



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9155		
Country/Region:	Cameroon		
Project Title:	Integrated and Transboundary Conservation of Biodiversity in the Basins of the Republic of Cameroon		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5610 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1 Program 1; BD-2 Program 3; LD-3 Program 4; SFM-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$147,000	Project Grant:	\$3,907,500
Co-financing:	\$25,782,781	Total Project Cost:	\$29,837,281
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Paul Harrison

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹		
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?		
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and		

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	innovation?		
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?		
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?		
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?		
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	6-20-15 This is a \$147K PPG for a \$3.9M project.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
Recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 		
	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	6-20-15 Yes. This PPG is recommended for clearance.	
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	<p>10 Jan 2017:</p> <p>The changes are limited and clearly informed in the last 2 paragraphs of p.8, with the addition of a relatively small fourth component on dissemination of lessons and monitoring and evaluation. The baseline scenario is also amplified. Nevertheless, the changes made increased the number of outputs in components 1 and 3 and they are now too numerous for the available budget. They need to be reduced. Please see comments on item 3.</p> <p>ON BUDGET</p> <p>1. The co-finance total in Table B adds up to \$25, 782,757 instead of \$25,782.781 as in Table A. Both should match.</p> <p>2. The box with the name of the Focal Point in the CEOP Endorsement was removed. Please re-instate.</p>	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>1-12-17</p> <p>The structure of the project is adequate to achieve the objectives.</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>Nevertheless, there are some issues regarding the proposed outputs that require additional work.</p> <p>GENERAL</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The project is too ambitious for the GEF funds available. In addition, and since the co-financing is mostly in-kind, no sufficient funds will be available to pay for the incremental cost. The outputs, and activities within, are simply TOO NUMEROUS and need to be reduced. 2. Please provide a MAP with the location of the Protected Areas and interzone. 3. When submitting revised CEO Endorsement please identify the Executing Partners for each of the components, not only in the table on p.14-17, but as part of the descriptions of the Component, Outcomes and Outputs. Please do not include Executing Partners that will not physically working on the project, or are aware of the fact that their names are associated with the project. Thanks. 4. GEBs: the estimation of the GHG 	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>benefits is by far too high. 1) The GEF does not understand how the 10,000 ha and 8,512 ha. were calculated in the EX-ACT Tool. 2) It is not correct to use the same area (18,512 ha) for avoided deforestation and forest degradation. 3) How the project can concretely have such effect (avoided deforestation and degradation) in a so huge area of 2.5 + 1.3 million ha. Please recalculate GHG target, explain the calculation and its components and adjust accordingly the Ex-act Tool.</p> <p>COMPONENT 1</p> <p>OVERARCHING: This component has three main parts: TRIDOM, National Protected Areas and IWT. This is far too much and complex for an investment of \$1.1 GEF. Since most (if not all) of the proposed activities are incremental, co-financing will not be of much use to deliver the outputs. The project needs to focus the investments in fewer parts (probably only one) and outputs. Comments below are for the Government and the Agency to explore the proposed outputs and interventions and to stimulate discussion regarding the priorities and</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>necessary activities to deliver the results. PLEASE do not address these comments one by one in a response matrix without the restructuring of the component.</p> <p>1. Please clarify if the Governments of Congo and Gabon have agreed on pursuing the establishment of the Trans-boundary Biosphere Reserve (TBR) in the TRIDOM area. Written commitment is needed, including the financial resources that will be used to cover the expenses on their side of the TBR.</p> <p>2. The issue described above is not included in the table on Incremental Cost (p.9 of CEO Endorsement). Please do so if this output is part of the revised CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>3. Output 1.1 Please clarify the status of the Dja Faunal Reserve. Conflicting statements between description on page 28 of Project Document and proposed activities in the output. Is Dja a Biosphere Reserve or not?</p> <p>4. Output 1.1; Activity 1.1.5. What is the nature of the proposed "platform"? Please describe in plain English.</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>5. Output 1.2. Isn't there a National Strategy on PAs already?</p> <p>6. Output 1.3; Activity 1.3.2. in Project Document. Does the Government of Cameroon requested the application of the ICCWC? What is the status of that request within the Consortium?</p> <p>7. Output 1.3; Activity 1.3.2 in Project Document. Conflicting messages on the status of the national strategy on forest and wildlife crime; to be developed under output 1.3 in CEO Endorsement and to be revised according to the Project Document. Please square this issue.</p> <p>8. Output 1.4. Aren't there agreements already among the three countries on the subject? Please provide background information. What is the LAB protocol?</p> <p>9. Outputs 1.5 and 1. What is the difference between the "National Wildlife Crime Task Force" and the Wildlife Crime Unit"? They appear to be the same. Please clarify and/or merge the two with a description of the administrative structure.</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>10. Output 1.7 appears to be embedded in Output 1.3 Please clarify, merge or make the outputs simpler and clearer.</p> <p>11. Output 1.8. What is the "national system for monitoring wildlife crime cases". Please clarify the nature of this system. Is this the database described under activity 1.8.1 in project document? System different from database. If system, please elaborate on how the database will be feed with information.</p> <p>COMPONENT 2</p> <p>OVERARCHING: This component, while comprehensive, is unlikely to deliver tangible and measurable results because there are far too many activities for the GEF funding available (\$1.2 million). As in the case of Component 1, the project needs to focus on a limited number of activities that are priority and doable within time and budget. Below a suggestion to systematically present the proposed activities by PA.</p> <p>It is very difficult to visualize and retain the proposed interventions in each of the 5 protected areas when there is information on pages 28-31</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>and 42-44 of Project Document, with hardly any detail in the description of the incremental cost reasoning (p.9 of CEO Endorsement). Please elaborate a table with the 5 protected areas, with the background information and the interventions proposed under the three outputs; a matrix of PAs vs. Management Plans, Training, and Implementation of MPs. This table should become the backbone for the elaboration of the budget by PAs in the Project Document.</p> <p>The land management activities that allow avoid deforestation and improve the forest ecosystems are not concretely presented and their link with the expected results are not explained. Furthermore, the area where these results are expected is far too big for funding and time available. Please provide more details regarding the proposed activities that have a real and sure impact on the forests, consider more reasonable results and explain clearly how this activities will lead to the expected results over the considered area. The same comment applied for component 3.</p> <p>COMPONENT 3</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>OVERARCHING: This component, as in the case of the previous 2, requires SIGNIFICANT work to narrow down the priority activities that can be done within time and budget (\$1.3 million for this component). While the list of outputs signals the direction of the proposed interventions, the list of activities is far too long (aspirational rather than realistic) and their description reflects very little thinking on their viability within time and budget. The detailed comments below are provided to show where these outstanding issues come from. But please do not address them in a response matrix, before restructuring the project.</p> <p>1. Output 3.1. p. 44 of Project Document. The requests needs to be shorten. It is unrealistic to request funding for 15-antipoaching posts and equipment for 3 or 4 brigades (conflicting numbers within the output). GEF funding can not be used to provide "defense weapons" to the brigades. Remove it.</p> <p>2. If bi-national brigades will be assembled, are the neighboring countries committed to this activity? Do they know they are being cited in this project? The GEF requires</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>written commitment on the part of the neighboring countries to form part of these brigaded and provide the necessary equipment to carry-out the work.</p> <p>3. What do you mean by "combat systems"?</p> <p>4. Output 3.2. This output should be under Component 2.</p> <p>5. Output 3.3/ This requires SIGNIFICANT WORK, as each individual activity needs to be spell out.</p> <p>6. Activity 3.3.1. Please clarify what you mean by "platforms".</p> <p>7. Second paragraph appear to suggest stakeholders engaged in "stopping poachers". Please clarify.</p> <p>8. What is the target population under this output? There is reference to 60,000 inhabitants in the project area.</p> <p>9. Activity 3.3.4. appears to be the same as 3.3.1.</p> <p>10. Outcome 3.2. This is the outcome that requires the most discussion and further preparation. It is hugely</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>aspirational with interventions that appear smart in principle (and have been implemented in other places) but require elaboration.</p> <p>Without describing the issues output by output, the following are all red flags on the HOW these activities will be implemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - unsustainable bush meat exploitation. - transforming poachers into wildlife guards. - capacity evaluation of every community (What, How many and Where) - involvement of poachers with the private sector in ecotourism (forestry and Agriculture too). - Supporting associations of former poachers. - The negotiation of revenue-sharing agreements between local communities and private sector companies (ecotourism) -Appropriate solutions to human-wildlife conflict -The expansion of intelligence gathering -The GEF does not support the creation of agricultural cooperatives. -Farmer Field Schools -Establishment of community tourism 	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		enterprises.	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	<p>1-12-17</p> <p>No. The GEF funding is NOT ENOUGH to cover the numerous outputs and activities. An STRATEGIC and SIGNIFICANT TREAMING of the project is needed, as well as the development of the ideas to bring them to the level of a CEO Endorsement. Most of what was written in the Project Document is at PIF level.</p> <p>Table C. Government of Cameroon, ZSL, and WWF are providing co-financing in-Kind, not Grants as in the Table.</p>	
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	<p>1-13-17</p> <p>Risks on p.21 of CEO Endorsement. The first category includes "Strategic" which is also a separate category on p.22.</p> <p>Please re-evaluate the risk on capacity to implement project. Please refer to the parts of the projects that have the most risk.</p>	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	<p>10 January 2017:</p> <p>1. The amount of co-financing is confirmed for each contributor.</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>Nevertheless the type of co-financing in the table p.6 of the Endorsement Request isn't correct (grant instead of in-kind). Please correct the table p.4 accordingly.</p> <p>2. The co-finance total in Table B adds up to \$25, 782,757 instead of \$25,782.781 as in Table A. Both should match.</p> <p>3. The table with the name of the Focal Point was removed from the CEO Endorsement Template. Please re-instate and fill-out. Thanks.</p>	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	<p>10 January 2017: No, the GHG benefit is missing. Please complete. Furthermore, the areas in sheet C (GEB_Human_Wildlife indicators) do not correspond to information provided in the in the project document and CEO endorsement request. Please check the areas (ha) where project activities apply and ensure the consistency among the different documents.</p>	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	NA	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	<p>1-13-17</p> <p>Please elaborate on the coordination with the current investments by GIZ. Although there is reference to the</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>GIZ in some parts of the Project Document and CEO Endorsement, it is not possible to understand how this project relates to the GIZ investments. There is only a footnote on a personal communication for ProPFE (2016-1019). Page 36 of CEO Endorsement. Clear elaboration on the collaboration is expected.</p> <p>Please include a paragraph describing how this project has benefited from participating in the Global Wildlife Program lead by the WB.</p> <p>In output 1.3 please elaborate on the relation between the investments in this project with Cameroon's Elephant Action Plan and the CITES decision on COP17 as appropriate.</p>	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	10 January 2017: Yes, cleared.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	10 January 2017: Yes, the knowledge management plan is part of Component 4. cleared.	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEFSEC 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP 	1-13-17	

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>The GEF requested additional information on: i) the collaboration with GIS projects, ii) the relationship between this projects and CITES. See item 8.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF Council 	<p>U.S. Technical Comments: GEF Project #9716, Cameroon</p> <p>The United States believes the illegal wildlife trade (IWT) work proposed in GEF Project, Integrated and Transboundary Conservation of Biodiversity in the Basins of the Republic of Cameroon, generally draws from best practices.</p> <p>We note that the project location is directly across the border from an area in Republic of the Congo that is also receiving new GEF funds. Additionally, both country projects build on past GEF interventions. We would like to see continued cross-border cooperation and communication among these projects, since the regional criminal groups and wildlife species themselves are transboundary in nature. The porosity of the border to criminal groups was introduced as a barrier in the project document, but we would like to see more detail as to how this will be managed.</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>On page 24, the document describes TRAFFIC as a "CITES management body." We do not understand what the authors meant by this, as TRAFFIC is not a CITES body. Nevertheless, the role described for TRAFFIC seems appropriate.</p> <p>The project's work on forests, especially activity 2.2.2, compliments USG efforts with Lacey Act trainings in the region. We believe the trainings featured in the project proposal could be an effective follow-on to USG work in this region. We would like to see greater weight and attention on these trainings, since we view them as critical and they are only briefly mentioned in the proposal. We would suggest that the project implementers also involve the UNODC, Interpol, etc. in their trainings, given their high-quality training curricula, experience operating and training in the region, and ability to coordinate regionally.</p> <p>With regard to protected areas, the United States is pleased with the strong plans for co-financing and work with implementing partners (e.g. WWF, World Bank, and IUCN), as well as clear Global Environmental Benefits to better protect parks and</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>threatened/trafficked species.</p> <p>From a conventions perspective, the project aligns well with Cameroon's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) under the CBD and will also help mitigate the effects of land degradation (a result of forest conversion to agriculture land and artisanal gold mining).</p> <p>Finally, we would like to commend the authors on their thorough gender mainstreaming analysis.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat 		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	<p>12 January 2017:</p> <p>No, please address the comments above.</p> <p>Considering the depth and number of comments on this project, please take the necessary time for re-structuring. The GEF does not expect to see a re-submission in the short time.</p> <p>The GEF remains available for consultation over email or phone.</p> <p>5-9-17 Please address comments by US Council and re-submit. Thanks</p>	
Review Date	Review	January 13, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 21, 2017	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	Additional Review (as necessary)	May 09, 2017	