Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility
(Version 5)

STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Date of screening: April 18, 2012 Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Michael Anthony Stocking; Thomas Lovejoy
Consultant(s):

I. PIF Information *(Copied from the PIF)*
FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID: 4739
PROJECT DURATION : 4
COUNTRIES : Cameroon
PROJECT TITLE: Participative Integrated Ecosystem Services Management Plans for Bakassi Post Conflict Ecosystems PINESMAP BPCE
GEF AGENCIES: UNEP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Environment and Nature Protection (MINEP) in collaboration with Fauna and Flora International, University of Dschang
Organisation pour l Environnement et le Developpement Durable OPED
CHEDE COOPERATIVE UNION LTD Cameroon
Cameroon Ecology

GEF FOCAL AREA: Biodiversity

II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies):
Major revision required

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP fully supports the objective of this project â€“ namely, to employ integrated ecosystem management plans including ecosystem valuation, available technologies and good practices, in order to ensure biodiversity conservation and sustainable use and improved management of landscapes in Cameroon.

STAP raises a number of serious scientific and technical issues that will require attention either now or as the project preparation develops.

1. The Project Framework requires immediate attention because it gives insufficient guidance as to what the project will achieve (Expected Outputs) and what major changes, especially global benefits, might be expected to which the outputs will have contributed (Expected Outcomes). Currently, 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. In addition, 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.

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.

3. 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 â€“ however this is not possible as these are not in the project components. Component 2 is aimed at developing integrated landscape management plans. Such plans are necessary, but they are not sufficient to deliver integrated ecosystem management. 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 â€“ 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.

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.

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." 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.

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.

STAP advisory response	*Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed*
1. Consent	STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasizing any issues where the project could be improved. Follow up: The GEF Agency is invited to approach STAP for advice during the development of the project prior to submission of the final document for CEO endorsement.
2. Minor revision required.	STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development. Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency: (i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP's recommended actions.
3. Major revision required	STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design. Follow-up: (i) The Agency should request that the project undergo a STAP review prior to CEO endorsement, at a point in time when the particular scientific or technical issue is sufficiently developed to be reviewed, or as agreed between the Agency and STAP. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.