



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

GEF ID:	<b>9604</b>		
Country/Region:	<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 Agency:	<b>UNEP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>BD-4 Program 9; LD-2 Program 3; LD-3 Program 4;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$91,325</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$3,105,023</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$19,000,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$22,105,023</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Jaime Cavalier</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Adamou Bouhari</b>

<b>PIF Review</b>			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	August 5th 2016  - please add a table or a paragraph showing the alignment with GEF strategic objectives.  - please provide numeric goals for the indicators in the Aichi target table  September 6, 2016 - Comments addressed.	

<sup>1</sup> 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)?

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Please provide numeric goals for the indicators in the Aichi target table at the end of PPG.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?</p>	<p>August 5th 2016</p> <p>Yes, the project align with the NBSAP V2 (<a href="https://www.cbd.int/doc/world/cm/cm-nbsap-v2-en.pdf">https://www.cbd.int/doc/world/cm/cm-nbsap-v2-en.pdf</a>) in particular Strategic goals A, C and D. it will also contribute to the National Action plan for the Fight against Desertification as well as to the CBD and UNCCD.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
<b>Project Design</b>	<p>3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers<sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>August 5th</p> <p>Yes the main drivers are identified from the direct pressures to the institutional weaknesses. Please confirm that IAS are not part of the major environmental threats.</p> <p>- regarding the sustainability issue, please explain how you plan to ensure that the animation needed for the cross-sector coordination and the Inter-institutional landscape managements boards will be financed.</p>	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>- Scaling-up - KM: please give more details in the KM part on how the project will disseminate lessons learned and best practices.</p> <p>9-17-16</p> <p>1. innovation. The PIF states that "The project is innovative because it will work from the communities up to inform and empower people to undertake CBNRM in a way that does not degrade the natural assets on which future productivity is based". That statement is not accurately, as empowering communities to undertake CBNRM has been tried before. Thanks to that, the PIF should be able to identify the approaches that have worked and those that have not. The GEF expects the PIF to elaborate on what has worked in other places and make use of them. That is far more important than to try to justify innovativeness when there isn't. Please use that space (p.17) to do that. An initial assessment must be carried out at PIF stage because if there is no firm ground to work on CBNRM in the ecological and cultural setting of the project, there is no justification to do the work at all.</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>2. Market transformation. The project needs to be exceedingly cautious about raising expectations about market transformation. That is not only difficult but very time consuming. Set realistic goals for the target area at PIF stage. Otherwise, the statements read as "boilerplates".</p> <p>3. Sustainability. Please elaborate on the proposed "Regional Platforms on CBNRM. Are these structures present in Cameroon? If not, would the project build them from scratch? Need to be specific about these structures. Otherwise, it reads as a theoretical structure with little chance to get developed and implemented.</p> <p>4. Scaling-up. Please state if the proposed interventions actually have a chance to get implemented somewhere and who is going to cover the expenses associated with that replication. Consider that this project is worth \$21 million.</p> <p>Comments addressed. IAS level of threat will be evaluated during PPG.</p> <p>10-2-16 Cleared</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	August 11th 2016	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>yes with a few comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please clarify what is the current status of the forests targeted in the project as well as the status aimed (with the main rules and outputs that will be derived from the status change).</li> <li>- please indicate how the target of 9000 ha of sacred forest to protect was chosen. Also please indicate which criteria will serve to select the sacred forest to work on. Make sure to link it with the reference in the GEB table to annex 2 list of species that could be used as possible indicator. Will a connectivity or size criteria be used also to select forests?</li> <li>- please also indicate the areas where the project will work on the outcome 3.</li> <li>- It could be interesting to add references to the closed GEF project 772 "Community Based Conservation in the Bamenda Highlands" and its lessons learned, as well as the completed project 2549 "Sustainable Agro-Pastoral and Land Management Promotion under the National Community Development Program Support Program (PNDP)" and the</li> </ul>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>ongoing project 4048 "CBSP Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Ngoyla Mintom Forest"</p> <p>- please also add a reference to the Small Grants Program (UNDP) as some of the projects may be of interest for this project and also as some coordination may prove useful regarding output 3.1.1</p> <p>- A map of the intervention areas in the south showing the main issues would be helpful. Also the map on page 4 doesn't show very clearly and doesn't seem to include the areas of intervention of the project. On the maps, please also add HCVF/KBA, if possible with the level of risk to show what is at stake.</p> <p>- Editorial remark: please check the reference numbers that start at 2 for stakeholders.</p> <p>9-17-16</p> <p>1. What is the baseline project(s) on which the GEF project will be build? The Baseline scenario presented on pages 9-11 is the background information (the history) rather than the projects and investments that will take place whether or not the GEF</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Grants get approved. Please provide the name of the Baseline Project(s), the budget and a very brief description on the objective of the investments (3-5 lines per project). Once these Baseline Projects are presented, it should be easy to understand how the 3 components fit.</p> <p>10-2-16 Cleared</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>August 11th 2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- please clarify if there will be some overlap, which could be ok, in the different zones under the three components.</li> <li>- The submission of "Legal and technical frameworks for attributing conservation status to identified HCVF/KBA managed by communities to designated authorities" is a necessary step but not sufficient. Would it be doable to ensure the adoption of these framework during the project?</li> <li>- Please clarify the difference between outputs 2.1.2 and 2.1.3</li> <li>- please provide some SMART indicators for the outputs: ratio of farmers trained, ratio of territory</li> </ul>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>covered by management plans ...</p> <p>9-17-16</p> <p>COMPONENT 1</p> <p>1. It is not clear what the following statement means in real terms ".....codification and formal recognition of Sacred Forests as High Conservation Value Forests (HCVF/KBA)" (paragraph 37, p.13). How this codification and formal recognition will actually contribute to the conservation and management of the Sacred Forests? Who codifies and who recognized these forests? What is the legal tenure of these forests once codified and recognized? This sounds like an academic exercise, that while valuable, does not seem to have the necessary "teeth", to assist improve conservation of Sacred Forests in the WHC.</p> <p>2. There is reference to High Conservation Value Forests (HCVF) and Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs). Following the language of the GEF-6 Biodiversity Strategy, Annex 3 , the GEF Secretariat needs to know if the proposed target areas are actually KBAs. Please explain if the proposed sites meet the agreed criteria for</p>	



## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>KBAs. Please used the following resource to determine if the proposed target areas of this project meet the criteria of the KBAs(<a href="http://www.keybiodiversityareas.org">www.keybiodiversityareas.org</a> ). This page can be use to search the map of the agreed KBAs (<a href="http://birdlaa2.memset.net/kba/what-are-kbas">http://birdlaa2.memset.net/kba/what-are-kbas</a>). Suggest overlapping the map of the Secret Forests (Figure 5) with the KBAs in the area as clearly showed in the web resources listed above.</p> <p>3. The project proposes to create "Landscapes Management Boards", "Regional Platforms on CBNRM" and "Multi-scale stakeholder groups" (paragraph 37, p. 13). The institutional architecture is very confusing and it is not possible to determine if these organizations will have the mandate and means to conserve and manage the target landscapes. Please elaborate on this matter. Explain if the proposed construct is working somewhere else in Cameroon or if this is new altogether. Suggest to weed-out all the conservation jargon and explain in plain English what is being proposed.</p> <p>COMPONENT 2</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>4. Component 1 is targeting 4,000 ha of HCVF/KBAs and component 2 is targeting the reduction of pressures on forests covering 25,000 of which 4,000 ha are the HCVF/KBAs and the other 21,000 are community forests. This is a good asset that deserves proper attention.</p> <p>In the PIF there is a list of barriers to make community forestry work in Cameroon, including "...burdensome bureaucratic requirements, a lack of social, organizational and enterprise capacity, limited finance, and weak market pull for products issued from sustainable community forests..", ".....weak organizational and business administration capacity", "...to establish community forests must also include an enterprise and market development component...". Based on the above, it is clear that in order to make this model work investments need to be made on these topics. The GEF suggest a better and more focus alignment of the proposed activities in the community forestry sector with the barriers listed above. It will be difficult for the project, considering budget and time limitations, to tackle all the proposed fronts including "strengthen business operations and value addition for ....non-timber forest</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>products" (not very profitable), "outreach into national and international markets" (a long term and demanding effort), "market and policy incentives". The intention of accessing premium markets nationally and internationally is exceedingly difficult and time consuming. Please provide information on the status of the markets of the products that are being targeted.</p> <p>COMPONENT 3.</p> <p>5. Who is going to provide the Technical Assistant to the recipient of Small Grants? TA may be as important, if not more, than funding itself.</p> <p>10-2-16 Cleared</p>	
	<p>6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?</p>	<p>August 11th 2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes for gender</li> <li>- For CSO and indigenous people, it will be defined during the PPG phase.</li> <li>- please consider more explicitly the socio-economic aspects.</li> </ul> <p>September 12th, 2016</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		- Comments addressed  Cleared	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	August 4th 2016  Yes for the BD and LD parts. SFM funds are already completely used.  September 12th, 2016 Yes for BD and LD parts.  Cleared	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	August 11th 2016  No, please address the previous comments.  9-11-16 No. Please address outstanding issues listed under items 3,4 and 5. The GEF suggest having a conference call with UNEP's Project Contact Person to discuss the issues raised in this second	

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
		review before re-submitting the revised PIF.  10-2-16 Yes. This PIF is recommended for clearance.	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	August 11, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 17, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	October 02, 2016	

<b>CEO endorsement Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		

<sup>3</sup> 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
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEF Council</li> <li>• Convention Secretariat</li> </ul>		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		