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

GEF ID:	**4800**		
Country/Region:	**Cameroon**		
Project Title:	**Sustainable Forest Management Under the Authority of Cameroonian Councils**		
GEF Agency:	**FAO**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Multi Focal Area**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-2; BD-1; CCM-5; SFM/REDD+-1; Project Mana;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$0**	Project Grant:	**$3,573,333**
Co-financing:	**$11,045,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$14,618,333**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Jean-Marc Sinnassamy**	Agency Contact Person:	**Adrian Whiteman,**

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?	- Cameroon became a party to CBD on 10/19/1994 - Cameroon ratified the UNFCCC on Oct 19 1994 Cleared	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Addressed.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes. FAO has an expertise and experience in the region and in Cameroon that is relevant to the current proposal.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	The project fits into the FAO Forestry Department's regular programme of activities. FAO has an office in the country managing projects for around	

		officer (based in Libreville, Gabon), as well as FAO staff in Rome, will provide technical assistance. Addressed.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	This PIF is compatible with the current status of the STAR allocation. However, we would like to invite the Agency to check with the country on the operational feasibility of each priority proposed in the NPFD. Actually, there is a potential risk of over-programming. Thanks to confirm the engagement of resources with the Operational Focal Point. April 4, 2012 Addressed.	
	• the focal area allocation?	See previous comment. The comment implies a potential over-programming of CC resources. FJ Jan 03 2012 - CCM-5: No. a) Following the NPFD, two other PIF proposals (PMIS ID 4739 & 4785) and a small grant program already account for the climate change allocation of Cameroon. b) The existing NPFD does not take into account the CCM amount included in this PIF. Please, confirm. April 4, 2012 The budget is confirmed in the new	

		Addressed.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	
	• focal area set-aside?	The project is financed by BD ($2,503,455) and CC ($178,818), leveraging $894,091 from the SFM/REDD+ programme. April 6, 2012 The project is financed by BD ($2,750,000) and CC ($198,000) to trigger the SFM/REDD+ incentive ($982,666): exactly a ratio of $3 from two STAR allocations for $1 from the SFM/REDD+ incentive. The ratio between BD and CC is somehow disproportionate (1:13). However, through informal discussions and the revised documents, we understand: 1) all the CC budget is focused in specific forest carbon monitoring applied to community forests and 2) the use of CC resources is a way to leverage significant cofinancing resources associated to REDD+ and forest carbon monitoring issues. This use of CC allocations in addition to BD resources is acceptable to leverage the SFM incentive. Addressed.	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	- Please confirm that no GEF grant will be associated to new exploitation of forests. - Please, give further information for the	

		in your reasoning that the GEF does not finance afforestation plan or implementation. FJ Jan 03 2012 - CCM-5: Yes for CCM. April 4, 2012 Addressed.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Addressed. FJ Jan 03 2012 - CCM-5: For table A, please: a) use the exact wording of the GEF's Focal Area Results Framework for outcome and outputs; b) use one row per outcome with related funding information. April 6, 2012 CCM-5 (FJ): Comment a) is not addressed yet. Outcome 5.3 is not a valid outcome under GEF-5. Please refer to the GEF-5 template reference guide (http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/3624). April 12, 2012 Addressed.	
	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?	FJ Jan 03 2012 - CCM-5: No, the project is listed in the National Portfolio Document "Portefeuille national des projets du FEM 2010-2014" but without any CCM budget attached to it. Please clarify especially in relation with Q6. Please describe the consistency of this project with the National Communication under UNFCCC. April 6, 2012 Addressed.	

	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Elements of sustainability are provided (p. 13 and 14). Please develop this section at CEO endorsement. Addressed.	
Project Design	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?	No. Please, develop the existing projects or sub-projects financed by the different partners (project summary, dates of implementation). It is a crucial step to figure out how GEF resources will be then used. Please revise the section B (baseline). Jan 03 2012 - CCM-5: a) The project background information does not provide information related to the climate change issue. Please adjust; b) The baseline description does not present clearly what is already done or on-going regarding monitoring of carbon stocks, reducing deforestation and forest degradation or restoration of carbon stocks, such as REDD+ strategy development. Please provide adequate information. April 6, 2012 Please see the cells 16 to fully address the issues raised above (the response given in the cell. 16 should be included in the baseline description). April 12, 2012 Addressed.	
	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?	Not clear. Please complete the description of the project baseline and revise the reasoning. FJ Jan 03 2012 - CCM-5: Please: a) first address Q 11 for proper assessment and b) then explain briefly how the project would contribute to carbon stocks monitoring and enhancement compared to the baseline situation (please also address Q14 on component 3). April 4, 2012 FJ Apr 4, 2012 - CCM-5: Comment b) of the previous review is not addressed yet. The incremental reasoning needs to: (i) explain the difference between what would have happened without GEF funding and what will happen with GEF funding; (ii) describe for each component how the GEF funding will be used and what new/additional will be achievable thanks to this funding, and; (iii) how these new/additional activities or this difference may induce incremental environmental benefits. The additional elements provided in chapter B2 describe what the project as a whole will achieve in terms of environmental benefits but does not explain what the GEF funding will bring to the project. Moreover, the PIF does not describe the difference between what will be achieved by the activities described in the baseline chapter B1 and what will be achieved by the project with GEF funding. Please modify to address the comment.	

		April 12, 2012 Addressed.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	No. - There are 12 outcomes and 23 outputs, it is definitely too much. Please simplify the framework. - Based on our understanding of the current situation, a lot of information is available and should be used to revise this framework. Moreover, we already sent preliminary comments to the GEF Operational Focal Point about this project idea after the NPFE. Please, contact him to include these comments. - This project is welcome to scale up existing efforts and reinforce some points that have been missing in the current experiences with Council Forests. The priority is to use the GEF grant for very operational activities on the ground. Almost all the BD allocation should be used for field activities. Please confirm. - We are not sure that outputs linked to strategies and paper works are relevant (output 1.1.1, 2.11, 2.1.2, 3.1.1, 3.3.1, 4.1.1...). Please remove them or justify. - Many activities under components 1, 2, and 4 are redondant. We propose to merge them in a single component devoted to protection and sustainable management of forests. The outputs that are very operational should be maintained to develop and implement forest management plans in 20 councils, to develop council forest technical units in X municipalities and train them. Outputs linked to the sustainability of	

		- Please explain the output 4.1.3. - A separate component for the enhancement of carbon stock is welcome (component 3). Please revise the outputs in regards to a better analysis of existing projects and initiatives linked to REDD+. Some outputs do not seem relevant (3.1.1, 3.3.1, 3.3.2). - Some outputs should be taken by the cofinancing or the governement (1.1.1, 2.1.1). - We would like to see a revised reasoning and a revised result framework, but it seems that many outputs should be removed as out of the scope of non eligible per se (2.2.2, 2.3.1, 2.3.2), some of them should be addressed at PPG level (2.1.3). - Please, pay attention to the formulation. Some outputs are not expressed as outputs (see GEF guidelines on GF5 projects if necessary): 1.2.1, 3.3.2. FJ Jan 03 2012 - CCM-5: a) Please consider revising the project objective in table B so as to include the climate change objective (e.g. "To reverse deforestation and forest degradation in forests under the authority of local councils in Cameroon in order to improve biodiversity protection and carbon stocks and sequestration"); b) Concerning Output 3.1.1 please briefly explain in the text why new carbon accounting methods need to be developed instead of adopting existing accepted simple carbon accounting	

		c) For component 3, while outcomes 3.2/3.3 describe concrete field impacts, their associated outcomes seem to refer solely to the design or promotion of plans and systems. Please consider going further towards implementation and enforcement of these plans & systems, especially considering the size of the co-financing. Besides, if investment is envisioned for this component separate rows will be needed for TA and INV respectively; d) The sustainability of Component 3 should be reinforced. One does not see how the project will pave the way for further and larger carbon stock monitoring, maintenance and enhancement beyond the investment and skills of the project itself. Please demonstrate how this will be taken into consideration and acted upon during the project so that project's activities may be continued and amplified after its completion. e) Please briefly explain the synergies captured by including these focal areas and activities in one multifocal area PIF. (For example: Will all components be implemented in the same areas? Will one component reinforce the other? Will economies of scale be achieved this way?). f) Please explain if carbon credit benefits are considered for the project and, if so, how these would be taken into account. April 6, 2012 CCM-5 (FJ): Some comments have not yet been sufficiently addressed:	

		demonstration of the sustainability and autonomous replicability of the proposed outcomes of the project need to be strengthened. This is partially related to Q13 since one does not yet clearly understand the difference between what the baseline will achieve and what the project with GEF funding may achieve. But other elements also need to be clarified. Part B2 argues that the sustainability/replicability of the project will come from the training provided, capacity building developed and the participation of the local population and institutions. Please clarify the achievements in these areas that are attributable to the GEF funding and not to baseline activities. Please clarify the financial/income related aspects of the replicability of the project outcome. Some of the expected outcomes seem to rely on external financial support that may not be sustained beyond the project. On the other hand, if, as indicated, the Mayors of the councils already have a strong commitment to sustainable forest management, it is not clear why the project activities would be needed. Please clarify and strengthen the sustainability/replicability demonstration or modify the project to this aim. b) Regarding comment f) above, please note that the GEF does not support activities that lead to CDM carbon credit development and selling. April 12, 2012 Addressed.	

	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Unfortunately, the reasoning and the information provided are not convincing. If FAO cannot provide a better analysis (even a rough analysis) of carbon benefits at PIF level, it will be very difficult to justify the use of the SFM/REDD+ incentive. Please revise. FJ Jan 03 2012 - CCM-5: a) The potential CO2 benefits from the project are presented on 400,000 ha (page 13) while component 3 of the project framework only refers to 50,500 ha. Please clarify and adjust this inconsistency. b) Please provide estimations of CO2 benefits from the project; c) Please explain if carbon credit benefits are considered for the project and, if so, how these would be taken into account. April 6, 2012 CCM-5 (FJ): Some previous comments have not yet been sufficiently addressed: a preliminary estimation of GHG gains and brief documentation explaining the assumptions is needed at PIF stage for further analysis. Even if precise estimates are not available at this stage, the methodology that will be used to assess these GHG gains and a rough estimate associated are needed at PIF stage. The rationale to assess GHG gains should particularly explain how each type of enhancement of carbon stocks (restoration, agro-forestry, and enrichment of savannah) will be taken into account and how the baseline GHG gains will be taken into account.	

		April 12, 2012 Addressed	
	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?	There is a description of these benefits. However, it is mentioned that mangroves could be selected as pilot sites. We do not support this option as another GEF4 project developed by FAO will focus on mangroves. There is a strong risk of duplication of efforts. Please, remove this mention and confirm that mangroves will not be included in the pilot sites. FJ Jan 03 2012 - CCM-5: Please clarify briefly how socio-economic benefits will support the achievement of incremental CO2 benefits. April 6, 2012 CCM-5 (FJ): - The rationale explaining why carbon stocks in these forests are degraded, which is presented in the response to the previous comments, should be part of the project description. Some details on this issue would help for the baseline description and incremental reasoning. - However, the main assumption that forest degradation occurs solely because of a lack of capacity and knowledge should be better demonstrated and substantiated. One would need an initial assessment of how economic needs and access rules interfere in relation with forest degradation, and whether all stakeholders involved (including for illegal logging) are part of the targeted communities. A demonstration of how	

		livelihood- related or access rules-related determining factors would then help to address Q13. April 12, 2012 Addressed.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	The section B3 related to socio-economic benefits does not mention any role or specific attention to local communities, indigeneous people, and CSO (including NGOs). Moreover, this is not a new initiative and this information is available. Please revise. April 6, 2012 Addressed.	
	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)	A very preliminary list of risks is provided. At CEO endorsement, please develop a more comprehensive risk analysis. Include risks linked to land tenure, land planning, and land rights issues.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, the project is well coordinated with other partners. FJ Jan 03 2012 - CCM-5: In relation with Q11 and Q13, please clarify briefly what other related initiatives will provide to the project and what the project will do that these initiatives cannot achieve. April 6, 2012 Addressed. However, Please address comments of Q13.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	The project implementation arrangement will use the existing framework with the Technical Center for Council Forest (CTFC) and other	

		MINFOF, ACFCAM). Please confirm the arrangements at CEO endorsement.	
	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?	No. Please maintain management costs strictly under 5 percent of the GEF grant used for the technical components (=$3,396,364): Please, maintain management costs under $169,818. April 4, 2012 Addressed.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	- Please, maintain the cofinancing ratio for the management costs close to the ratio at project level. - Please, revise the reasoning and the amounts with the partners and provide a much better cofinancing ratio. - Please, maintain the component 5 strictly under 5 percent ($169K). FJ Jan 03 2012 - CCM-5: Please explain why the cost per ha of the CCM component (component 3) is more than twice the cost per ha of the rest of the activities. Apr 6, 2012 CCM-5 (FJ) : Please address Q15 for further analysis on this part. April 12, 2012 Addressed.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated	- Please confirm that you have contacted	

	At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	cofinancing. - The cofinancing ratio is under 1:2. It will be very difficult to support this project with a such low cofinancing. April 6, 2012 We take note that the cofinancing ratio is now at 1:3.09. April 12, 2012 The cofinancing ratio is now at 1:4.5. Addressed.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	- Please, confirm if FAO will bring core ressources for this project. - Please try to increase the cofinancing managed by FAO. April 6, 2012 FAO is providing a core cofinancing ratio of $1,100,000, including a grant of $750,000. April 12, 2012 FAO is now providing a core cofinancing of $1,450,000, including a grant of $1,050,000	
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?		

Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	January 06, 2011 The PIF cannot be recommended yet. Please address the comments above. Thanks. April 6, 2012 The PIF cannot be recommended yet. Please address the comments above. April 12, 2012 The PIF is recommended for clearance.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	- Please include a comprehensive risk analysis, - Detail the comparative advantage of FAO and provide core resources for cofinancing. - Increase and confirm the cofinancing, - Detail the project implementation arrangement, - Detail the nature and role of local stakeholders, - Please develop the sustainability aspect of the approach, - Develop a Monitoring and Evaluation plan. Detail how the Global Environment Benefits will be measured.	
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*	January 06, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 04, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 12, 2012	
	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?**	
	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.