minister of MINEPIA officially requested that the proposed GEF project be complementary and incremental to this project, following a meeting held in Yaoundé on 31st January 2013. Another development in line with the Priority Programme was the creation of the South Western Development Authority (SODEWA), whose mandate is to support development of the region by mobilizing resources through projects designed and implemented in collaboration with regional technical departments.

The Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife (MINFOF) has lead responsibility for ecosystem management, but it does not have the resources to implement many ecosystem management programs without external support. For example, there are no ecosystem level management plans or programs in the project area, and neither the Ndongore National Park nor the Rio

del Rey Ramsar Site has yet been gazetted. One of MINFOF's major relevant accomplishments however was the creation of a National Master Plan for Mangroves, which includes the Bakassi area. The Ministry of Environment, Nature Protection and Sustainable Development (MINEPDED) has the mandate to define measures for environmental management, in liaison with other Ministries, which includes defining the conduct, content and quality of Ecosystem Services Management Plans (ESMPs). The Institute of Agricultural Research for Development (IRAD) and other government partners have implemented various programs to support biodiversity conservation through the development of livelihood activities as "alternatives" to a dependence on natural resource exploitation that are considered 'unsustainable'. However, most of these programs to date have been unable to effectively address the sustainable management of natural resources with income generation and socio-economic benefits for local communities.

PES¹⁰ Legal Framework: In Cameroon, the concept of environmental services lacks recognition in society as well as their formal establishment in the constitution or legislation. However, the concept of ES and PES could be easily taken up by the Cameroonian legislature. **The Constitution and laws governing natural resources or ecosystems management** in Cameroon does not explicitly mention PES. However, the country's constitution authorizes protection of the environment and recognizes the role of environmental resources in the development process. It grants citizens a 'right to a healthy environment' where it is mentioned in its preamble: "...every person shall have a right to a healthy environment. The protection of the environment shall be the duty of every citizen. The State shall ensure the protection and improvement of the environment". Nonetheless, the preservation and environmental protection are always to be viewed as a duty, and not as a service that could be provided. **Forestry Law:** the Forestry Law N° 94/01 of 20 January 1994 contains an explicit reference to forest ecosystem services and provides for their sustainable management, thereby linking environmental, economic and social concerns. Indeed, the forestry law is crucial for the governance of PES in Cameroon. The protected areas enter this law through the zoning that is applied in forested areas categorizing them into 'permanent' or 'non-permanent' forest domains. The country foresees management plans under its forestry law aimed at the sustainable use of forest goods and services in reserves and protected areas. Furthermore, the law creates the community forestry and places a duty on the community around community forests to sustainably manage the forests and its resources. Section 37 of the Law allows communities to exercise all rights that result from ownership of the forest subject to limitation in Land tenure laws and the forestry laws. Furthermore, Section 14 (1) of the 1994 Law forbids any one to light a fire that may cause damage to the vegetation of the national forest estate without prior authorization from the local authority in accordance with the order of the Senior Divisional Officer. **Environmental laws:** the Law No. 96/12 of 5th August 1996 Relating to Environmental Management is the national framework Law that propagates a holistic view of the environment. It mandates the government to develop and implement environmental policies and instruments, establish environmental standards and research and gather information on environmental issues. It establishes an environmental planning process and provides for public participation. Furthermore, it creates coordinating institutions, oversees a financial mechanism, and provides the basis for economic instruments. As a matter of facts, this law, just like the forestry laws, does not provide any particular provision on PES initiatives. However they contain provisions that allow for the preservation and rational management of resources in the Cameroon. The law provides that "the environment constitutes a national common heritage ...its protection and rational management of resources it provides to human life are of general interest (Section 2 (1), (2)). It mandates the President of the Republic to draw up the national environmental policy which shall define the national strategies, plan or programmes for the conservation and sustainable use of environmental resources which shall be implemented by the government, decentralized territorial authorities, grassroots communities and environmental protection associations. The framework law also provides that the laws and regulations shall guarantee the right of everyone to a sound environment and ensure a harmonious balance within ecosystems and between the Urban and rural zones (Section 5). Most of all Section 62 provides that: '**The protection of nature, the preservation of animal and plant species and their habitat, the maintenance of biological balance and ecosystems and the conservation of biodiversity and genetic diversity against all causes of degradation and threats of extinction are of national interest**'. It then places a duty on the state and citizens to safeguard this natural heritage. The law also punishes any person who pollutes or degrades the soil and subsoil thereby altering the quality of water. Moreover, with respect to **Taxes and charges**, environmental legislation in the country provides for tax exemptions as incentives for conservation measures. However, these provisions are not always implemented by the state financial authorities. **Water law:** the most important legislation dealing with water resources is the Water Code, particularly Law No. 98/005 of 14 April 1998 on the Water Regime. Although the Water Code does not particularly deal with PES schemes in watersheds, the 1998 Water Law contains a series of legislation dealing with the sustainable management of water resources in Cameroon. It lays down the

¹⁰ Claudiane Yanick MOUKAM, 2016.

Water Code and its enabling status. Article 2 (1) of the Water Code provides that : “L’eau est un bien du patrimoine national dont l’état assure la protection et la gestion et en facilite l’accès à tous.” (unofficial translation : Water is a national, common resource which the state must ensure protection, management of and facilitate access by all). From the provisions of the subsection above, the state has the duty to ensure the protection and management of water in Cameroon. Moreover, the Decree No: 2001/162/PM of 8thMay 2001 fixes the modalities of designation of agents for surveillance and control of water quality (Article 1(3)); the Decree No:2001/163/PM of 8thMay 2001 regulates the perimeter of protection of water sources and treatment of water stored for potable use; Decree No: 2001/161/PM of 8thMay 2001 fixes the competence, organization and functioning of the national water committee; Decree no: 2005/493 sets out the means of Water Supply and Sanitation (WSS), public services in urban and peri-urban areas; Decree No: 2005/494 pertains to the creation of the Cameroon Water Utilities Corporation (CAMWATER). To date, water policies in Cameroon have been more focused on expanding infrastructure (in particular networks of safe water supplies) but less in managing watershed and wetland resources. Governance framework and law enforcement are still too weak and financial means too scarce to adequately prevent pollution and ensure sustainable watershed management and the efficient and equitable use of resources. Although water is the main target in the PES watershed, the services that are provided are also land use-related, specifically involving reforestation or forest maintenance, agriculture, urbanization. For this reason, both water- and tenure related legislation are required. **Land tenure Law:** Land tenure rights are a very important aspect of PES and greatly affects the implementation of PES schemes and they determine the level to which PES schemes can be effectively carried out especially when it comes to PES schemes in Watershed areas. Law No. 74-1 of 6th July 1974 establishes rules governing land tenure in Cameroon. This law provides that the State is the guardian of all lands in Cameroon (Article 1 (2)). However it also provides that customary communities who are occupying and using lands which are occupied by houses, farms and plantations and grazing lands manifesting human presences and development¹¹ may apply for land certificates in accordance with the Law governing the application of Land Certificates.¹² The law therefore makes it mandatory for communities to obtain land certificates on land that they have been occupying. The importance of property rights in Watershed PES schemes cannot be overstated. Properly delimited boundaries promote effective PES schemes in Watershed areas.

PES Institutional Framework and Measures taken at international and national levels: Cameroon is a signatory of the UNFCCC and in 2012, the country submitted its Readiness Preparation Proposal (RPP) funded by the World Bank through its Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) (CFA 100 billion) to the UNREDD. In the RPP, the country manifested its willingness to implement REDD+ at the national level as a tool to achieve sustainable development. Furthermore, the creation of 10 national parks to protect biodiversity between 2006 and 2011 also highlight the country engagement in implementing PES for biodiversity conservation. In this context, an evaluation study carried out by Tropenbos International¹³ of the funding received by the country for forest and biodiversity conservation in the Reserves, Zoos and National Parks highlighted a low valuation of ecosystem services (ES) provided by forest. Another important engagement of the country is the establishment of trust funds for biodiversity conservation and eco-development activities such as the Tri-national Trust Fund (FTNS) in 2007. Moreover, at the national level, there are some pilot studies carried out by the Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife (MINFOF) among which, that of 2013 on the analysis of forest and wildlife sector in Cameroon in “*Economic and social importance of forestry and wildlife sector in Cameroon*”. The study was carried out for the purpose of the country’s fifth report to the Convention on Biodiversity in 2014 under the MINEPDED trusteeship in which, the country committed to develop and implement a national PES program for biodiversity valorization by 2020 and to impute PES in the national budget (République du Cameroun, 2014, fifth report to the CDB page 96, objectives 14 and 15). The MINFOF study evaluated the contribution of PES to national economy and concluded that once implemented, the mechanism could generate average annual net revenues from 11.66 to 25.05 billion CFA that would benefit to government, councils, management structures and local communities. Moreover, this amount could increase with the valorization of watersheds protection. The study also provides wide information about the contribution to country economy and improving of the living conditions of local communities, and the key of sharing PES benefits among stakeholders. The country is now negotiating and/or developing with councils pilot REDD+ projects for purpose of

¹¹ This land is called National Land. Section 14 of the Land Tenure Law does not give a definition of national land. It only lists the types of land that are considered national land. One of them is land that is occupied by the community and have been used by them for a long time.

¹² The Law on the application of Land Certificates is Law No. 76-165 of 27 April 1976 to Establish the Conditions for Obtaining Land Certificate as amended by Decree No. 2005-481 of 16 December 2005 to Amend and Supplement some Provisions of Decree No. 76-165 of 27 April 1976 to Establish the Conditions for Obtaining land Certificates.

¹³ a conservation NGO

implementing REDD+ at the national level by 2017 in the framework the National Plan for Participatory Development (PNDP).

Examples of PES schemes in the country are described below:

- **South and East Regions:** The first PES initiatives in these regions are the outcome of partnership between the Centre pour l'Environnement et le Developpement (CED), BioClimate Research & Development (BioClimate) and the Rainforest Foundation UK. The initiative was selected out of seven initiatives to receive funding from the UK's Department for International Development (DFID). This concerned the two community forests (CF) Nkolenyeng (1,043 ha) and Nomejoh (1,759 ha) respectively located in the south region (Dja et Lobo subdivision) and East Region (Haut Nyong Subdivision), each at different stages of simple management plan development. The purpose of this pilot initiative was to assist local communities in Cameroon, to protect their forest resources using PES. The initiative seeks to change forest management practices and enables local communities to practice sustainable resource management and receive direct payment for their environmental performance. Beyond having local impact, the project aims to nourish debates that are influencing the development of national REDD+ policy, even though government support for the project has been lukewarm. Households in both villages have expressed their willingness to base exploitation of their forests on principles of ecosystem conservation in the hope that in return, they will receive compensation. This project took up the challenge of reconciling local development and global challenges of greenhouse gases reduction. *However, CED insists that its PES pilot cases are not to obtain carbon credits, but only a way to reorganize community management of CF as an alternative to logging.* However, some studies such as that of CIFOR have analyzed this as REDD+ project for carbon purpose. Mainly monetary compensation were some 32million FCFA (US\$64000) to be disbursed through CED to bank accounts of community farming groups practicing improved sub-canopy agroforestry that conserves forest cover involving the cultivation of short rotation crops, beekeeping, livestock and NTFPs collection and commercialization. Payment hinged on community defined simple forest monitoring parameters based on tree density and forest area changes. The scheme has been a much lauded initiative but the major drawbacks was the sustainability of funding mechanism after the present buyers (DFID) leaves, and lack of legislation supporting PES to avoid conflicts with private logging operators that continue exploiting timber in the CF with the support of local elites. Another initiative is that of EU-Ngoyla Mintom (European Union and WWF) on the socio-economic aspect of the Ngoyla- Mintom forest conservation and sustainable management. The implementation of payment for environmental services, in particular for carbon trade for which the Wildlife Works Carbon (WWC), the Nedbank and mining companies (CamIron and Geovic) were interested, permit to raise resources durability and increase the welfare of the local populations in four communities forests, while ensuring the continuity of the project activities. The project accompanied by Plan Vivo standard for carbon credits certification on the voluntary market is about to obtain the project certificate (foresee for early 2017). However, one of the major concerns that remains is the mechanism for an equitable management of funds from the trade of these environmental services. Furthermore, an agreement of US\$80,000 (400 Million FCFA) is being negotiated with private sector that has elements both for biodiversity compensation and payment for watershed protection services, concerning the development of the hydroelectric power Lom Pangar along the National Park Deng-Deng and involve Electricity Development Corporation (EDC), World Bank, French Development Agency (AFD) and World Conservation Society (WCS) (Nlom and Sonwa, 2013). But the project is based on a macro watershed where externalities are usually difficult to internalize because of the large number of stakeholders involved. Another PES scheme is the marine turtle conservation initiative in the Campo National Park. The initiative, started in 1999, has as objective the protection of marine turtles with their habitats and improving wellbeing of local population, while creating a marine sanctuary for marine turtles. The project was funded by Tropenbos Foundation (1999-2002); EU (2003-2005); GEF/PNUD (2010-2011) and Tourists in Kribi. The sellers were fishermen who capture marine turtles accidentally in their fishing nets and other local communities who collect turtle eggs. This initiative for biodiversity conservation received the support of intermediaries such as WWF, local NGOs (KUD'A TUBE) and also from technical local government services of MINFOF, MINEP, MINEPIA, etc. The fisherman which accidentally captured alive marine turtles receives 10,000 FCFA (US\$20) based on the local cost of marine turtle and equivalent kg of meat and 10F (US\$0.02) per egg by a tourist through a system of sponsorship campaign for tourists who receive a sponsorship certificate. However, the main concern is that the payment depends on the tourist visit and the number of accidentally captured fish cannot be known with certainty. CIFOR initiated a project for carbon emission reduction in two community forests in the Tri-national landscape,

but the project stopped early due to some financial and other constraints.

- **North Region:** In the north region, there are mostly pilot studies such as that of Ngondjep (2011). Ngondjep (2011) studying the conservation of natural resources through agriculture for the Lake Lagdo, has examined the theoretical analysis of the normative approach of environmental service based on the theory of external effects, and the necessity to make a monetary appraisal of environmental service. She identified the most likely internalization modality to encourage the preservation of the hydroelectric potential of lake Lagdo through agricultural activities carried out in its watershed. It appears that the outcome of the preservation of the hydroelectric potential of lake Lagdo is equal to the value of power lost by the power company due to the silting-up of the lake. A compensation system for farmers in the watershed seems to be the most adequate modality to extend the life of the lake.
- **South West region:** One case that is considered as a PES project in this region is the recently created Mont Cameroon National Park, where the Programme for Sustainable Management of Natural Resources South-West region (PSMNR-SWR) has signed a Conservation Development agreement with villages around the parks for enhancing management performance and communication. The number of villages involved or to be involved are in total 91 and the conservation incentives promote collaboration and create benefits at individual and community level. The PSMNR-SWR develops income generating projects such as cocoa, cassava, plantain, agro-forestry development and also improve socioeconomic infrastructure such water, farm to market roads. Further, it encourages income from sustainable resource management and use of resources such as Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs) like bush mango and the prunus bark (*Prunus Africana*). As far as prunus bark is concerned, local communities receive 60% of the benefits for road, council construction; 30% goes to the harvesters and 10% to the management structure. There is also a system of conservation bonus that is implemented for poaching and encroachment reporting. However, the scheme is not so far different from the traditional Integrated Conservation and Development projects (ICDP) although it introduced conservation bonus as incentive schemes and agro-forestry. So it is a modified ICDP approach to reflect PES modalities. Furthermore, using the Contingent Valuation Method, Moukam (ongoing publication) analyzes the perception and ability of 384 farmers in Lake Barombi Mbo watershed in providing watershed protection through agro-forestry and reforestation. She found that almost all farmers perceive the importance of forest for climate regulation, flood control, erosion control, wildlife habitat, and aesthetics, and for cultural and spiritual site. A total of 85.42% of farmers expressed a positive willingness to accept (WTA) for reforestation programme, while some are willing to adopt agro-forestry. Furthermore, 21.35% of farmers do fish in the Lake and 92.68% of these fishermen are willing to receive fishing tools recommended for sustainable fishing activities. The Tobit model results reveal that variables age (-), sex (+), education (-), knowledge of bio-fertilizers (+) significantly determine their WTA. The mean WTA for environmental services provision is up to **10,352.4844FCFA/year** with a total cost of reforestation programme of **84,554,347.6905 FCFA/year**. With appropriate policy incentives, farmers and fishermen could adopt these practices and contribute to the improvement of the environment in its various dimensions. Her estimates provide key information to the government agencies and policy-makers in designing innovative incentives such as Payment for Environmental Services to encourage agro-forestry and reforestation with local species; and also protect the twelve endemic fish species of the Lake. From these PES initiatives and pilot studies in different regions of the country, there is therefore a need to create a database for PES schemes and implement PES programme for the country.

PES Lessons learnt and gaps to be addressed: In protected areas and in many other ecosystems in Cameroon, a system of compensation through PES should be implemented as a realistic payment scheme for biodiversity financing. PES takes into account not only forest carbon but also the wide range of ecosystem services provided by forests. In this context, legislative and regulatory frameworks for PES should be developed, enhanced and implemented while the local governance of PES is strengthened. Institutions for forests, mining, water, agricultural and other natural resource management should collaborate and harmonize, improve and disseminate their strategies with a view to contribute to the development of communities adjacent to these natural resources. There is also need for the building capacity of stakeholders involved at the national, regional and local levels, and developing training manuals for PES projects. This can be an objective of MINEPDED, the leading and coordinating government institution on REDD+ in Cameroon

Among the CSOs active in the Bakassi area is the CHEDE Cooperative Union Ltd., a federation of 30 farmer groups (cooperatives, common initiative groups, and other village-based civil society organizations) comprising a cumulative total of over 10,000 individual farmers and development actors that has helped to organize and link farmers to markets in and around the Bakassi area. CHEDE is currently working with MINEPAT, IRAD, CIRAD and other partners on a USD 1.3 million project to produce smoked fish that will be marketed in CEMAC countries and the European Union. In addition, a number of local NGOs, including the Environment and Rural Development Foundation (ERuDeF), have supported a range of small-scale livelihood initiatives within the Bakassi area. Several international development partners and environmental NGOs are also implementing programmes in the South West Region of Cameroon that may complement and provide lessons learned and data to the proposed project. These projects include a GIZ/KfW/WWF/WCS/GFA project for the preservation of high value ecosystems in the South West Region; a WCS project to secure the habitat of the Cross River Gorilla and other endangered species; and a project of ERuDeF, FFI and the University of Dschang for the conservation of the Cross River Gorilla while ensuring the livelihoods of local populations. The involvement of OPED in this project as the Executing Partner, is primarily justified by their current experience baseline activities in Kiribi (Southern Cameroon) for the utilization of fish dryers and technology to achieve fish smoking with less mangrove wood consumption and more quality in term of fish taste (Linkage with Component 1). This can be an entry point for certifying the fish production in Bakassi area, under the global scheme of the financial mechanism.

UNEP baseline programmes include the on-going work of the UNEP Marine Branch in assessing mangrove carbon sequestration in Central Africa, including in the Bakassi area. In addition, the LifeWeb initiative, with support from UNEP and the Government of Spain, is being implemented in the 12,000km² Cross River Gorilla landscape in the South West region of Cameroon, with the goal of developing REDD as a tool to provide economic incentives for the conservation of Cross River gorilla habitat.

In summary, although various programs have supported environmental conservation and sustainable development projects in the South West Region, many of these have been poorly designed or inadequate in size and duration to deliver long-term benefits of conservation to local communities, and the resulting loss of community support is a significant problem for implementing ecosystem management in the region. Therefore, solutions are urgently required to restore the confidence of local communities, and indeed the Government, of the contribution of ecosystem management to rural development, employment creation and poverty alleviation.

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

The Project Objective is to ensure biodiversity conservation and sustainable use and improved management of Bakassi ecosystems through integrated ecosystem management plans including ecosystem valuation.

According to Levis¹⁴ et al (2009), Ecosystem Based Management (EBM), [which can be considered as Integrated Ecosystem Management – IESM] differs from conventional resource management in that it defines management strategies for entire systems, not simply individual components of the ecosystem. As a consequence, EBM takes into account interactions among ecosystem components and management sectors, as well as cumulative impacts of a wide spectrum of [other] sectors. Importantly, EBM considers humans as an integral part of the ecosystem, since humans derive a portfolio of services from the ecosystem and also act as a driver influencing ecosystem processes. Thus, a key aspect of EBM is illuminating trade-offs among ecosystem services and management goals. After years of debating about the meaning of EBM, it is broadly accepted as crucial for effective marine conservation and resource management. While some policy makers clearly grasp the utility of an EBM approach, implementation of EBM in marine ecosystems (like Bakassi ecosystem) is a significant hurdle, and little practical advice is available to inform management authorities on how to select specific management measures to achieve EBM goals.

¹⁴ Levin PS, Fogarty MJ, Murawski SA, Fluharty D (2009) Integrated ecosystem assessments: Developing the scientific basis for ecosystem-based management of the ocean. PLoS Biol 7(1): e1000014. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.1000014

What will be the main features of the Bakassi Integrated Ecosystems Management Plan (IESMP)? GEF incremental activities will focus on developing the IESMP which will bring together in a more coherent and holistic way the fragmented baseline initiatives from different sectors, targeting specific communities or ecosystems (Government efforts for providing services such as improved education and the construction of schools, roads and other infrastructure so that communities in the area feel a sense of belonging and a stake in the country; National Participatory Development Programme, which supports the preparation and implementation of Council Development Plans; Priority Programme for Sustainable Management and Development of Bakassi, which include the Priority Programme titled “Special project for the support of the development of fisheries and livestock production in Bakassi area and Lake Chad”, executed by the Ministry of Fisheries, Livestock Production and Animal Industries; National and International NGOs and partners interventions e.g. CHEDE working with MINEPAT, IRAD, CIRAD and other partners on a USD 1.3 million project to produce smoked fish that will be marketed in CEMAC countries and the European Union; Environment and Rural Development Foundation –EruDeF promoting small-scale livelihood initiatives within the Bakassi area; GIZ/KfW/WWF/WCS/GFA project for the preservation of high value ecosystems in the South West Region; and WCS project to secure the habitat of the Cross River Gorilla and other endangered species). into the framework of an Integrated Ecosystem Services Management Plan (IESMP) that includes in addition: (i) sustainable management of mangrove forest ecosystems that constitute highly important aquatic biodiversity hotspots and are threatened by overexploitation, infrastructure development, and oil exploration activities with negative consequences on important biodiversity species; (ii) an effective financing mechanism to support integrated sustainable ecosystem management and biodiversity conservation; (iii) an integrated approach to natural resources management in a post conflict situation where building trust is the first challenge; and (iv) institutional strengthening and adequate coordination to achieve local development objectives.

How the IESMP will be developed and operated? Under the leadership of MINEPDED, the Integrated ecosystem management services plan referred to will be developed and serve as a framework for organizing scientific and stakeholders’ consultation outcome to inform decisions in Bakassi ecosystem management at multiple scales and across sectors. The plan will be highlighting the ways that the IESM will enhance the ability of resource managers to evaluate cumulative impacts of diverse human activities as well as steer management efforts to achieve multiple simultaneous ecosystem objectives. The approach to develop the IESMP follows the paradigm of formal decision analysis and is consistent with the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. In the process of developing the IESMP, formal synthesis and quantitative analysis of information on relevant natural and socioeconomic factors will be conducted in relation to specified ecosystem management objectives. The IESMP will be an incremental approach, in which integrated scientific understanding feeds into management choices and receives feedback from changing ecosystem objectives. This approach will involve and inform citizens, stakeholders, scientists, resource managers, and policy makers through formal processes that contribute to attaining the goals of the IESMP. The IESMP will apply the basic Integrated Ecosystem Assessment concept which is an approach rooted in formal decision theory, and as in other applications of this paradigm, implementation forces practitioners to confront a dizzying array of issues. The approach will allow to quantitatively consider objectively and subjectively identified goals in an open and transparent setting. Identifying and evaluating trade-offs among diverse and possibly incommensurable objectives are feasible within this general setting. In marine ecosystems like Bakassi, issues span sectors as diverse as fisheries, tourism, energy, shipping, real estate, agriculture, and forestry (among many others). Despite the complexity of the issues, aspects of the IEA framework have been successfully used to guide management of marine resources as recognized by Levis *et al* .

To achieve the above-mentioned project objective, the project will implement the following four components: 1) Institutional and Stakeholder capacity building to be able to engage in the development and implementation of the IESMP; 2) Participative and inclusive development and implementation of IESMP; 3) Knowledge management, monitoring and evaluation and 4) Project Management.

Component 1: Institutional and stakeholder capacity building to be able to engage in the development and implementation of the IESMP

In the Bakassi area, institutional and policy frameworks are overwhelmingly oriented around peace building and economic development, and as a result there are significant gaps in policy, regulatory and institutional frameworks and capacities for the management and conservation of natural resources. While the government has created training centres in the region and has identified some capacity gaps, project capacity building under this component will target individuals,

organized local communities, government agencies and administration, private sector and CSOs in order to equip them to embark on an integrated natural resources management approach. The strengthening of policies, laws and regulations and the institutional and individual capacity building proposed under this project will create an enabling environment for the first ever implementation of an integrated ecosystem management approach (see Component 2) in the region that will support sustainable natural resource use and poverty alleviation.

Outcome 1.1: An enhanced policy, institutional and technical environment to develop an Integrated Ecosystem Services Management Plan (IESMP) for Bakassi mangrove ecosystems

Output 1.1.1 – Policy , regulatory and institutional frameworks are amended to integrate sustainable management of mangrove ecosystems into the existing Forest Law, and regulations governing fisheries and land zoning and use. According to the assessment conducted during the PPG, the weaknesses and constraints of the institutional framework result much from the centralized administrative organization of the state. Due to the low overall coordination, overlapping of competencies is real and felt locally. Among other duties, the Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife (MINFOF) is responsible for the development and implementation of the strategies for exploitation, regeneration, conservation and sustainable management of forests and wildlife, establishment and management of protected areas. As a wetland, the responsibility for the management of Bakassi ecosystems straddles between MINFOF and MINEPDED. Another manifestation of this poor coordination among ministerial departments is the overlapping of land use titles across the peninsula. In addition to the above mentioned weaknesses, there are a number of other institutional problems which include: (i) The inadequacy of Environment and Forests national policies in the management of wetlands and fragile ecosystems, particularly mangroves, and (ii) Weakness in the prescription of Environmental Impact Assessment and monitoring of environmental and socioeconomic indicators. Current government policy in Cameroon recognizes the need to decentralize development planning and action and to empower communities to contribute to and manage their own development processes. The policy structure is therefore conducive to community-demand driven development that is based on participatory planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of development programmes. At present, policies, laws, institutions, and regulations related to natural resource management and conservation are generally weak and insufficiently detailed and adapted to local conditions and authority. The project will support efforts to improve the regulatory, policies, institutions and regulations governing the management of mangrove ecosystems, including the need to clarify the status of mangroves within protected areas. More specifically, the project will support the review of Law 94/01 of 20 January 1994 related to the forests, fauna and fisheries regime. The weakness identified in this law is the lack of reference to mangrove forests. The National Mangrove Strategy adopted in January 2015 recommends the review of that Law to include the mangrove and also to develop a specific law on mangrove ecosystems management. Furthermore, the Decision N° 0108/D/MINEF/CAB of 9th February 1998, related to application of normative intervention in forest domain in Republic of Cameroon. The weakness identified by the Mangrove Strategy in relation to this law is the absence of a legal framework granting protection status of mangroves. The Strategy, therefore recommended the creation of Protected Areas which include mangroves. It is good however, to note action conducted to address specific mangrove areas in the country. One example is the Douala-Edéa Wildlife Reserve and related watersheds, which has now a Master Plan. The first 4 pillars of the Master Plan are:

- *Strategic pillar 1* (“law, regulation and institution-related components”) aims to establish a specific legal and regulatory framework for the management of mangrove forest ecosystems.
- *Strategic pillar 2* (“conservation and sustainable management”) aims to rehabilitate degraded areas and maintain or increase existing conservation areas in the Cameroon Estuary (parks, reserves, etc.).
- *Strategic pillar 3* (“collaborative and fair management”) aims to involve people who neighbour mangrove forests, as well as other stakeholders, in management activities through the establishment and management of community forests, including mangroves and watershed uplands, and in the development of detailed maps through a collaborative process. Such maps will serve to demarcate the limits of “village mangroves” between mangrove forest communities and fishing camps, etc.
- *Strategic pillar 4* (“sustainable development of infrastructure projects”) requires large economic and agro-industrial development projects to take into account the vulnerability of mangrove ecosystems and mitigate their negative impacts (e.g. through environmental and social impact surveys).

The analysis conducted during the PPG, clearly reveals that the above mentioned pillars are also relevant to Bakassi mangrove ecosystem and there the activities designed bellow will contribute to address the weakness of the policy and regulatory environment but also to implement actions contributing to the above mentioned 4 pillars,

The project also will work to strengthen policies and especially enforcement mechanisms (specific regulations) to address illegal and unsustainable fishing and conflicts over land zoning and use in the Bakassi area. More generally, this output will help to reverse the current baseline situation in which many policies and regulations have been adopted at the national level but have not been operationalized at the local level. The recent GEF/WB Forest and Environment Development Policy (FEDP) project highlighted the key importance of ensuring inter-ministerial cooperation, and in this proposed project, coordination activities will be prioritized, with the regional delegation of MINEPDED taking the lead role in this regard. The FEDP also identified the importance of clarifying distinct roles for MINFOF and MINEPDED in the management of forests and the broader environment. For this reason, the proposed project will make considerable effort to pinpoint the role that MINEPDED should play in ecosystem management, and the project design ensures that any activity to be undertaken by MINFOF will be done directly under MINFOF supervision – with the GEF project (managed under MINEPDED) funding the operation under the mandate of MINFOF will only be done once approved by MINFOF and with it close supervision.

As the mangrove ecosystem are the target focus in this project to reduce the pressure on this important aquatic system in collaboration with local community, the project will support expansion of the mangrove through the application of manual of creation of mangrove communities forest and execution of communities conservation agreement which place mangrove conservation at the centre of the community and local authorities action.

The activities of this output are as follows:

- 1.1.1.1. Conduct participatory consultations at council, regional and national levels to identify policy, institutional and regulatory gaps with the aim of promoting Bakassi ecosystem management
- 1.1.1.2. Strengthen policy and regulatory frameworks to close identified gaps, including development of proposals for amendments to integrate sustainable management of mangrove ecosystems into the existing Forest Law, and regulations governing fisheries and land zoning and use
- 1.1.1.3. Develop, validate and implement a procedural manual for the creation and management of mangrove community forests in Bakassi. This activity will support communities and local administration to expand mangrove communities protected forest in line with activity 1.1.1.6 below.
- 1.1.1.4. Conduct training and sensitization on ecosystem management and land use laws and regulations for IESMP practitioners; key staff of MINEPDED, MINFOF, MINEPIA, MINDCAF; and other key stakeholders
- 1.1.1.5. Build the capacity of Cameroon's defence forces on mangrove conservation issues
- 1.1.1.6. Conservation and Development Agreements (within the framework of the IESMP) negotiated with at least 20 villages in the Bakassi area to create Communities mangrove forest.

Output 1.1.2 At least 1 inter-institutional coordination mechanism for integrated management of Bakassi area is established. An assessment carried out by the Bakassi Development Committee recognised institutional problems as a key barrier to the development of the area, including the fact that although various ministries are active in the region, their programs are carried out within narrow sectorial approaches and are characterized by weak capacity; the lack of sub-regional or field representation of MINEPDED and other ministries in the region; and the lack of an institutional framework of collaboration among local sectorial administrations. GEF resources will help to address these and other institutional problems, with the primary goal of increasing institutional coordination and capacities in order to support the development and implementation of the Integrated Ecosystem Services Management Plan for the Bakassi area. The project will first conduct a stocktaking of initiatives at national and international levels to learn from successful models. One typical example of model to learn from is the Puget Sound¹⁵ ecosystem model in which the Washington Governor Christine Gregoire and the Washington legislature created the Puget Sound Partnership (PSP)—a public-private entity made up of citizens, governments, scientists, and businesses working to rehabilitate and conserve Puget Sound (<http://www.psp.wa.gov/>). In the National Strategy for sustainable Management of Mangrove envisage the creation of national Platform for stakeholder coordination. The project will support the creation of such platform at local level and will contribute to the emergence of a national one. This local platform may be the creation of an environment sub-committee in the existing Government Bakassi Development Committee placed under the Cabinet of the Prime Minister. The modus operandi of that platform will be discussed and agreed upon with all the stakeholders taken into account how the Bakassi Development Committee is operating and with the view to have due consideration of the biodiversity conservation.

¹⁵ The Puget Sound ecosystem includes 41,500 km² of upland, freshwater, estuarine, and marine habitats, and is home to a large and increasing human population from Olympia, Washington north to Vancouver, British Columbia. It is renowned for its superficial beauty

The activities of this output are as follows:

- 1.1.2.1. Carry out mapping and analysis of institutional stakeholder roles and responsibilities related to natural resources management, planning and conservation
- 1.1.2.2. Organize stakeholder meetings and consultations to agree on institutional roles and responsibilities within a revised institutional framework for integrated management of Bakassi ecosystems
- 1.1.2.3. Prepare official documentation, guidelines and management rules / agreements under the new institutional framework
- 1.1.2.4. At least one inter-institutional collaborative management platform established by relevant authority and evaluated annually

Output 1.1.3 – A conflict risk and mitigation plan is developed and implemented and the capacity of the existing Land Consultative Committees is enhanced. The plan's primary objective will be how enabling a peaceful environment can be created to ensure the conservation and expansion of mangrove in the Bakassi. The creation of communities' mangrove forests and the mangrove PA should be done in such a way the sustainability is ensured by avoiding opposition and conflicts. Ultimately, this will lead to: (i) Conservation of threatened taxa of global importance; and (ii) Preservation of habitat and/or important ecosystems for threatened and endemic species of global importance. The project will help to evaluate the risk to the expansion of the mangrove posed by human activities and natural processes. The objective of these conflict risk analyses is to qualitatively or quantitatively determine the probability that the mangrove expansion will reach the conservation objective or remain in an undesirable state as a response to changes in human-induced pressures. The conflict risk analysis will explicitly consider the inevitable uncertainties involved in understanding and quantifying mangrove ecosystem dynamics and their positive and negative impacts on social systems. With support from the UNEP Post-Conflict and Disaster Management Regional Coordination for Africa, the project will carry out activities to ensure that conflict and disaster vulnerabilities of the mangrove and social systems are assessed and a strategy for mitigation measures developed and incorporated into the new Integrated Ecosystem Services Management Plan (IESMP). The UNEP Disaster and Conflict Regional Coordination for Africa will support the project in providing guidance and technical support to the establishment of the Conflict Management mechanism in the project area taken into consideration current institutional and traditional set up. The coordination will also guide on what can be the project contribution to the post-conflict management issues in the project areas using the mangrove ecosystems as an entry point. This process will include assessments of the existing natural resources and services in relation to different users and potential conflicts in order to come up with a strategy that ensures peaceful coexistence among different stakeholders, including mining companies that have received concessions and other local users. The project also will assess disaster risks related to natural hazards, climate change, and industrial development, and incorporate disaster risk reduction measures into the IESMP. A critical issue in the Bakassi region is that approximately 98% of the population is made up of immigrants from Nigeria and therefore the assessment will identify opportunities to use shared natural resources as a platform for cooperation and peace building in the region.

The activities of this output are as follows:

- 1.1.3.1. Carry out a study of existing and potential conflicts and disaster risks in the region, compare in relation to existing natural resource governance frameworks (policies, processes and institutions), and identify mitigation measures
- 1.1.3.2. Strengthen the functioning of existing Land Consultative Committees responsible for land boundary conflicts in the Bakassi area by providing them with a good practices guide and other strategic and technical tools for conflict management, based on a review of partner experiences with conflict management in natural resources management
- 1.1.3.3. Sensitize the population on disaster risks and on land zoning, use and ownership processes, including IESMP practitioners, local villagers, and key staff of MINEPDED, MINFOF, MINEPIA, and MINDCAF
- 1.1.3.4. Develop guidelines for local land use planning which gives due consideration to mangrove conservation and expansion, agreed with MINEPAT and other stakeholders.
- 1.1.3.5. Develop and implement a conflict risk and mitigation plan, specifically adapted to the context of the Bakassi area, including multiple competing uses of natural resources, mangrove conservation and expansion, the presence of several nationalities, and a post-conflict environment
- 1.1.3.6. Disseminate lessons learned on the conflict risk and mitigation plan at local, regional and national level through experience exchange workshops

Component 2: Participative and inclusive development and implementation of IESMP

Current baseline interventions for ecosystem and resource management in the Bakassi area are implemented without sufficient planning, harmonization and long-term vision. Through this component, the GEF alternative will bring existing initiatives within a single Integrated Ecosystem Services Management Plan that includes biodiversity conservation, and pilot activities to demonstrate the potential to ensure livelihood options, the sustainability of the plan, and its role as a framework for biodiversity conservation and mainstreaming will be implemented. The GEF financing will add value through providing the funds to complete the IESMP process and to begin to manage pilot initiatives related to IESMP implementation, which have hitherto been severely limited by lack of resources. Cost effectiveness is one of the key underlying principles that guided project design. During the project preparation process a thorough inventory was made of the existing funding for ecosystem management within the area, and the project is carefully tailored to compliment this rather than duplicate it. GEF funds will be used as much as possible to leverage additional funds, by conducting studies that will influence the way that government (with development partner support) and the private sector allocate their funds. The design is intended to use the very limited GEF funds to maximum effect. The project also will identify key livelihoods initiatives that will help to alleviate poverty by increasing and diversifying income sources while also enhancing the involvement of local communities in natural resource management. The FEDP project identified the shift of Government focus and interest currently taking place in Cameroon from sustained livelihoods and natural resources management towards a greater emphasis on economic growth and employment. The proposed project therefore takes great care to support activities that will demonstrate that Bakassi ecosystems a) contribute to local job creation and b) do not unduly limit livelihood opportunities without appropriate mitigation of social impacts.

Outcome 2.1: Integrated Ecosystem Services Management plan that includes mangrove forest conservation and biodiversity mainstreaming developed and its implementation initiated in a few selected pilot areas through cross sectorial participatory processes that facilitate increased investments and adoption by local communities

Output 2.1.1 - Integrated Ecosystem Services Management Plan (IESMP) developed and under implementation, that increases the % of mangrove land cover and the conservation of aquatic biodiversity: The National Community Driver Development Programme (NCDDP) has facilitated the preparation of Council Development Plans (CDPs) for each of the Councils in the Bakassi area. The GEF increment will help to bring together current and planned interventions, including the CDPs and the pending establishment of the Ndongore Marine Protected Area and the Rio del Rey Ramsar Site, into an overall plan for management and conservation of sustainable resources in the Bakassi area. The IESMP will provide an enabling framework that can PA management effectiveness and support improved community planning and management of natural resource uses. The IESMP also will be used as a means of more accurately targeting investments in livelihood support initiatives, which historically have been very poorly targeted, often not benefiting those with the greatest stake in the Bakassi area, such as those people who are directly affected by ecosystem protection.

Capacity building elements under Component 1 will ensure stakeholder capacities to conceive and implement the plan.

The activities of this output are as follows:

- 2.1.1.1. Carry out a participatory and detailed mapping of land uses in the Bakassi area
- 2.1.1.2. Develop and validate the IESMP document and its operational plan for the Bakassi ecosystem, through a participatory approach where local communities, government authorities and other stakeholders agree on integrated ecosystem management standards at the local level
- 2.1.1.3. Implement the IESMP on a participatory basis, and document and share lessons learned with all stakeholders at local, regional and national level
- 2.1.1.4. Revise existing Council Development Plans and other programmes in Bakassi area to incorporate ecosystem services / biodiversity priorities
- 2.1.1.5. Initiate the gazette process (stakeholder consultation, delimitation and technical files prepared) for the Rio del Rey Ramsar site and the Ndongoré Marine Protected Area and develop detailed guidelines for PA Management Plans that incorporate social impacts
- 2.1.1.6. Based on mapping of mangroves to identify degraded areas and needs for reforestation (local adapted species and quantities, etc.), establish community mangrove nurseries for reforestation of degraded areas
- 2.1.1.7. Identify 2,000 ha of High Conservation Value (HCV) forest areas and develop and implement management plans.

Output 2.1.2 - Livelihood options that enhance ecosystem management and biodiversity conservation are tested and promoted in at least three different sites: To date, the development process in Cameroon has been determined primarily by the Government and external agencies without much input from local communities. Communities are however willing to contribute to the development process, if they are made aware of opportunities, and given the authority, training and responsibility to do so. In general people are willing to contribute time and labour for village development if they see the potential for benefits such as increased incomes and strengthened social structures. Therefore, the GEF increment will promote the efficient and sustainable use of natural resources to simultaneously promote biodiversity conservation, socio-economic development and post-conflict reconstruction objectives. The livelihood investment the project will support will include:

- Pilot certification process on sustainable fish production that will reduce harvesting pressures on mangroves while also enhancing local livelihoods. This effort will learn from the experiences of the joint World Fish Centre / FAO project on Aquaculture Certification in Thailand, and be carried out in collaboration with a recognized certifying agency particularly Rainforest Alliance and with local NGOs (OPED) with experience in other parts of the country on low wood consumption dryers and Chede Cooperative Union exporting agricultural products to Europe (the buyers); co-financing from MINEPIA will provide infrastructure (e.g. stores, cooling materials, etc.) that will support fishermen. The certified fish is expected to gain market in European Union countries through Chede Cooperative Union which is already exporting agricultural products to Europe.
- The ecotourism potential in the region is mainly around natural sceneries (Sea, beaches, rivers, mountains, mangrove, and biological diversity). The specific investment in ecotourism will be particularly the creation of Mangrove Ecotourism Centres in key locations in the region. The Mangrove Ecotourism Centre are key investment identified in the National Mangrove Strategy in ecotourism sector as alternative livelihood which will also contribute to resources mobilization for Non Timber Forest Products recognized to be of high income generating potential both at local and national levels. These products are Essessang¹⁶ and Eru. The Essessang has important ecological, culinary and medicinal value and can be important source of income from local and national markets.

Achievement of the activities under this output will be supported by the capacity building of local communities under Component 1.

The activities of this output are as follows:

2.1.2.1. Develop market value chains (including harvesting, processing, marketing, etc.) for key Non-Timber Forest Products (NTFPs) e.g. Essessang and Eru

2.1.2.2. Undertake a pilot certification process on fish production, focused on the utilization of fish dryers and technologies for fish smoking that use less mangrove wood and provide better testing and higher value fish products. The product is exported to European Union markets (Buyers)

2.1.2.3. Carry out a technical study on potential strategies for the collection and transformation of fishery wastes

2.1.2.4. Identify, develop and promote Mangrove Ecotourism Centres in at least two pilot localities (one in terrestrial areas and one in swamp areas)

2.1.2.5. Strengthen capacity of local communities (one in each council area) for adopting best practices in sustainable use of natural resources

2.1.2.6. Document lessons learned from pilot programs on NTFPs and fisheries value chains, fishery waste management, and ecotourism and disseminate for potential replication and up scaling

¹⁶ The oily seeds tree, *Ricinodendron heudelotii*, found in tropical [West Africa](#). It is also known as [Munguella \(Angola\)](#), [Essessang \(Cameroon\)](#), [Bofeko \(Zaire\)](#), [Wama \(Ghana\)](#), [Okhuen \(Nigeria\)](#), [Kishongo \(Uganda\)](#), [Akpi \(Cote d'Ivoire\)](#), [Djansang, Essang, Ezezang and Njasang](#). Two varieties of the tree species are recognized *R. heudelotii* var. *heudelotii* in Ghana and *R. heudelotii* var. *africanum* in Nigeria and Westwards. Ecological value: Presence of Njangsa helps to improve soil quality because the roots are colonized by [mycorrhizae](#) and because of its natural leaf litter. Burned kernel shells deliver potassium rich ash and the cake remaining after oil extraction from seeds has high nitrogen content. Both products can be used as fertilizer. Njangsa provides shade for humans, livestock and crops. Leaves can be used as fodder for livestock during dry season. Medicinal value: The extract from bark of the tree is used by traditional doctors as an antidote against poison because the extracts are said to contain [lupeol](#). It is also used to cure various diseases as cough, [malaria](#), [yellow fever](#), stomach pain, [rheumatism](#) etc. Other characteristics are aphrodisiac and anti-inflammatory properties. Seed husk and latex, leaf decoction and sap are also used to treat divers' illness. Culinary value: The seeds are usually dried for use as flavouring agent in West and Central African food dishes.^[2] The whole seeds are pounded in a [pestle and mortar](#) and the paste of ground seed is added as a [thickener](#) for soups and [stews](#). The prepared seeds (either pounded in a pestle and mortar or the prepared form from markets) are steamed and then crumbled into rice as a flavoring. The seed form the spice is also sold in [African](#) markets rolled into sausage shapes. Source: Wikipedia.

Output 2.1.3 – Bakassi Ecosystem Foundation established in order to support of implementation of the IESM plan: The lack of sufficient financial resources is a key constraint to effective sustainable resource management in the Bakassi area. Based on a review of existing financing mechanisms (TNS Foundation, CAMCOF, FEDEC), and following extensive consultations with stakeholders on various options and opportunities and taking in to account their needs as well as priority conservation objectives, the project strategy will support the establishment of the Bakassi Ecosystem Foundation (BEF), a financial mechanism with the goal of supporting implementation of the IESMP, and in particular biodiversity conservation activities as well as livelihoods activities that incorporate biodiversity conservation. The BEF will be funded through payments for ecosystem services and offset payments from companies in the mining and fishing industries.

According to CBD ‘innovative financial mechanisms for biodiversity’ **Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES)** are voluntary programmes that provide direct incentives to enhance the provision of ecosystem services. PES compensate individuals or communities whose land use or other resource management decisions influence the provision of ecosystem services for the additional costs of providing these services. They have been defined as “a voluntary, conditional agreement between at least one ‘seller’ and one ‘buyer’ over a well-defined environmental service – or a land use presumed to produce that service”. According to OECD, PES programmes have proliferated rapidly over the past decade, with more than 300 programmes implemented around the world. It is estimated that 5 national PES programmes alone channel more than USD 6 billion per year. Another study estimates that payments for watershed services in 2008 totaled over USD 9 billion. The **Biodiversity Offsets**, in other hand are instruments used to allow some continued project development, within an overall objective of no net loss of biodiversity. More specifically, biodiversity offsets are “measurable conservation outcomes resulting from actions designed to compensate for significant residual adverse biodiversity impacts arising from project development after appropriate prevention and mitigation measures have been taken”. They are intended to be carried out during the final step of the environmental impact mitigation hierarchy – avoid, minimize, and mitigate (restore and offset) – and are based on the premise that impacts from development can be offset if sufficient habitat can be protected, enhanced or established elsewhere. Interest in these programmes has increased in recent years, with about 45 programmes in place today that require biodiversity offsets or some form of compensatory conservation for particular types of impacts. In 2011, these were estimated to have mobilized between USD 2.4 and 4 billion (OECD, 2013).

In the case of Bakassi agreements could be sought from private sector companies whose activities have negative environmental impacts on the Bakassi ecosystem, and who can support IESMP activities as part of their corporate environmental policy. During the first two years of the project, legal, governance and institutional mechanisms will be created as needed in order to establish the BEF and to develop its criteria for funding of biodiversity conservation and mainstreaming programs; and to design and carry out a resource mobilization strategy and secure funding agreements from partners. During the last two years of the project, the BEF will support pilot activities and develop lessons learned, which will serve as the baseline for a possible national forum to explore the possibility of scaling up of such experience toward the establishment (post-project) of a Trust Fund. GEF funds will only be used to support the establishment of the BEF, for example by supporting an assessment of similar programs such as conservation trust funds in Madagascar and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and documenting and disseminating lessons learned and analysis for scaling up the approach at national level. There are experience of PES in Cameroon described in section 2 Page 13 – 22.. The project will collaborate with these initiatives to share strategies, approaches and finding.

The governance structure of the BEF will be established under the leadership of UNEP and in such a way that risk of diverting the fund objective is avoided. It can be established for example a Board chaired by a recognised independent national or international institutions and with member from CSO, Private Sector, Donor Representatives and Communities representatives. In addition to the consideration of national and local experiences on existing mechanism cited above, the establishment of BEF will learn from the different experience at international level.

For example, according to IUCN¹⁷, in the 1990s, Environmental Funds (EFs)¹⁸ have emerged as promising long-term mechanisms for providing financial support to biodiversity conservation and sustainable development activities. Environmental Funds vary greatly in terms of their funding, governance, structure, purpose and funding priorities. They

¹⁷ FINANCING BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION: The Potential of Environmental Funds. By Ricardo Bayon and Carolyn Deere IUCN-The World Conservation Union US Office, presented at a workshop on Financial Innovations for Biodiversity Bratislava, Slovakia 1-3 May 1998

¹⁸ Environmental funds are regional, national or community-based instruments for financing sustainable development or the conservation of biological diversity. They are instruments for managing money and disbursing it to people or projects that help protect the environment

operate at the local, national and sometimes, regional level. Yet, there are some common threads, both in terms of lessons learned and features contributing to success. For instance, the most successful funds tend to operate like independent foundations, investing their assets and using the interest to fund programs. They tend to be governed by mixed public-private sector boards, often with NGOs often as "majority stakeholders", helping manage the capital, invest the funds, and determine which projects will receive funding. The key issues to consider in the establishment of any Environmental Fund are:

- The source of funds: To date, major capital funding for Environmental Funds has come from national government payments resulting from debt-for-nature swaps, and from other bilateral or multilateral sources such as the GEF. However, environmental Funds are also increasingly focusing on harnessing in-country resources (such as user fees, taxes and levies, income from privatisation and donations) to ensure financial sustainability in the long-term.
- The Fund's long-term plan: What area/s will the fund focus on? Will it finance National Parks, National Conservation strategies, biodiversity conservation, poverty alleviation, or something else? Funds with clear short, medium, and long-term plans and with specific criteria governing the use of funds tend to be the most successful.
- Fund Governance: The relationship between the board and the secretariat has important impacts on the fund's success. The level of representation and decision-making power of NGOs on the board tends also affects the ultimate success of the fund.
- Asset Management: The long-term viability of the fund is strongly dependent upon the way in which the money is managed, the rate of return on investment, and the use of the fund's capital base. **The source of funds:** To date, major capital funding for Environmental Funds has come from national government payments resulting from debt-for-nature swaps, and from other bilateral or multilateral sources such as the GEF. However, environmental Funds are also increasingly focusing on harnessing in-country resources (such as user fees, taxes and levies, income from privatization and donations) to ensure financial sustainability in the long-term.
- Grant making Criteria: Both the private and public partners involved in the fund should jointly establish the criteria by which projects will be chosen for funding. Often, this involves building local participation into project preparation and assessment.
- Fund monitoring and evaluation: It is important to monitor and evaluate the impacts and effectiveness of projects funded. This means establishing monitoring and evaluation mechanisms BEFORE the projects are funded.

Clearly environmental funds can provide a useful and sustainable source of funds for biodiversity conservation. But beyond the money, the funds can also help build a culture of philanthropy in the countries concerned and serve as increasingly important actors in national policy arenas

As rightfully recognized by IUCN, regardless of whether it is private or public, greater investment in the environment is vital. The BEF will need reliable, long-term sources of financing to enable it to develop the internal capacity needed to take responsibility for the environment. Moreover, the BEF investment should meet certain basic criteria. It should:

- **Be Sustainable:** Wherever possible, investment should be available over the long-term. It should focus on goals rather 10, 15, even 50 years down the line, rather than on short-term gains.
- **Be Locally Driven:** Experience has shown that environmental problems are best solved by the people that are closest to the problem, the people most affected by the problem. By the same token, the closer the source of finance is to the activity or project being financed, the more likely it is to reflect the reality on the ground, and be flexible enough to meet changing needs/realities. For this reason, financial mechanisms tend to be most successful when they are locally managed and locally driven.
- **Create local Capacity:** The best measure of an investment's success is whether it builds the capacity of people to meet today's environmental problems as well as future challenges.
- **Leverage other funds:** The best investments are those that leverage additional funds to help meet their goals, thus multiplying their impact.

Based on the above lessons learning, the activities of this output are as follows:

2.1.3.1. Carry out analyses of ecosystem services and their potential economic value in the Bakassi area, and based on that, assess the potential for Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES) as well as offset payments for example by mining and fishing companies. To finance the BEF through PES, the project will conduct in-depth analysis of potential voluntary programmes that provide direct incentives to enhance the provision of ecosystem services in

Bakassi ecosystem. These services may include among others conservation of mangrove as a fish reproduction areas. The financing of the BEF through offsetting will be primarily through support to measurable conservation outcomes resulting from actions designed to compensate for significant residual adverse biodiversity impacts arising from industrial fishing, mining and other economic activities which may impact the biodiversity.

2.1.3.2. Develop a strategic plan and guidelines for establishment of locally driven and participative Bakassi Ecosystem Foundation (BEF), its structure, operation modalities, governance, etc. taken in to account lessons from analysis of existing funding mechanisms and their best practices in other initiatives or GEF-funded projects, and a resource mobilization strategy for the BEF

2.1.3.3. Establish a framework for GEF funds involvement in the BEF and sign agreements with other potential donors

2.1.3.4. Assess at middle term the performance or potential for performance of BEF in terms of supporting and improving livelihoods and the conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services in the Bakassi area

Output 2.1.4 - One viable and sustainable multi-stakeholder consultation, communication, interaction and decision-making framework that links clearly to IESMP is established in the Bakassi area: One of the constraints to the development of Bakassi, as identified by the Bakassi Development Committee, is the absence of an institutional set up that can bring together local stakeholders to discuss the development of the region. The GEF involvement will support development of this framework through consultation and support to the development of necessary tools to make the consultative framework adopted and more viable. If established, the framework will provide an enabling environment for decision making related to the process for the creation of the Ndongore National Park. Co-financing from the Bakassi Development Committee, located in the Prime Minister's Cabinet, will support the process by facilitating forums and ensuring political support.

The activities of this output are as follows:

2.1.4.1. Establish a collaborative platform to support collaboration among stakeholders, including a project portal developed on the MINEPDED website

2.1.4.2. Elaborate and validate the organizational chart of the collaborative platform and guidelines for collaboration for all partners

2.1.4.3. Elaborate and adopt bilateral agreements for transboundary management of mangroves, including at least one agreement signed between MINFOF/MINEPDED and at least one local natural resources user.

Component 3: Knowledge management, monitoring and evaluation

The project will assess available knowledge related to the sustainable management of ecosystem services and combine the results of that assessment with the results of the capacity assessments under Component 1 in order to generate knowledge that will both serve IESMP development and implementation and also provide an opportunity to compile lessons learned for national and international users. It is good to recall that in the application of the International Court of Justice Decision which transfers the Bakassi Peninsula to Cameroon, a Joint Nigeria – Cameroon Commission which meets regularly and alternatively in the two countries. The Commission always has in its agenda the development initiatives which will help to consolidate the peace agreement. In order to ensure sustainability of the mangrove conservation, the project will use the Bakassi Development Committee to convey the need for concerted approach with Nigeria through inclusion of conservation issues in the agenda of the Cameroon – Nigeria Joint Commission. Furthermore, there are currently NGOs which are working on transborder to support peace building. The project will develop partnership with these NGO to support awareness raising for the conservation of mangroves ecosystem. This is more than necessary as more than 80% of fishermen in Bakassi are Nigerian citizens. UNEP, through the Grape Apes Partnership (GRASP) has already initiate these kind of actions for the conservation of Gorillas population across the borders.

Outcome 3.1: Increased knowledge products, and sharing of knowledge and understanding of mangrove forests and terrestrial ecosystem services among stakeholders, to foster the development and implementation of the IESMP

Output 3.1.1 IEC plan is developed, learning and necessary knowledge development established, training package developed to build capacity for IESMP implementation:

The activities of this output are as follows:

- 3.1.1.1. Identify communication and sensitization tools, and develop, validate and implement an Information, Education and Communication (IEC) plan on the values of ecosystem services and biodiversity in the Bakassi area
- 3.1.1.2. Conduct organizational capacity strengthening, training and sensitization of existing groups, including local Cameroon – Nigeria Joint Commission, residents, environmental clubs, schools, Jangui groups savings associations, etc. to participate in IESMP implementation
- 3.1.1.3. Generate necessary knowledge and information kits to capture, analyse and disseminate lessons learned from project interventions
- 3.1.1.4. Support exchanges of experiences between Nigeria and Cameroon local cross border administration, local existing groups and other initiatives at national and international level, facilitated by UNEP/DEPI, the PSC, and contributing partner organizations

Output 3.1.2 – Key indicators to monitor changes in socio-economic impacts and environmental conditions under the Bakassi IESMP developed, tested and approved by all stakeholders: Effective management of the Bakassi ecosystems and implementation of the IESMP will require the establishment of clear and widely agreed indicators to measure environmental and socio-economic conditions and changes over time as the IESMP is implemented. At present, there is some useful socio-economic data and information in the Council Development Plans for the key councils at the site (Bamuso, Idabato, Idenau, Isangele, Kombo Abedimo and Kombo Itindi); in addition, in 2013 MINEPDED developed national environmental indicators that can be downscaled at the local level in Bakassi. The project will build on these data sets and indicators to develop specific IESMP indicators targeted at the Bakassi ecosystems. In support of the project, the UNEP Marine Branch will carry out carbon sequestration studies and measure water resources and environmental restoration objectives at the project sites, with the aim of measuring and demonstrating how good water resources management activities can contribute to marine ecosystem restoration, and conversely how good environmental management can benefit sustainable water management.

The activities of this output are as follows:

- 3.1.2.1. Elaborate in a participatory manner indicators on socio-economic impacts and environmental conditions to support implementation of the Bakassi IESMP, for example showing changes in land cover, conservation of aquatic biodiversity, etc.
- 3.1.2.2. Conduct participatory field-testing of the indicators in pilot areas
- 3.1.2.3. Based on results of field-testing, revise indicators and carry out a validation / approval process for their use under the IESMP
- 3.1.2.4. Develop guidelines documents and carry out technical training to support long-term monitoring of the Bakassi ecosystem using the IESMP indicator sets
- 3.1.2.5. Consolidate and disseminate knowledge products and environmental data developed under the IESMP, including (reports, flyers, lesson learned, policy briefs, manuals, etc.)

Output 3.1.3 - Project monitoring and evaluation system in place: The Project results framework as approved in the PIF was updated and reorganized during the PPG phase with strong stakeholder engagement and involvement. It will be revisited, and revised where needed, particularly during the Project’s Inception Workshop to ensure that all targets and indicators are agreed upon, are relevant, realistic and achievable, and that responsibilities for gathering information and tracking the achievement of these indicators are well understood among the different stakeholders.

The activities of this output are as follows:

- 3.1.3.1. Establish an M&E results-based framework for project monitoring and evaluation
- 3.1.3.2. Implement M&E during the project implementation period and draw lessons for the sustainable implementation of the IESMP
- 3.1.3.3. Constitute local IESMP monitoring committees and train them in various ecosystem monitoring techniques, in partnership with existing groups identified by the project (e.g. village committees, CIG, cooperatives, women’s groups, youth groups, traditional councils and municipal councils, etc.)

Project Management

This component relates to the operations of the Project Management Unit (PMU), which will consist of a Project Coordinator, an Assistant Project Coordinator, a Financial Manager / Project Accountant and a Project Secretary. The

salary costs of these project staff will be partially borne by the government of Cameroon (notably the Ministry of Environment) as part of their counterpart funding contribution. The Project will pay for their travel allowances when they need to travel to the field. This component also provides some funding to train key stakeholders and GEF project staff in GEF/UNEP Financial Management and Procurement Procedures (before project start and on-going through the project, as needed). It will also cover the operational costs of the PMU office (office equipment, stationery, communications, etc.); the costs of external evaluation and annual audits; and the costs of Steering Committee and other coordination meetings (travel, per diems and meeting costs).

Changes from PIF to CEO Endorsement document

| | At PIF stage | At CEO ER | Justification for changes |
|------------------------|--|---|---|
| | Project objective, Components and Outcomes (see PIF) | Same | No change from the PIF |
| Outputs of component 1 | <p>At least 1 Policy and 1 regulatory framework identified and agreed upon by key stakeholders during PPG phase, developed or adapted to Bakassi area to ensure integrated management of natural resources</p> <p>At least 1 Sustainable Institutional framework for integrated management of Bakassi area established</p> <p>At least 1 framework of conflicts risks and mitigation measures put in place and functional with active participation of key resources users.</p> | <p>1.1.1 – Policy and regulatory frameworks are amended to integrate sustainable management of mangrove ecosystems into the existing Forest Law, and regulations governing fisheries and land zoning and use</p> <p>1.1.2 - At least 1 inter-institutional coordination mechanism for integrated management of Bakassi area is established</p> <p>1.1.3 – A conflict risk and mitigation plan is developed and implement and the capacity the existing Land Consultative Committees is enhanced</p> | <p>Amended to clarify what the output will be deliver</p> <p>No significant change</p> <p>Amended to consider strengthening of an existing mechanism: Consultative Committees</p> |
| Outputs of component 2 | <p>One (1) Integrated Ecosystem Services Management Plan developed in participatory fashion and available to all stakeholders for implementation</p> <p>At least three (3) Identified livelihood options (e.g. introduction of efficient fish dryers, ecotourism promotion and Non Timber Forest Products - NTFP) that enhance ecosystems management and high conservation value areas are tested, and promoted at least in three (3) different sites.</p> <p>One (1) Financial Mechanism which will include pilot certification in support of implementation of the IESM plans and alternative livelihood of Bakassi management plans is capacitated.</p> | <p>2.1.1 - Integrated Ecosystem Services Management Plan (IESMP) developed and under implementation, that increases the % of mangrove land cover and the conservation of aquatic biodiversity</p> <p>2.1.2 - Livelihood options that enhance ecosystem management and biodiversity conservation are tested and promoted in at least three different sites</p> <p>2.1.3 – Bakassi Ecosystem Foundation established in order to support of implementation of the IESM plan</p> | <p>Reformulated to include the startup of the implementation of the IESMP</p> <p>No significant change</p> <p>Minor change to indicate the type of financing mechanism</p> |

| | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|---|
| | One (1) viable and sustainable multi-stakeholder consultation, interaction and decision making framework established in the Bakassi area | 2.1.4 - One viable and sustainable multi-stakeholder consultation, communication, interaction and decision-making framework that links clearly to IESMP is established in the Bakassi area | Slightly amended to include the communication aspect |
| Outputs for component 3 | <p>One (1) Learning and capacity building framework established to capture, analyse and disseminate lessons learned nationally and internationally</p> <p>1 Set of Socioeconomic impacts and environment monitoring indicators of Bakassi IESM plans developed, tested and approved by all stakeholders</p> <p>One (1) Project monitoring and evaluation system in place and shows satisfactory results</p> | <p>3.1.1 - <u>IEC plan is developed</u> Learning and knowledge management framework established, training package developed to build capacity for IESMP implementation</p> <p>3.1.2 – Key indicators to monitor changes in socio-economic impacts and environmental conditions under the Bakassi IESMP developed, tested and approved by all stakeholders</p> <p>3.1.3 - Project monitoring and evaluation system in place</p> | <p>Output 3.1.1 amended to include IEC element</p> <p>Minor amendment which has not changed the output meaning</p> <p>Minor reformulation</p> |

The incremental value of the project is described below:

The baseline scenario without GEF Investment is constituted of isolated interventions under the Bakassi Priority Programme, with local and international partners' operations targeting isolated communities or ecosystems. These baseline activities operate in an environment with weak institutional and individual capacities and insufficient enforcement of the regulatory framework and use of opportunities to boost partnership with private sector. Consequently, the role of biodiversity hot spots and ecosystem services in the context of mangrove ecosystems will continue to be undermined. The potential of building public-private partnership for the sustainable use of natural resources will suffer from a lack of champions and adequate frameworks (institutional, legal and financial) that can build confidence and trust between stakeholders.

The GEF alternative will support the Government of Cameroon to develop an Integrated Ecosystem Services Management Plan (IESMP) for the Bakassi ecosystems. Through the IESMP, the GEF increment will bring together in a harmonized way sustainable development initiatives that guaranteed biodiversity conservation and alternative livelihoods for the local communities. The IESMP will be operationalized through selective pilot activities related to biodiversity conservation and alternative livelihoods through supporting the stakeholders to ensure sustainable management of mangroves, in order to reduce pressures from overexploitation of mangrove wood for smoking fish and for construction materials and thereby to protect marine biodiversity linked to the mangrove ecosystems. Biodiversity mainstreaming within the IESMP will also be achieved by giving special attention to conserving High Conservation Value forest areas that support livelihood options. The sustainability of the IESMP and related pilot activities will be ensured through supporting the emergence of a financial mechanism and through focused capacity building including the strengthening of institutional and legal mechanisms. The GEF alternative will therefore support the baseline activities related to institutional capacity needs highlighted by the Bakassi Development Programme. The GEF alternative also will significantly influence both public, private and donor funding in the region to better prioritise the limited funds available to avoid and/or offset the environmental impacts of development projects, and to support social groups affected by conflict and post conflict readjustment to adapt and improve their livelihoods to more sustainable activities.

| <i>Baseline Scenario B (Business as Usual)</i> | <i>Alternative Scenario A (With project interventions)</i> | <i>Increment (A-B)</i> |
|---|--|------------------------|
| <i>Component 1: Institutional and stakeholder capacity building to be able to engage in the development and implementation of</i> | | |

| Baseline Scenario B (Business as Usual) | Alternative Scenario A (With project interventions) | Increment (A-B) |
|---|--|---|
| the IESMP | | |
| <p>Baseline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Institutional and individual capacities to manage natural resources are very weak - Existing development activities are directed toward peace building without addressing challenges related to natural resources management in a conflict situation - Significant post-conflict distrust among stakeholders - Extensive land grabs and lack of clear land tenure rights - Overexploitation of natural resources and pressure on fragile ecosystems with significant impacts on globally significant species <p>Probable results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continued environmental degradation stemming from development pressures in the Bakassi region - High risk of resource use conflicts - Weak recovery of social trust within a population that has just come out of military conflict - Permanent land conflict | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy, legal and regulatory changes to enable sustainable management of natural resources in the Bakassi peninsula - Capacity building that will create an enabling environment (institutional, systemic and individual capacity) for sustainable natural resources use and poverty alleviation and development and implementation of the IESMP - Conflict risk and mitigation plan will reduce land conflicts and organize land use of the Bakassi peninsula | <p>Local/national benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Effective participatory management of natural resources in the Bakassi region - Improved dialogue and social confidence among local populations in the post-conflict environment - Reduced levels of land conflict - Improved local capacity to sustainably manage the environment - Increased trust among population as a result of participatory preparation of the IESMP - Additional livelihoods options generated and their sustainability strengthened by improved management of natural resources <p>Global benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conservation of threatened taxa of global importance - Preservation of habitat and or important ecosystems for threatened and endemic species of global importance - Documented case study of post-conflict recovery involving improved environmental management in a region that represents a unique case of diplomatic success of United Nations on eliminating armed conflict between neighbouring countries |
| Component 2: Participative and inclusive development and implementation of IESMP | | |
| <p>Baseline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of coordinated ecosystem management among various sectors / stakeholders - Insufficient funding to prepare an IESMP in the project area - Protected Areas exist but funding is insufficient to make them formally gazetted or managed <p>Probable results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Environmental degradation, including loss of globally significant biodiversity, and levels of human health in the Bakassi peninsula continue to decline - Population's livelihoods are threatened over the long-term by on-going degradation of natural resources and ecosystem services | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Relevant baseline data collected, consolidated and readily analysed - IESMP elaborated and validated in a participatory approach - Stakeholders actively participating and taking responsibility for implementation of the IESMP - Participatory and inclusive activities contribute reducing animosities among different population groups and strengthen the state of peace in the Bakassi peninsula | <p>Local/national benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Relevant data on environmental conditions, ecosystem services and values, threats to ecosystem services, etc. available and accessible - Local awareness of linkages between integrated ecosystem management and sustainable livelihood opportunities - Capacities for management planning and administration strengthened - Demonstration of how participatory preparation and implementation of IESMP can effectively build positive collaboration and reduce conflicts between local communities and other stakeholders <p>Global benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The coastal and marine ecosystems of the Gulf of Guinea, a hotspot of biodiversity with endemic species of global significance, are sustainably managed and serve to improve local community livelihoods - Demonstrate a site-specific financing mechanism for long-term sustainable funding of biodiversity conservation |
| Component 3: Knowledge management, monitoring and evaluation | | |
| <p>Baseline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing environmental and resource data for the Bakassi area is largely outdated, insufficiently consolidated and not readily available <p>Probable results:</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Robust information systems on the ecosystems and environmental conditions in the Bakassi area are in place to help keep track of the evolution of the | <p>Local/national benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Bakassi ecosystem and its natural resources are sustainably managed and help improve local community livelihoods <p>Global benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The status and conditions of ecosystem and |

| Baseline Scenario B (Business as Usual) | Alternative Scenario A (With project interventions) | Increment (A-B) |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inability to identify priority threats or areas for conservation leads to inefficient use of resources and a lack of agreed resource management plans that bind resource users, resulting in continued degradation of Bakassi ecosystems - Collective irresponsibility vis-à-vis the conservation of unique biodiversity in the Bakassi region, with the risk of loss of some taxa | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> environment - Predictable and strategic actions to preserve Bakassi ecosystems and natural resources become possible thanks to robust data collection, analysis, stocking and sharing among stakeholders | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> species of global significance are well understood and more effectively managed to the benefit of all - Reduced degradation of the Bakassi ecosystem increases its contributions towards mitigating the effects of climate change |

Global Environmental Benefits:

By establishing an integrated ecosystem level approach to resource management and use that incorporates ecosystem services and values, strengthens management of protected areas, supports sustainable livelihood options and establishes mechanisms for long-term sustainable funding, the project will help to reduce the primary threats to biodiversity in the Bakassi area of southwest Cameroon, in particular biodiversity loss due to over-harvesting and conversion of habitat, unplanned development leading to encroachment on natural habitat, and resource use conflicts among local communities. The Project will contribute to maintaining global environmental benefits by conserving threatened taxa of global importance, preserving habitat and or important ecosystems for threatened and endemic species of global importance, linking improved local community livelihoods with sustainable resource management and conservation of ecosystem services. Other global benefits of the project will include demonstrating post-conflict recovery involving improved environmental management and demonstrating a site-specific financing mechanism for long-term sustainable funding of biodiversity conservation.

Bakassi ecosystem, including Ndongere and Rio del Rey PA to be established, and KBA status: According to IUCN “A Global Standard for the Identification of Key Biodiversity Areas, March 2016”, Bakassi ecosystem including Ndongere and Rio del Rey PA to be created, respond to criteria **A 1** (Threatened species site which hold a significant proportion of the global population size of a species facing a high risk of extinction and so contribute to the global persistence of biodiversity at genetic and species levels); **B1** (Individual geographically restricted species); **B2** (Co-occurring geographically restricted hold a significant proportion of the global population size of multiple restricted – range species , and so contribute significantly to the global persistence of biodiversity at the genetic and species level) and **E** (Sites have very high irreplaceability for the global persistence of biodiversity as identified through a complementarity – based quantitative analysis of irreplaceability).The project area which consists of Bakassi ecosystem contains (i) threatened or endangered species, thus responding the vulnerability criteria of KBAs and (ii) endemic species, responding to the irreplaceability criteria of KBA. The existence of the **threatened** gorillas sanctuary in Bakassi in addition to the important mangrove ecosystem, make these connected ecosystems biodiversity hot spots which appropriate management will yield Global Environment Benefits. As indicated in Cameroon NBSAP 2012, the area contains **Macro hotspots** (>100 threatened species : 2 sites on Mt. Kupe-Bakossi. Protected areas include the Mount Cameroon National Park (58 178 ha) and **Meso-Hotspots**: There are about 50-100 threatened species: Five sites in the Southwest Region; Bimbia-Bonadikombo (eastern foothills of Mt. Cameroon), Lake Barombi Mbo (Kumba) and southern Bakundu Forest Reserve (north eastern outliers of Mt. Cameroon), Mokoko Forest Reserve (north eastern outliers of Mt. Cameroon), West Bakossi North, West Bakossi South.

The diversity of marine fish in Cameroon marine and coastal waters totals some 557 species, **including 51 endemic species, 43 threatened**, 59 reef associated, 131 pelagic, and 187 deep water. 11 major fish families have been identified within Cameroon waters together with Shrimps, Cephalopods, Sharks and Rays of which two (**Serranidae and Scombridae**) are known to possess **threatened fauna**. (Krakstad et al, 2006). However, **a total of 20 species have been documented as vulnerable, endangered, near threatened, critically endangered or data deficient and likely to occur in Cameroon waters.** (www.IUCNREDList.orgChiambeng, 2006

Major hotspots include amongst others the Boumba Bek National Park (210 000 ha), Korup National Park (126 000 ha) Lobeke National Park (43 000 ha), **Bakossi National Park (29 320 ha)**, Takamanda National Park (67 599 ha), Mpem et

Djim (97 480 ha), Nki National Park, Mbam and Djerem National Park (4 234 78 sq km which overlaps the tropical forest and tropical savannah ecosystems), and the recent Deng Deng National Park (52 783 ha) created as a Biodiversity offset/compensation for the Lom Pangar Hydro-electricity Project. The Ndongore National Park (230,000ha) is in the gazettement process. The Rio Del Rey mangroves are a uniquely important habitat for the endemic and threatened species, the Giant frog (*Conrana goliath* – Endangered). It is also the environment of the West African Manatee (*Trichechus rachelia* - Vulnerable).

Innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up:

Several elements of the project design are innovative in the context of Cameroon and the region. In undertaking participatory preparation and implementation of the IESMP in the Bakassi area, the project is intended to demonstrate how such a process can effectively build positive collaboration and reduce conflicts between local communities and other stakeholders. In addition, the IESMP will be used as a means of more accurately targeting investments in livelihood support initiatives, which historically have been very poorly targeted, often not benefiting those with the greatest stake in the Bakassi area, such as those people who are directly affected by ecosystem protection. By establishing a clearly recognized mechanism for identifying the groups and individuals who should be supported, and a platform mechanism that outlines what will be done, the project is adopting an innovative approach to ensuring that agreed-upon mitigating measures are actually implemented. Furthermore, unlike most programs that develop national level financing mechanisms to support conservation, the proposed project will demonstrate the viability of a site-specific financing mechanism for long-term sustainable funding of biodiversity conservation. The project also incorporates a number of measures to ensure the sustainability of project outcomes. The project will ensure the sustainability of the project outputs through a comprehensive knowledge management approach (Outcome 3.1) that strengthens stakeholder understanding & capacity for implementation of the new regulatory framework (Outcome 1.1). The project also will directly support the preparation of IESMPs (Outcome 2.1). This holistic approach will enable GEF funding to be catalytic and create enabling conditions for a long-term financial mechanism that supports biodiversity conservation and sustainable livelihood options in the Bakassi region (Outcome 2.1). Finally, by contributing to an appropriate policy on collaborative management and conservation incentives, and by completing the regulatory framework and producing guidelines for the implementation of the IESMP, GEF funds will promote more environmentally & socially sustainable fishing and farming practices that simultaneously support biodiversity conservation and improve rural livelihoods. The project also has significant potential for up scaling and the impacts of the project should be felt well beyond its geographical scope. For example, modifications to the legal framework for ecosystem management developed and tested by this project will influence the approach of government stakeholders and funding partners to address more methodically and comprehensively the social impacts of ecosystem management well beyond the project area, to the South West Region, the National level and by example to the Congo Basin Region. Similarly, during the second half of the project, activities will be carried out to develop lessons learned on the establishment of the Bakassi Ecosystem Foundation (BEF) and the effectiveness of different funding mechanisms for projects supported by the BEF, which will serve as the baseline for a possible national forum to explore the possibility of scaling up of such experience toward the establishment (post-project) of a Trust Fund.

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

| Risks | Risk Level | Mitigations Measures |
|---|------------|---|
| Reluctance of local communities to participate in the project as a result of their culture and traditions, as well as the potential social impacts the project may have on them | Low | The project envisages through Outputs 2.1.1, 2.1.2; 3.1.1; a participative approach, with significant awareness raising, community dialogue, and local-level capacity development, and the development of various platforms for stakeholder dialogue and collaboration to generate understanding of and support for the conservation of ecosystem services. In addition, the project will develop alternative options and income-generating activities for local communities. The assessment of potential social and economic impacts of the project on local communities conducted during the PPG will be updated during the project implementation and the consensual mitigation measures suggested will be a part of the project activities. In addition, indicators will be defined for |

| | | |
|---|----------|--|
| | | monitoring the effective implementation of the measures. |
| Institutional instability | Moderate | The institutional assessment conducted during the PPG phase will be updated and recommendations on adequate institutional framework and capacity needs will be implemented during the project implementation. In mean time the envisage multi stakeholders platform will help to mitigate the risk. |
| Political instability and conflict | Moderate | The Green Tree Accord between Cameroon and Nigeria, which established basis for peaceful resolution of the Bakassi conflict between the two countries, provides a solid framework for the project to be executed in good condition. In addition, the Government of Cameroon has made peace building and development of the area one of its national priorities, and the significant on-going development of infrastructure in the areas is a testament to the GoC's commitment in this regard. Also, UNEP through the Great Apes Survival Partnership (GRASP) is supporting collaborative natural resources management between Cameroon and Nigeria, and the partnerships established by this program will provide an additional mechanism to help the proposed project to be executed in a peaceful environment. The envisage activities in the project output 3.1.1 will contribute in mitigating the risk |
| The existing policy, legal and fiscal framework a) does not encourage IESMP and b) does not adequately protect ecosystem services such as carbon stocks, biodiversity and supply of natural products that contribute to local livelihoods. | High | The Project will address this risk by supporting the further development the regulatory framework, standards and guidelines for preparation of ESMPs for Bakassi management and other public / private sector development projects that have impact on biodiversity. All the steps and criteria t develop and implement IESMP will be observed. |
| Weak enforcement of environmental laws and regulations, allows the arrival of unsustainable projects, and persistent illegal or unsustainable exploitation of natural resources. This will continue to foster degradation of ecosystems and loss of biodiversity. | Moderate | The project puts strong emphasis on the preparation and continuous monitoring of high quality ESMPs to ensure respect of agreed measures for significant development projects and IESMP. |
| There is a risk that the Executing Agency (MINEPDED) lacks capacity and experience for project and fiduciary management. There is additional risk that project execution by a government institution will not be sufficiently rooted at the field level. | Moderate | The Project Director (the Regional Delegate of MINEPDED) will need to execute the project through close consultation with MINFOF Regional Delegation and with various implementing partners on the ground. Specifically, this risk will be addressed by the following activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fund an experienced Project coordinator with responsibility for day-to-day management of the project, under the supervision of the Project Director. The PC will make regular field missions to plan activities with implementing partners on the ground, and monitor progress, providing advice where necessary. • Train the PIU team in GEF Procedures, MINEPDED key policies and procedures, and ensure ongoing training on other important developments. |
| Risk of confusion over the role of different GoC institutions. The risk was that MINEPDED would have taken on a legally non-mandated role in PA management within the project. | Moderate | The project design will assists MINEPDED to clarify and play its mandated role in the process of land allocation, i.e. to ensure that high quality Environmental and Social Impact Assessments are conducted during development project design, and during the gazettelement and management of Protected Areas. |
| Key private sector and conservation organisations are reluctant to coordinate and co-finance pilot projects for conservation and | Medium | The Project will address this risk, by securing private sector co-financing for ecosystem management and/or profitable & sustainable livelihood activities that are supportive of IESMP. |

| | | |
|--|----------|---|
| sustainable production | | The activities envisaged for project are designed to encourage such investment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forums to stimulate private sector investment organized by the project. • Projects / business plans for co-investment between local communities and private sector partners in sustainable agricultural / natural resource based enterprises. • Field missions with private sector to design, implement and monitor co-financed projects. |
| Lack of adequate budget for conservation | Moderate | Through output 2.1.3, the project will assist in the development of a strategic plan, and a resource mobilization strategy, to establish the Bakassi Ecosystem Foundation (BEF), which will be designed to provide long-term funding for biodiversity conservation and for livelihoods activities that contribute to biodiversity conservation. |

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

With regard to coordination with other initiatives, during the PPG phase, a comprehensive assessment of impacts and lessons learned from GEF activities in Cameroon and the region was conducted to capture the positive lessons learned and also the experiences from less successful projects. Lessons have been drawn from the GEF/WB Forest and Environment Development Policy (FEDP) project, whose objective was to strengthen public and private efforts to achieve socio-economically and ecologically sustainable use of national forest and wildlife resources. The project sought to: (1) promote the sustainable management of rainforests and savannah lands; (2) increase local community involvement in and benefits from sustainable management of natural resources; (3) improve the institutional and organizational capacity to implement new policies and regulations for forest management and timber industry development; and (4) enhance conservation of biodiversity and supply environmental services of national and global relevance. The FEDP closed in December 2011, with overall GEO outcomes rated as ‘unsatisfactory’; however it should be noted that MINEPDED (then called MINEP) performed satisfactorily and achieved all the outcomes for which it was responsible, including those relating to the publication of environmental regulations, information management and implementation of the Environmental Impact Mitigation Plan of the FEDP. Among the problems identified in the FEDP completion report, and which are addressed in the strategy of this project, is the importance of clarifying distinct roles for MINFOF and MINEPDED in the management of forests and the broader environment; the importance of ensuring inter-ministerial cooperation; and in light of new national policies that place emphasis on economic growth and employment, the need to demonstrate that Bakassi ecosystems a) contribute to local job creation and b) do not unduly limit livelihood opportunities without appropriate mitigation of social impacts. The project also will use lesson learned from the WB-GEF Sustainable Agro-Pastoral and Land Management Promotion under the National Community Development Program Support Program (PNDP), whose objective was to reduce poverty and promote sustainable rural development in Cameroon by strengthening local governance and empowering communities in rural areas, including marginalized groups. In particular, this project’s mix of activities to both ensure the productivity of the natural resource base and to preserve globally significant biodiversity will provide a model for such activities in the Bakassi area.

In addition, the project will build and compliment a number of on-going national and regional GEF projects executed in Cameroon. The UNEP-GEF project Development and Institution of a National Monitoring and Control System (Framework) for Living Modified Organisms (LMOs) and Invasive Alien Species (IAS) will be of interest for the project, particularly the issue of IAS and possible movement of living modified organisms into Bakassi as a transboundary area linking to the vast area of neighbouring Nigeria.

The GEF Council has approved a large number of projects in the Congo Basin under the Congo Basin Strategic Programme (CBSP) led by the World Bank. Among those of particular importance to this project is the FAO-GEF CBSP Sustainable Community Based Management and Conservation of Mangrove Ecosystems in Cameroon project, whose objective is to have in place planning, managing and monitoring capacities, institutional frameworks and consultative mechanisms for the long-term sustainability of mangrove forest ecosystems and their biodiversity through participatory and inclusive participation of communities and other key stakeholders. Another important relevant project is the WB-GEF CBSP Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Ngoyla-Mintom Forest project whose 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, through an approach based on land use planning and fostering public-private partnerships. The proposed project will coordinate and exchange experiences with the Ngoyla-Mintom Forest project, for example in supporting MINEPDED to perform its role in providing the information on biodiversity, social impacts, and sustainable land use and livelihood options necessary to make land use planning more sustainable.

The proposed project also will seek to share information and lessons learned with several relevant regional projects under the CBSP framework, including the UNEP-GEF CBSP - A Regional Focus on Sustainable Timber Management in the Congo Basin, the UNDP-GEF CBSP Sustainable Financing of Protected Area Systems in the Congo Basin, the WB-GEF CBSP Enhancing Institutional Capacities on REDD issues for Sustainable Forest Management in the Congo Basin. Under International Waters, the on-going project UNEP-GEF Demonstrating and Capturing Best Practices and Technologies for the Reduction of Land-sourced Impacts Resulting from Coastal Tourism, will be an important model for lessons learned as the marine environment and tourism are important aspects of the Bakassi project. In addition, the on-going UNEP-GEF CBSP - A Regional Focus on Sustainable Timber Management in the Congo Basin project has strengthened the periodic project portfolio review by the Central Africa Forests Commission (COMIFAC) with the goal of ensuring synergy and complementarity between projects implemented in Congo Basin. UNEP will ensure that the same approach is used by the GEF Operational Focal Point of Cameroon to conduct periodic reviews of GEF projects to ensure synergy and complementarity.

The recently approved UNEP-GEF project on Sustainable farming and critical habitat conservation to achieve biodiversity mainstreaming and protected areas management effectiveness in Western Cameroon - SUFACHAC will also be of interest for the project. As the SUFACHAC project is aiming at strengthening and expanding the PA network of, and mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in, the Bakossi Banyang Mbo landscape, the south west region, it will be very useful for the UNEP-GEF Bakassi project to coordinate and exchange experiences with the SUFACHAC project in order to make ecosystems management more sustainable. In this perspective, as the two projects will be implemented at the same time, a process will be put in place to discuss and ensure joint steering committee of both projects. This will ensure synergy and complementarity and the same time will be cost effective as there will be cost sharing of meetings organisation.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

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

During the PPG phase, national, local and community stakeholders were consulted on the Project's implementation strategy and were invited to join several inclusive stakeholder workshops. Together with the GEF review process and comments, they provided a very good backdrop to re-evaluate on-the-ground needs and expectations and to revise the project implementation strategy for more reliability, feasibility and sustainability. The most important expectations of local populations for the project as expressed during these consultations are: i) the involvement of local authorities including traditional rulers in the IESMP process, ii) the necessity of equitable land use to avoid rampant land grabbing, iii) the improvement of livelihoods through promoting income generating activities, iv) the need for clarification of roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders in natural resources management within the Bakassi IESMP, v) the need to fight against illegal logging, poaching and other unsustainable practices commonly carried out by persons coming into the area from other countries. In addition, the consultation meetings recommended the following key approaches to the management of the Bakassi ecosystems: i) training and awareness raising on best practices related to natural resource management, ii) development of a collaborative framework and guidelines for resource management, iii) organisational strengthening of CBOs and CSOs involved in land use management in order to reduce the negative impacts stemming from natural resource exploitation, iv) and development of synergy and cooperation among stakeholders (councils, traditional rulers, public local authorities, local NGOs and associations, communities, etc.) for the development and implementation of micro-projects.

During project implementation, stakeholder analysis will be deepened, and engagement will be sustained through various institutional structures: the Project Steering Committee, local IESMP-level Consultation Platforms and through regular public-private sector forums with innovative farmers and community leaders. The proposed IESMP Monitoring and

Evaluation mechanism will also bring stakeholders together on an annual basis to share perspectives and mutually evaluate the effectiveness of project interventions on the basis of mutually agreed set of social, economic and environmental criteria. The table below characterizes the specific entry points and different and complementary roles various stakeholder groups and political actors are expected to assume during project implementation. Managing the consultative and participatory processes will be a dynamic exercise, and the table below is only an indicative assessment that will be adapted during project implementation.

| Stakeholders | Role in Project Implementation |
|--|---|
| Government Institutions | |
| Ministry of Environment, Nature Protection and Sustainable Development (MINEPDED) | MINEPDED is the Executing Agency for the project will have a crucial role to play in overall national and institutional coordination of the project. MINEPDED's existing role in supervising the preparation and monitoring of ESMPs, and for coordinating REDD+ development, are among the main justifications for it to lead implementation of this project. MINEPDED will also facilitate the leveraging of private sector initiatives that can support sustainable development in the region, particularly through the development and implementation of the IESMP. |
| Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife (MINFOF) | MINFOF is responsible for the establishment and management of Protected Areas, and already has significant financial support within the government investment budget, which can help to support (along with GEF resources) the consultations for the gazettelement of the Ndongore Marine Park and the Rio del Rey Ramsar site targeted by the Project. MINFOF also will be the key partner in identifying key ecosystems including mangroves and strengthening the protection of those ecosystems. |
| Ministry of Economy, Planning and Regional Development (MINEPAT) | MINEPAT is responsible for land use planning, coordination of rural development, and resource mobilization, and therefore will play an important role in the execution of Component 2 of the project. MINEPAT will be supported to identify, plan and provide coherent support for sustainable rural development in the Bakassi area, in line with the IESMP. |
| Ministry of Tourism (MINTOUR) | MINTOUR will be the key player in the identification and promotion of eco-tourism activities. |
| Ministry of Research, High Level Education and Innovation (MINRESI) | MINRESI is the institutional body in charge of research and academic institutions, and as such will facilitate their involvement and consideration of relevant thematic research on ecosystem management, etc. into the national academic and research agenda. |
| Sectorial Ministries (and their subordinate agencies) with responsibilities linked to ecosystem management | Various ministries implement programs that can impact ecosystem management in the Bakassi area, including the Ministries of Transport, Public Works and Infrastructure; Agriculture and Rural Development; Territorial Administration & Decentralization; Water and Energy; State Property Survey and Land Tenure; Livestock, Fisheries, and Animal Industries; Defence; and Mines, Industries and Technology Development. In addition, other government agencies such as the Agronomic Research and Development Institute have relevant programs. These ministries and their subordinate technical (executive) agencies (i.e. their local branches which serve both the central and regional level) will play a major role in the Project. Some of these ministries will participate as members of the Project Steering Committee (PSC) and/or will back up the project with technical expertise. Various ministries will contribute to work on national and local level governance processes, e.g. on land-use and development planning, including relevant legal and policy expertise; and to national and local level data collection and analysis on environmental parameters, biodiversity and natural resources, social and demographic parameters etc. All of the ministries will be concerned with issues of developing, implementing or mainstreaming policies and strategies through the regular vertical and horizontal governance procedures to ensure that the delivery of the project fits national standards. |
| Regional and district level governmental bodies | A number of regional and local government bodies will be actively involved in the project, including the Governorate of South West Region of Cameroon; Local Councils (Isangele, Kombo Abedimo, Idabato, Bamuso and Kombo Itindi); the local branches of ministerial and executive agencies; and the Bakassi Development Committee, which is an inter-ministerial body linked to the Prime Minister's office. The regional/district government will participate in the Project Steering Committee and otherwise support oversight and guidance of the project. Local branches of certain ministries and executive agencies, as well as municipal and parastatal bodies will assume a role according to their mandates and support capacities. These bodies will contribute (significant in terms of the regional government) to baseline investments, including, staff, infrastructure, equipment and operations. They will also support the strengthening of local level governance processes e.g. on land-use and development planning, and on relevant legal and policy changes, and assist with data collection and analysis of environmental parameters, biodiversity and natural resources, social and demographic parameters. |
| Universities of Buéa | The Universities of Buéa and Dschang will help to identify biodiversity priorities and conservation |

| Stakeholders | Role in Project Implementation |
|---|---|
| and Dschang | solutions, agricultural best practices, and agriculture and natural resource related business opportunities, and they will support research activities and some targeted capacity building. |
| Local Communities and Organizations (CSOs, NGOs, Women's and Resource Users' Associations, etc.) | |
| Local Communities | Stakeholders in the elaboration and implementation of the project include first and foremost the communities who live closest to, and have traditionally used these ecosystems and adjacent lands to sustain their social and economic wellbeing. Their effective engagement during project implementation will be assured through the identification of, and support for, activities that simultaneously improve the livelihoods of local communities and build local support for effective conservation measures. A careful identification and engagement of community members affected by ecosystem management are key to the success of the project, and the long-term conservation of biodiversity in the region. The Indigenous and Local Communities (ILC) in Bakassi Peninsula will be at the centre of the local dialogue both in terms of considering their expectations, responsibilities in the development and implementation of the Integrated Plans but also in terms of handling the issues of potential socioeconomic impacts the project may have on their livelihoods particularly as mangrove protected area creation is anticipated. Farmers also will play an important role; farming is the primary economic activity in the area and local farmers are the major private sector investor in the Bakassi area, and therefore project activities will involve significant dialogue with and participation of farmers. |
| CHEDE Cooperative Union Ltd. | CHEDE is a private sector institution with CSO status that is a federation of local agricultural cooperatives/societies. CHEDE will be an official local executing partner of the project in Bakassi, where it has done research and field work for the past several years. CHEDE is working with MINEPAT to mobilize investments for economic activities designed to protect the peninsula's ecosystem while also boosting the incomes of its inhabitants. |
| Centre Technique pour la Foresterie Communale (CTFC) | CTFC supports community forest management and will be a key partner in the development of the Integrated Ecosystem Services Management Plan targeting forest ecosystems. |
| Other Local Organizations | Bakassi is a region grounded in traditional societal and religious actors such as the Fons and Elders, as well as a range of community-based groups that have developed in recent decades, including environmental NGOs, fisheries cooperatives and associations, a variety of CSOs, and numerous and diverse associations including many women's associations. Representatives of such organizations will be appointed to the PSC and project technical boards in order to ensure community participation in project implementation. Local NGOs and associations, including women and youth associations, most involved in natural resource exploitation or supporting relevant alternative livelihoods will be engaged as project implementing partners through contracts negotiated with the PIU. Civil Society Organizations will give technical backstopping in the areas of fisheries production, fish post-harvest preservation and management, and in mobilization and training of women and youth. Other possible contributions of community groups will encompass, inter alia, active intellectual and physical engagement, provision of traditional knowledge, socio-cultural information and interaction, decision-making and moderation processes and societal cohesiveness, granting of local support, tenure rights, and provision of land. The establishment of Field consultations will be an important participatory tool to engage local communities and resource users in evaluating, approving, implementing and discussing approaches for IESMP development |
| Private sector | |
| Small & Medium Enterprises and Large Enterprises | Private sector enterprises, including private and cooperative Small and Medium Enterprises in fisheries, agriculture/livestock, trade etc. as well as Large Enterprises such as companies involved in oil, transport and construction etc. will be engaged in a dialogue to support the environmentally friendly objectives of the project through their regular participation in the proposed public-private sector platforms with community leaders and farmers. The possible involvement of the private sector in IESMP preparation will primarily focus on small and medium scale activities, community-based enterprises as well as women's associations active within the target areas. Private sector stakeholders also will be sought as partners to support the long-term funding of the implementation of the IESMP. |
| International Organizations | |
| United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) | UNEP and its specialized partner agencies will, in addition to fulfilling its oversight functions as GEF Implementing Agency, provide a wide range of technical in-kind contributions to the design and implementation of the project, including linkages with parallel UNEP programmes of national and global nature focused on related issues, including protected areas, conservation planning, environmental policy and climate change-related expertise; biodiversity databases, data analysis, decision-support tools and GIS systems; coastal zone management, wetlands and natural resources management, etc. UNEP will ensure full consideration of the Bakassi integrated ecosystem services management plan in the UN |

| Stakeholders | Role in Project Implementation |
|---|--|
| | country programme and will therefore create opportunities for more resources to flow from UN Agencies and their partners in support of the project. The UNEP Disaster and Conflict Regional Coordination for Africa will support the project in providing guidance and technical support to the establishment of the Conflict Management mechanism in the region. The coordination will also guide on what can be the project contribution to the post conflict management issues in the project areas. |
| Global Water Partnership (GWP) | Both regional (Africa) and national representatives of GWP will be involved in the project, particularly on coastal management issues and investigating the potential of coastal mangroves for carbon sequestration |
| Other International and Bilateral development partners | Other agencies such as UNDP, UNESCO, FAO, and others have been active in supporting conservation and sustainable development efforts in the South West region and will support the objectives of the proposed project by participating in the Project Steering Committee (this may be organized in a rotational or other appropriate manner, with other institutions that have an activity-/site-specific stake invited to partake in consultation mechanisms temporarily or as guests). Thematically, these stakeholders will be involved in various biodiversity conservation elements of the project, including e.g.: biodiversity and ecosystem monitoring and field research (marine and terrestrial), training and capacity development, development of incentive-based mechanisms, conservation policies and legal instruments, community involvement, outreach and awareness programmes; assessment and evaluation of the ecosystem services provided by the target protected areas; climate change modelling, land degradation/ soil erosion mapping, etc. All such contributions will be defined in detail during the Project's inception phase, and will encompass material, financial and in-kind contributions to the baseline investment (partly through staff, infrastructure, equipment and operations). |
| International Agreements, Conventions, Programmes and Platforms | Cameroon has ratified and acceded to most of the international agreements and conventions relevant to the proposed project. Convention secretariats and other partners will provide linkages with relevant international processes; offer guidance, training, awareness raising and educational materials to support the work of the IESMP; and assist in showcasing, sharing and disseminating the experience and achievements of the project in international fora. |

With regard to institutional arrangements, UNEP/DEPI is the *Implementing Agency (IA)* for this GEF project. UNEP/DEPI shall in its role as GEF Implementing Agency, provide project oversight to ensure that GEF policies and criteria are adhered to and that the project meets its objectives and achieves expected outcomes in an efficient and effective manner. It shall also in partnership with MINEPDED and other key project partners engage in promoting the project with a view to mobilizing resources and partnership. Project supervision will be entrusted to the UNEP Division of Environmental Policy Implementation (DEPI) Director who will discharge this responsibility through the assigned Task Manager who represents the UNEP/DEPI Director on the Project Steering Committee. Project supervision missions by the Task Manager shall constitute part of the project supervision plan. UNEP/DEPI will perform the liaison function between UNEP and the GEF Secretariat and report on the progress against milestones outlined in the CEO approval letter to the GEF Secretariat. UNEP shall inform the GEF Secretariat whenever there is a potentially substantive co-financing change (i.e. one affecting the project objectives, the underlying concept, scale, scope, strategic priority, conformity with GEF criteria, likelihood of project success, or outcome of the project). It shall rate, on an annual basis, progress in meeting project objectives, project implementation progress, risk, and quality of project monitoring and evaluation, and report to the GEF Secretariat through the Project Implementation Review (PIR) report prepared by the Executing Agency (EA) and ensure that the Evaluation and Oversight Unit of UNEP arranges for an independent terminal evaluation and submits its report to the GEF Evaluation Office.

The Ministry of Environment, Nature Protection and Sustainable Development (MINEPDED) is the National *Executing Agency (EA)* of the project and shall take responsibility to ensure that the project is implemented in accordance with the agreed objectives, activities and budget and deliver the outputs and demonstrate its best efforts in achieving the project outcomes. It shall also coordinate activities with the other key Government partners, including the Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife (MINFOF), the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MINADER), the Ministry of Livestock, Fisheries and Animal Industry (MINEPIA), the Ministry of Economy, Planning and Land Management (MINEPAT), the Ministry of Water and Energy (MINEE), the Ministry of Mines, Industries and Technology Development, the Ministry of Scientific Research and Innovation (MINRESI), the Ministry of Land Tenure (MINDCAF), the Universities of Buea and Dschang, international NGOS, local NGOs such as the Environment and Rural Development Foundation (ERuDeF), private sector partners such as the Chede Cooperative Union, and other relevant partners, and address and rectify any issues raised by UNEP with respect to project execution in a timely manner.

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

The Bakassi peninsula offers substantial socio-economic opportunities for local communities, particularly in terms of fisheries production as in the baseline situation the primary beneficiaries in the fisheries sector are mostly non-resident / foreign actors who capture many of the fisheries resources and associated benefits. The proposed project will support the government and local communities to establish the policy and regulatory frameworks to ensure that the socio-economic benefits of natural resource exploitation accrue primarily to local communities. The project also will support long-term alternative livelihood options for local communities, including improved production of crops, fodder and trees; fishing and fish conservation improvements; introduction of value chains and product branding. For example, persons involved in the production of smoked fish have average monthly incomes ranging from US\$138 - US\$875, but analyses carried out during project preparation estimate that by implementing activities to reinforce organizational capacities, improve smoking techniques, and support commercialization and value chain development, the project can increase average monthly incomes. Furthermore, by establishing the first cross-sectorial Integrated Ecosystem Services Management Plan for the area, the project will help to maintain the long-term viability of ecosystem services such as fisheries habitat, water provision, fuel wood provision, etc., which will improve socio-economic conditions and thereby reduce immigration out of the region, thereby maintaining the manpower needed to boost the local and regional economy and maintain important social structures. Effective ecosystem services management also will contribute to reduced conflicts among local groups by ensuring equitable access and sharing of ecosystem services and by enhancing collaboration and the capacities of local and national stakeholders in resource management.

Socio-economic baseline data will be incorporated into the capacity needs assessment and the capacity development strategy that particularly targets the local communities. Ecosystem services maps will delineate trade-off analyses and vulnerability assessments, which will build the foundation for piloting sustainable financing schemes, based on local conservation efforts that also aim at diversified and/or alternative livelihoods. The strong support expressed for the project from community-based organizations during the PPG phase (demonstrated in numerous letters of endorsement and support) reflects the confidence among local groups that the Project will effectively deliver socio-economic benefits.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment:

The project will ensure that women's access to and use of natural resources is fully recognized, and that where such uses must be restricted, that women too are given equal access to project support to ensure that they find viable alternative livelihoods activities (e.g. in fish production / processing). The income generating activities promoted by the project will see an important proportion of its funding devoted to women groups in order to strengthen them and encourage them to feel part of the project implementation. Within the project area, indigenous people and women engage significantly in the post-harvest preservation of fish – approximately 77% of fishmongers are women aged 26-40. In order to ensure that the benefits of new processes for drying fishing, and other sustainable resource / livelihoods activities, accrue equally to women (many of whom have very little formal education), the project will directly link production oriented activities with the development of management and business skills among women, which will provide a useful model for the protection of women's economic rights relevant throughout the region. The project will identify vulnerable communities and ensure that the drivers that push women to engage in unsustainable practices are addressed, for example through improving access to land, and through improving farming techniques, yields and revenues on the land available to women. Women's associations will be sensitized and involved in the implementation of the project, and their concerns and interests will be taken into account.

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

Cost effectiveness is one of the key underlying principles that guides project design. During the project preparation process a thorough inventory has been made of the existing funding for ecosystem management within the area and is carefully tailored to compliment this rather than duplicate it. The GEF funds are being used as much as possible to leverage additional funds, by conducting studies that will influence the way that government (with development partner support) and the private sector allocate their funds. The design is intended to use the very limited GEF funds to maximum effect. The project will have impact well beyond its geographical scope. The modifications to the legal framework for

ecosystem management developed and tested by this project should influence the approach of government stakeholders and its funding partners to address more methodically and comprehensively the social impacts of ecosystem management should have impact well beyond the Project area, to the South West Region, the National level and by example to the Congo Basin Region. Another key aspect of cost-effectiveness is the proposal to refine and use the EISMP tool as a means of more accurately targeting investments in livelihood support initiatives. Historically, these have been very poorly targeted, often not benefiting those with the greatest stake in the Bakassi area, such as those people who are directly affected by ecosystem protection. Typically, conservation initiatives have very limited funds for such livelihood activities. Hence a clear, legally recognized mechanism for identifying the groups and individuals who should be supported, and a platform mechanism that outlines what will be done is highly efficient, and is most likely to ensure that agreed mitigating measures are actually implemented. The legal framework provides a mechanism at Divisional level to regularly monitor IESMP implementation, including the allocation of resources for its conduct, thereby minimizing the need for extra-ordinary budgets to monitor project implementation.

The Project will also link up with and build upon ongoing and relevant global initiatives and platforms. This approach is adopted to generate greatest possible synergies at the local/national and global levels, and therefore maximize cost-effectiveness. This approach will generate global benefits in terms of (a) positively contributing to the enhanced conservation status of globally important biodiversity, improved land management and ecosystem stability at large, and (b) positively contributing to the ongoing international dialogue on sustainable development challenges. The coordinated approach among project activities at the local/national and global level, facilitated by UNEP/DEPI, the Project Steering Committee, and contributing partner organizations, will avoid duplication of activities and investment, maximize synergies with other relevant initiatives and further improve cost-effectiveness.

Cost-effectiveness measures include: i) Building on existing programmes and grassroots efforts at the local, national and international level; ii) Building on prior experience, data and knowledge generated through the broad consortium of project partners; iii) Targeting an extensive range of stakeholders, including through existing local, national and international networks, so as to maximise impacts at various governmental and societal levels; iv) Employing a capacity development approach that targets both local stakeholders so as to improve the notion that conservation efforts can contribute to improved and diversified livelihoods, thus instilling sustainability; and that aims at enhancing the capacities of local authorities to integrate local stakeholders in decision making processes, hence increasing policy relevance and cohesiveness; v) Forming communication and knowledge networks which create bridges between local needs and realities, translation into relevant and applicable policies. as well as uptake and replication opportunities through international fora and networks; vi) Investing in pre-emptive measures, e.g. to prevent and manage the introduction of invasive alien species, rather than late and expensive solutions; vii) Installing sustainable financing mechanisms that aim at ensuring that the cost associated with developing and implementing the IESMP of Bakassi region will be met in the long term.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M &E PLAN:

| Type of M&E activity | Responsible parties | GEF Budget (\$) | Budget co-finance (\$) | Time frame |
|--|---|-----------------|------------------------|---|
| Inception meeting | - Project Management Unit (PMU) - UNEP | 14,000 ** | 30,000** | Within 2 months of project start up (cost incorporate in project components) |
| Inception Report | - PMU | - | 14,000* | One month after project inception meeting (Cost incorporated in project components) |
| Measurement of project indicators (Outcomes, progress and performance indicator, GEF tracking tools) | - PMU | - | 25,000* | Outcome indicators: Start, mid and end of project Progress/perform. Indicator: annually (cost incorporate in project components and management budget) |
| Semi-annual Progress/ Operational Reports to UNEP | - PMU | - | 12,500 * | Within 1 month of end of reporting period, i.e. on or before 31 January & 31 July. (cost incorporate in project components and |

| | | | | |
|---|--|----------------|----------------|---|
| | | | | management budget) |
| Project Steering Committee (PSC) meetings | - PMU - UNEP - National Partners | 60,000 ** | 40,000 ** | Annually (physically, at least) + telephone and video conferences as needed |
| Reports of PSC meetings | - PMU | - | 10,000 ** | As per above |
| Project Implementation Report (PIR) | - PMU | - | 20,000 * | Annually, part of reporting routine |
| Monitoring visits to field sites | - PMU - UNEP | 60,000 * | 50,000 * | As appropriate |
| Mid Term Review/Evaluation | - UNEP | 20,000 ** | - | At mid-point of project implementation |
| Terminal Evaluation | - UNEP | 25,000 ** | | Within 6 months of end of project implementation |
| Audit | - PMU | 10,000 ** | - | Annually |
| Project Final Report | - PMU | - | 10,000 * | Within 2 months of project completion |
| Co-financing Report | - PMU | - | 10,000 * | Within 1 month of the PIR reporting period, i.e. on or before 31 July |
| Publication of Lessons Learnt and other project documents | - PMU | 50,000 ** | 30,000 ** | Annually, part of Semi-annual Reports & Project Final Report |
| Total M&E Plan Budget | | 239,000 | 251,500 | |

* Cost internalized in project components and/or management budget

** Cost budgeted separately in specific budget line

PART III: CERTIFICATION BY GEF PARTNER AGENCY(IES)

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

| NAME | POSITION | MINISTRY | DATE (MM/dd/yyyy) |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| M. NANTCHOU NGOKO Justin | GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT | MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT, NATURE PROTECTION AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (CAMEROON) | SEPTEMBER, 25 TH , 2015 |

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies¹⁹ and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO endorsement under GEF-6.

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

| Agency Coordinator, Agency Name | Signature | Date (Month, day, year) | Project Contact Person | Telephone | Email Address |
|---------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| | | | | | |

¹⁹ GEF policies encompass all managed trust funds, namely: GEFTF, LDCF, and SCCF

| | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------|--|
| Brennan Van Dyke, Director GEF Coordination Office, UNEP | <i>Brennan Van Dyke</i> | October 5, 2016 | Adamou Bouhari, Task Manager Biodiversity/Land Degradation | +254 20 7623860 | adamou.bouhari@unep.org |
|---|-------------------------|--------------------|---|--------------------|--|

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Attached as a separate document.

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).

The GEF review and STAP comments to the PIF and related responses and changes to the implementation strategy are summarized below.

RESPONSES TO GEF SECRETARIAT COMMENTS ON PIF

| Comments of CEO | Responses to comments and reference to revised section of the CEO ER document |
|--|--|
| <p>10. We understand that the project is looking for the sustainability of the approach by mainly securing mainstreaming of biodiversity in productive sectors and within different planning tools. Financing mechanisms should also be tested and established to support the implementation of management plans. At CEO endorsement, please develop the sustainability of project outcomes.</p> | <p>Measures of sustainability are integrated in the CEO document in section A.1, Part 6 (Sustainability). In addition, financing mechanisms have been further detailed under project Output 2.13.</p> |
| <p>10. Preliminary information on the financial mechanism has been provided. Table B mentions the establishment of a financial mechanism to support the implementation of the IESMP. P16, one paragraph explains that the project will focus on an assessment of the opportunities, which could eventually lead to the creation of the appropriate financial mechanism. The following paragraph introduces a different scenario, where a financial mechanism will be developed. The creation of a regional agency of environment financing is also mentioned in this paragraph. Please be explicit on what the project expects to do regarding the financial mechanism, which seems to be a core activity of the project.</p> | <p>This issue has been clarified – the project will support the establishment of a Bakassi Ecosystem Foundation as a financing mechanism to support implementation of the IESMP. This issue is detailed in section A.1, Part 3 (Project Alternative Scenario), in the description of Output 2.1.3</p> |
| <p>10. Please, explain also how the two PES activities will feed or be fed by this process. Regarding PES, same comment. The text does not provide the rational to develop two PES, and what will be the specific activity developed under the project. Please, highlight the sustainability of these expected outcomes.</p> | <p>The project will carry out a study to identify the most important ecosystem services in the Bakassi area and to quantify their economic and social values and identify the providers and recipients of those values. Based on that analysis, the project will support the Government in seeking to establish PES and/or offset payment mechanisms. This issue is detailed in section A.1, Part 3 (Project Alternative Scenario), in the description of Output 2.1.3</p> |
| <p>10. It is noted that the financing mechanism will build on the baseline constituted by the SOWEDA. Does it mean that SOWEDA will be the legal institution managing the fund? Does SOWEDA have a biodiversity oriented mentioned that this mechanism will be used to channel the project financial support to ground activities. This mention does not appear anymore. If the project does not use the SOWEDA / financial mechanism anymore; what is the rational to finance the legal and institutional set-up of this mechanism? If the project will use SOWEDA to channel project financial support to ground activities, the kind of financial mechanism has to be known at PIF stage. Finally, it is noted that the project will build on the experience of different CTF such as Madagascar, DRC CTF. The set-up of a Trust Fund is a project by itself; which cannot be listed as an activity of a project. Therefore please, (i) provide the rational to support</p> | <p>During PPG phase, it was noted that SOWEDA is a public development agency without capacity to act as a financial mechanism with no biodiversity mainstreaming strategy. Based on the review of existing financial mechanisms (TNS Foundation, CAMCOF, FEDEC), and an analysis of different opportunities linked to those mechanisms, project stakeholders convened and agreed to establish a specific financial mechanism to support the IESMP, namely the Bakassi Ecosystem Foundation. This issue is detailed in section A.1, Part 3 (Project Alternative Scenario), in the description of Output 2.1.3</p> |

| Comments of CEO | Responses to comments and reference to revised section of the CEO ER document |
|--|--|
| the set-up of the SOWEDA financial mechanism, (ii) provide information regarding the SOWEDA biodiversity mainstreaming strategy. | |
| 10. All the information regarding the financial mechanism that will be set-up by the project has to be provided at CEO endorsement. | See above |
| 11. A comprehensive analysis of the baseline will be required at CEO endorsement stage. Demonstration of how the projects outputs will complement the on-going programs and will effectively address the threat/pressure described in the baseline will have to be reinforced at CEO endorsement stage. | Additional information has been provided in the section A.1, Part 2 (Baseline Scenario) |
| 14. The demonstration of how the projects outputs will complement the on-going programs and will effectively address the threat/pressure described in the baseline will have to be reinforced at CEO endorsement stage. The development of metrics/indicators for each of the outputs and outcomes will have to be provided at CEO endorsement stage. □ | Additional information on the complementarity of the project is provided in the section A.1, Part 2 (Baseline Scenario) and in section A.6 (Institutional Arrangement and Coordination). Metrics/indicators for each of the outputs and outcomes are provided in Annex A (Logical Framework). Additional indicators / benchmarks are provided in Annex I-2 (Deliverables and Benchmarks) of the UNEP Prodoc. |
| 14. From information in Table B and the text, we understand that the project will only support the framework development, consultation, and capacity building regarding financial mechanism, and the certification. Therefore, most of the budget of component 2 will be dedicated to the 3 livelihood options. Dedicating US\$1.5 million to 3 livelihood options will have to be very well explained and justified at CEO endorsement stage. | The budget of \$1.5 million for Component 2 is not dedicated only to livelihoods options; this is evident in the more detailed descriptions of Component 2 in section A.1, Part 3 (Project Alternative Scenario), and in Annex F (Budget) of the UNEP Prodoc. |
| 16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits? Preliminary information is provided. Further information (including measurable indicators) will be provided at CEO endorsement | Socio-economic benefits are described in section A.7; gender dimensions are described in section A.4. Relevant indicators are provided in Annex A (Logical Framework) and Annex I-2 (Deliverables and Benchmarks) of the UNEP Prodoc. |
| 17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly? Preliminary information is provided. Further information (including measurable indicators) will be provided at CEO endorsement. | The roles of all stakeholders are detailed in section A.3 |
| 18. Please, provide a comprehensive risk analysis at CEO endorsement. | This is provided in section A.5 (Risks) |
| 19. Please provide additional information regarding the coordination with the related initiatives at CEO endorsement. | This is provided in section A.6 (Institutional Arrangement and Coordination) |
| 20. At CEO endorsement, please detail the execution arrangements. | This is provided in section A.6 (Institutional Arrangement and Coordination) and in more detail in Annex H (Implementing Arrangements) of the UNEP Prodoc. |
| 31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement / approval - Please, include a comprehensive risk analysis. | All of these items are provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Section A.5 (Risks)</u> |

| Comments of CEO | Responses to comments and reference to revised section of the CEO ER document |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Include the incremental reasoning, and include one scenario with the GEF and another without the GEF. - Please detail partnerships on the ground, and how indigenous people issues will be addressed. - Confirm the cofinancing - Develop the execution arrangements. - Develop a Monitoring Plan, including the indicators to measure the Global Environment Benefits - Include the Tracking tools (Excel tables). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section A.1, Part 4 (Incremental Reasoning) • Section A.3 (Stakeholders) • Part I, Table C, and attached letters of co-financing • Section C (M&E Budget) • Annex J (BD Tracking Tool) of the UNEP Prodoc |

RESPONSES TO STAP COMMENTS ON PIF

| STAP comments | Replies |
|---|--|
| <p>1a. Most of the Expected Outputs are project activities and not project deliverables. For example, training and awareness raising events are not Outputs; they are part of the process towards an Output that would best be articulated as human resource capacity that will have been built.</p> | <p>The project outputs have been significantly revised.</p> |
| <p>1b. Outputs should normally have quantifiable targets. The Expected Outcomes are similarly problematic. For a GEF project they should reflect some of the major beneficial changes that the project will contribute to in terms of global environmental benefits as well as co-benefits for human development. STAP strongly urges that the Project Framework be recast so that the vision of the project to enhance biodiversity conservation and SLM is fully reflected, and so that appropriate indicators of impact may be identified.</p> | <p>Output 2.1.1 have been revised to include quantifiable targets.</p> <p>Output 2.1.3 have been reformulated</p> |
| <p>2. Related to the above point, it is impossible to identify from the PIF what indicators will be chosen from the three focal area strategies (including SFM) that contribute to the project. For example, the baseline analysis identifies the "unsustainable felling of mangrove trees for fuel wood and timber, and the disorganized and wasteful harvesting of aquatic life". Provision should, therefore, be made in the project for impact indicators such as change in land cover and conservation of aquatic biodiversity</p> | <p>Output 2.1.1 have been revised to include percentage of mangrove cover change and conservation of aquatic biodiversity as deliverables of the project</p> |
| <p>3a. The previous point is substantiated by what appears to be a major disconnect between Components 2 and 3. STAP bears in mind that the project objective specifically mentions "available technologies and good practices", yet in the project description these do not appear. STAP would normally have assessed technologies and best practices; however this is not possible as these are not in the project components.</p> | <p>The project objective does not mentions "available technologies and good practices", however, in the project design, sharing of best practices is part of the learning and knowledge management framework</p> |
| <p>3b. Component 2 is aimed at developing integrated landscape management plans. Such plans are necessary, but they are not sufficient to deliver integrated ecosystem</p> | <p>Component 2 includes development of IESMP, livelihood options and financial mechanism in support of IESMP implementation</p> |

| STAP comments | Replies |
|---|--|
| management. | |
| <p>3c. Component 3 is on KM, monitoring and evaluation however the document is silent on what is to be monitored. KM and M&E are, indeed, very important and need to be built on a carefully-chosen set of impact and result indicators with suitable monitoring and tracking measures. For example, in this project, it would be reasonable to expect that changes in carbon and GHG emissions will be measured and reported “ and the results used to adjust the project activities as necessary and to report as global environmental benefits at project completion. Similar quantifiable measures are needed for biodiversity.</p> | <p>Monitoring mechanism is taken into account in output 3.1.3 through establishment of M&E results-based framework and capacity building of local monitoring committees to monitor IESMP sets of indicators developed in output 3.1.2.</p> <p>The focal area of the project has been limited to biodiversity conservation at PIF</p> |
| <p>4. STAP appreciates that much of the detail related to the above aspects will be developed in the PPG phase. Nevertheless, there should be a clear strategy at the outset for choice of impact indicators, identification of methods, choice of technologies and the implementation of monitoring and tracking.</p> | <p>Same as above</p> |
| <p>5. The PIF rightly points out the distressing state of conservation of the Bakassi mangroves and the Banyang-Mbo reserve. The project approach of seeking integrated management and land use plans is an appropriate strategy. However, as many studies have shown, integration requires a careful analysis of stakeholders and relevant institutions. As it stands, the project seems mainly to have engaged as executing partners environmental agencies. Yet, the baseline analysis identifies "the weak institutional capacity of the rural sector, the need to decentralize development planning and action, privatize production and commercial activities and empower communities to contribute to and manage their own development."</p> <p>These major barriers to effective integrated management of the natural resources will require cross-sectoral engagement of institutions and professionals as well as genuine participatory engagement by local people and communities.</p> | <p>The project has included the establishment of a collaborative multi-stakeholder framework involving local communities, councils, local NGOs, administrations, etc.</p> |
| <p>6. In line with what appears to be only a limited intention to address the developmental issues that likely underlie the unsustainable utilization of resources, STAP has concerns on the distributional aspects of benefits, as well as costs born by the local communities in, for example, being denied access to livelihood resources. In particular, there is little discussion of gender issues, health and poverty. STAP would have expected that even at this early stage of project development that there would be some identification of issues that will assume fundamental importance to the success of the project.</p> | <p>The project has a component on livelihood options to be developed as alternatives income generation activities. Most of these livelihood activities are implemented by women groups such as fish drying and NTFP value chains.</p> |

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS²⁰

A. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

| PPG Grant Approved at PIF: US\$ 86,757 | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i> | <i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i> | | |
| | <i>Budgeted Amount</i> | <i>Amount Spent To date</i> | <i>Amount Committed</i> |
| Project Coordinator | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lead Consultant | 7,887 | 7,887 | 0 |
| GEF Programming/PPG Advisor | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Biodiversity Specialist | 5,400 | 5,400 | 0 |
| Socio-Economist Specialist | 5,400 | 5,400 | 0 |
| Institutional and Politic Analysis Specialist | 5,400 | 5,400 | 0 |
| National Consultant for PPG Preparation | 15,500 | 15,500 | 0 |
| PPG inception workshop | 20,415 | 20,415 | 0 |
| PPG Validation workshops | 17,755 | 19,755 | 0 |
| International Consultant for PPG Preparation | 5,500 | 5,500 | 0 |
| Reimbursable expensive | 2000 | 0 | 0 |
| Bank charges | 1,500 | 1500 | 0 |
| Total | 86,757 | 86,757 | 0 |

²⁰ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue to undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities. Agencies should also report closing of PPG to Trustee in its Quarterly Report.

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

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

Not applicable