

# 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: November 09, 2017  
Screener: Sarah Lebel  
Panel member validation by: Annette Cowie  
Consultant(s):

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

<b>FULL-SIZED PROJECT</b>	<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>
<b>GEF PROJECT ID:</b>	9604
<b>PROJECT DURATION:</b>	5
<b>COUNTRIES:</b>	Cameroon
<b>PROJECT TITLE:</b>	Removing Barriers to Biodiversity Conservation, Land Restoration and Sustainable Forest Management through Community-based Landscape Management – COBALAM
<b>GEF AGENCIES:</b>	UNEP
<b>OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:</b>	Ministry of Environment, Nature Protection and Sustainable Development of Cameroon (MINEPDED) with support of Rainforest Alliance
<b>GEF FOCAL AREA:</b>	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):  
**Concur**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the UNEP proposal "Removing barriers to biodiversity conservation, land restoration and sustainable forest management through COmmunity-BASed LANDscape Management - COBALAM". The project's stated objective is to "enable improved biodiversity conservation and sustainable landscape and forest management through participatory community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) and local enterprise development". STAP believes the PIF is well developed both scientifically and technically. STAP appreciates the comprehensive yet succinct descriptions of the issues, barriers and planned interventions, that convey deep scientific understanding of the social-ecological system, and awareness of practical considerations. The use of citations to provide justification is also appreciated. In elaborating the project, STAP suggests that the project developers address the following items:

1. In paragraph 34, as a justification for the implementation of community forests, it is implied that they significantly outperform protected areas in reducing deforestation rates. This statement, referring to a single context, can be misleading. In fact, it would be risky to dismiss protected areas as ineffective in reducing deforestation (there is plenty of evidence to the contrary). Rather, using CBNRM and protected areas in tandem would likely more effectively address deforestation by tackling underlying pressures linked to the lack of local community ownership. STAP does welcome, however, Section f. on innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up which presents comprehensive scientific evidence to support the selection of a CBNRM approach for this project, and outlines key challenges and lessons learnt.
2. Outcome 1.1 refers to the improved protection status for 4,000 ha of HC VF/KBA, i.e. Sacred Forest. Earlier in the document, it is mentioned that some of the largest Sacred Forest areas are in fact eucalyptus plantations (paragraph 28). It would be important here to clarify that the improved protection status is not in fact intended for eucalyptus plantations, but rather for natural forests which are in fact HC VF/KBA.

3. STAP welcomes a comprehensive section on Gender Considerations, and encourages the project proponents to provide further details of their gender strategy in the PPG.
4. STAP would encourage the project proponents to further develop their Knowledge Management strategy beyond the current focus on Monitoring and Evaluation. For some guidance on this topic, the projects developers may consult STAP's ongoing advice on Knowledge Management to the GEF at <http://www.stapgef.org/knowledge-management-gef> as well as some of the knowledge management tools that are currently recommended – see, for example <http://www.knowledge-management-tools.net/knowledge-management-systems.html>. STAP encourages the project developers to include plans to publish the outcomes and findings of this well-planned and innovative project, so that it can inform future projects applying CBNRM approaches.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Concur</b>	In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple “Concur” response will be provided; the STAP may flag specific issues that should be pursued rigorously as the proposal is developed into a full project document. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
<b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b>	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised.</p> <p>(ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.</p> <p>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.</p>
<b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b>	<p>STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required.</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP’s concerns.</p> <p>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.</p>