

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: May 04, 2012

Screener: Guadalupe Duron

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

I. PIF Information *(Copied from the PIF)*

FULL SIZE PROJECT **GEF TRUST FUND**

GEF PROJECT ID: 4800

PROJECT DURATION : 4

COUNTRIES : Cameroon

PROJECT TITLE: Sustainable Forest Management Under the Authority of Cameroonian Councils

GEF AGENCIES: FAO

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Environment and Nature Protection (MINEP), Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife (MINFOF), Technical Center for Council forest (CTFC)

GEF FOCAL AREA: Multi Focal Area

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): **Minor revision required**

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the proposal "Sustainable management of forest under the authority of Cameroonian councils" by the FAO. In particular, STAP supports the general premise of the proposal to strengthen the council forests' capabilities to sustainably manage the forests while protecting biodiversity. STAP also is pleased to see the socio-economic benefits defined specifically, as well as how the proposal intends to mainstream gender. Nonetheless, STAP believes the proposal should be strengthened further in its design in order to accord with GEF requirements and principles. STAP outlines its recommendations below on strengthening the scientific basis of the proposal.

1. In general, the project framework is defined clearly. The outputs and outcomes are well defined " with a small number of exceptions. For example, 4.1.1 appears to be defined as an outcome and not an output. As an outcome indicator, 4.1.1. also is not well-defined, since an outcome indicator tells us what is going to be measured " not what is to be achieved (example " percentage of integrated landscape management practices adopted by council forests to address ecosystem restoration " not 50,000 ha of degraded forests restored). STAP also has concerns that the indicators specified in the Outcome column are primarily about target numbers of hectares and people involved " and are not about the delivery of global environmental benefits (GEBs), which is the primary rationale for GEF support. Therefore, STAP suggests reviewing carefully the project framework to address potential inconsistencies between outputs and outcomes and the selection of indicators. In addition, STAP would like to see the intended GEBs be reflected in the choice of what scientific measures will be tracked and reported upon to indicate progress and success of the project, especially as three of the project components specifically mention building the capacity to measure environmental benefits .

2. STAP appreciates the description of the multiple global environmental benefits, illustrating these clearly in a table format under the incremental reasoning section. In particular, STAP acknowledges the explicit definition of carbon benefits. However, STAP has concerns that the biodiversity benefits receive almost no attention, either as targets to be achieved by the project or as subjects for monitoring. There are no biodiversity indicators, for example; yet the project rationale stresses the importance of Cameroonian forests for global biodiversity. Thus, STAP strongly recommends defining more explicitly the intended biodiversity benefits during the proposal development, paying attention to relevant indicators and their measurement. This could be made part of the capacity-building of forest user groups and local councils. [see, for example, the adaptive value of participatory biodiversity monitoring amongst forest user groups in Nepal - <http://www.eci.ox.ac.uk/research/humaneco/downloads/adaptivevalue.pdf>]

3. Also, STAP recommends strengthening the project baseline. Currently, the baseline narrative could define specifically the tree species and biodiversity species targeted by the project. The threats also could be described more comprehensively – for example what are the multiple drivers of, and potential response to, forest degradation, and biodiversity loss? Furthermore, the proposal could include an ex-ante estimate of forest carbon stock using the REALU methodology (if appropriate), or another carbon methodology that is decided to be used. Similarly, a biodiversity baseline also needs to be defined during the proposal development.

4. On carbon methodologies, STAP recommends describing further the REALU methodology (ies), and to what extent they are appropriate for this project. If the REALU methodologies are not selected, STAP suggests describing the chosen methodology and its appropriateness for the project. Furthermore, STAP wonders why the FAO's own carbon monitoring tool, EX-ACT (see <http://www.fao.org/tc/exact/ex-act-home/en/>), is not being proposed as a methodology.

5. STAP believes that a multifunctional landscape approach is utmost critical, and integral, to the nature of the proposal seeking to contribute to multiple global environmental benefits on biodiversity and carbon, as well as socio-economic benefits. Nonetheless, the interventions say very little how they are rooted on a multifunctional landscape approach. Hence, STAP strongly recommends exemplifying the ways the project intends to rely on a multifunctional landscape approach to achieve the expected global benefits, and the project objective.

6. In component 1, the project developers may wish to consult the following reference as they design land use and forest management plans that integrate biodiversity – Dewi, S. et al. Protected areas within multifunctional landscapes: squeezing out intermediate land use intensities in the tropics *Land Use Policy* 30 (2013) 38-56.

7. For component 3, the project developers may wish to consult the following source for strengthening capacity to estimate and monitor carbon in the project site, especially as the results will seek to contribute to Cameroon's implementation of a REDD+ strategy – Romijn, E. et al. Assessing capacities of non-Annex 1 countries for national forest monitoring in the context of REDD+ *Environmental Science & Policy* 19-20 (2012) 33-48.

8. On risks, STAP has some concerns on the risks specified in the table in Section B4 (page 13 of the PIF). First, it is suggested that climate risks be included. Moreover, STAP recommends including climate trends, or projection data in the background section, as well as mainstreaming adaptive capacity as appropriate in the various interventions. The project developers may wish to consult the following sites for climate change data and adaptation tools – <http://www.geog.ox.ac.uk/research/climate/projects/undp-cp/> <http://sdwebx.worldbank.org/climateportal/index.cfm>. Secondly, of the seven risks included, four (the first three and the last) essentially specify a risk that the project does not succeed in its aims. These – risks' are failures in the internal design of the project and are not externalities over which the project has no control. They should be an integral part of project design and not be consigned to an analysis of issues that might arise during the course of the project which cannot be controlled.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	STAP acknowledges that on scientific/technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasising any issues that could be improved and the proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
2. Minor revision required.	STAP has identified specific scientific/technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. One or more options that remain open to STAP include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues (ii) Setting a review point during early stage project development and agreeing terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.
3. Major revision required	STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical omissions in the concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. Normally, a STAP approved review will be mandatory prior to submission of the project brief for CEO endorsement. The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.