



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5210		
Country/Region:	Cameroon		
Project Title:	Sustainable Farming and Critical Habitat Conservation to Achieve Biodiversity Mainstreaming and Protected Areas Management Effectiveness in Western Cameroon SUFACHAC		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-1; BD-1; BD-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$1,716,895
Co-financing:	\$7,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$8,716,895
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Charlotte Gobin	Agency Contact Person:	Adamou Bouhari

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	12/20: Yes	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	12/20: Yes, in a letter dated December 8, 2012 for US\$1,960,000 including PPG, implementation, and agency fees.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	12/20: UNEP is implementing several projects in the area, including LifeWeb Initiative, GRASP, the Cross River Gorilla Habitat Protection, and the Cross River Gorilla Local Guard training program. UNEP has developed a tied relationship with Civil society, which will ensure a good project execution on the ground.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	12/20: N/A	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the	12/20: The project is in line with the UNEP work programme (POW) and the	

		staff in the country. However, regular field missions will be realized by the Regional Office in Africa to ensure that the project is fully embedded in a global UNEP wide support to Cameroon.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	12/20: Yes.	
	• the focal area allocation?	12/20: Yes, to date sufficient resources are available from the BD FA.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	12/20: N/A	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	12/20: N/A	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	12/20: N/A	
	• focal area set-aside?	12/20: N/A	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	12/20: Yes, the project is well aligned with the BD results framework. Indicative measurable outputs have to be provided. 02/25: Indicative measurable outputs have been provided. At CEO endorsement, these outputs will have to be further detailed and confirmed. Cleared.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	12/20: Please, re-formulate all the outcomes to make them clearer and more focus. Please include indicator metrics (example of which are given in the FA strategies) e.g. based on METT and quantifiable outputs.	

regarding the output 1.1 and 1.3 e.g. which kind of activities will be developed. The expected outcome and the output 1.4 are similar, please revise. Output 1.4 Establishment of a Technical Operation Unit, please further describe the status e.g. governmental body, association; and the role that this entity will have during the project implementation and after the project.

Component 2 and 3: the number of outputs identified appears to be too many and is confusing what the components are proposing. It seems ambitious, with the time and funds constraints, that the project will be able to realize an ecosystem valuation, set-up a certification process, develop two PES mechanisms (among others). Furthermore, there is redundancy between the outputs of the two components e.g. outputs 2.5 and 3.4. Please, merge these two components and limit the number of outputs. Please, provide the rationale to develop on the top of two PES mechanisms, another financial mechanism. P17, please further explain what will be the investment framework that the GEF will support.

In the text, p14-15, the description of the components has to be further detailed e.g. Component 1, what innovative and transferable approaches the project will develop, how the protection of the high conservation value areas will be undertaken.

		reformulated. The number of expected outputs has been reduced. The identified objectives are relevant. Clarification on the TOU status is satisfactory. The METT and detailed information related to the financial mechanism will have to be provided at CEO endorsement stage. Cleared.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	12/20: yes, the project is consistent with the country's national strategies.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	12/20: Capacity building is a key activity in Component 4, but is not entirely clear how the learning framework will operate. The number of outputs related to capacity building appears to be too many, please focus on 2 or 3 outputs, which will directly support the project's objective. 02/25: The component objective is clearer and the number of outputs reduced. Metric indicators will have to be provided at CEO endorsement stage. Cleared.	
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	12/20: Preliminary information is provided. The key drivers of biodiversity loss and damage are developed e.g. wildlife poaching, illegal logging, large scale agriculture expansion; however, it is not clear which of these should be addressed as a priority. More information about the current policy framework, certification process, and the status, governance of PA will help to understand the added-value of this project. Finally a tentative	

		<p>be useful.</p> <p>02/25: The additional information provided helps to better understand the baseline situation and how the project will operate. The on-going activities supported by the government and its partners are well developed. At CEO endorsement stage, a tentative budget of the baseline activities will have to be provided. Cleared.</p>	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	<p>12/20: Incremental reasoning is difficult to assess at the moment given the baseline and component description. If the GEF activities aims to develop and implement an Integrated Land Use Plan, please be more specific in the description of the current situation (baseline) and focus the project's outputs on this objective.</p> <p>02/25: From the information provided, we understand that the project will adopt a landscape approach, in addressing both the management of PA and the development/ support of sustainable livelihood in the PA buffer zones. The project will built on the on-going programs and will coordinate them; ensuring an holistic approach. The reasoning is clear and relevant. Cleared.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	12/20: The project aims to address wildlife poaching, small and large scale agriculture expansion. The project	

		<p>PA, PES mechanism, certification, valuation of ecosystem services...Although each of these tools seems relevant for addressing the mentioned threats, it is not entirely clear how the project will be able to adopt an holistic approach and ensure that each activity will profit to each others. Please explain further.</p> <p>02/25: The project framework has been reformulated and restricted to four major outputs. The main objective is to address the existing and potential new threats from large and small scale agriculture around four PA in West Cameroon. It is noted that during PPG, analysis regarding financial mechanism development will be undertaken. At CEO endorsement stage, clear proposal will have to be presented. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>12/20: This needs some additional information throughout. As an example, how the creation of the Technical Operation Unit will support the improvement of the PA management effectiveness, and what will be the metric to assess the progress? Also it is unclear how the integrated land use plan will be developed e.g. will it address only small scale agriculture or also integrate large scale agriculture? Finally how the financial incentives/mechanisms (PES, commercial opportunity, certification, biodiversity conservation mechanism) will be complementary and contribute to the sustainable land use management, as a all.</p> <p>02/25: Clarification has been provided</p>	

		<p>The priority areas for support related to sustainable agriculture are around the four targeted PA. Only one financial mechanism will be developed to support the mainstreaming activities. It is noted that all the information regarding this mechanism will be provided at CEO endorsement stage. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>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?</p>	<p>12/20: No, this needs to be developed. Please provide some examples of the socio-economic benefits expected including gender dimension, especially with regards to the financial mechanisms that the project wants to develop. Please, explain how the benefits that will arise from this project will support the sustainability of outcomes post-project.</p> <p>02/25: Preliminary information has been provided however it is expected, at CEO endorsement stage, to receive detailed and accurate information regarding the targeted communities, the economic benefits for these targeted communities, and the sustainability of this approach. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>12/20: CSOs and indigeneous people are well taken into account. Several CSOs will be the local executing partners of the project. This constitutes the strength of this project. It is noted that a stakeholder mapping will be conducted during the PPG and that a comprehensive stakeholder's involvement plan will be provided at the CEO endorsement. Cleared.</p>	

	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	12/20: Please consider risk associated with project execution and those related to the development of large scale agriculture. 02/25: Addressed.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	12/20: Yes, the project is consistent with other related initiatives. It is noted that during the PPG phase, a comprehensive assessment of impacts and lesson learned from major projects in Cameroon and the region will be conducted. Cleared.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	12/20: It is noted that a consensual project institutional and implementation arrangement will be developed and validated with all the stakeholders during the PPG. Preliminary indication on these arrangements have been provided, the strong partnership with CSOs on the field is a key element. Cleared.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	12/20: The project management cost is over 5% threshold. Please reduce it within 5%. This should be calculated based on the sub-total in table A. 02/25: Addressed.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	12/20: The GEF funding allocated to Component 1 seems insufficient regarding the expected outputs, which are, among others, protection of high	

		of a Technical Operation Unit, Development of conservation and enforcement activities for keystone species. Therefore, please increase the budget of this component 1. Part of this budget could be taken from Component 4, which have in comparison, a relative important budget for the expected outcomes. 02/25: Addressed.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	12/20: The indicative co-financing is fine, with a ratio of 1:4. Please make sure to use one line per type of cofinancing and indicate the tentative amount of co-financing from the Moringa Partnership. Cleared.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	12/20: The co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project is US\$500,000 in cash; which is fine.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	12/20: The project proposal cannot be recommended at this stage. Please, address the issues raised above.	

		technically cleared and recommended for CEO approval.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>Please, ensure that the following issues are addressed at the Request for CEO Endorsement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implementation arrangement with partners and local authorities are well set-up - Budget of the baseline activities is presented - Clear and measurable outputs and outcomes are defined - Co-financing is confirmed - Details on socio-economic benefits are included - Clear presentation of the financial mechanism and its rational is submitted - GEF TT are included - Strong evidence of GEF incremental value and sustainability of the project approach is presented 	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 20, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 25, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	The PPG request complies with the new requirement (January 2013). The amount requested is US\$XX including Agency's fees.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.