REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized project
THE GEF TRUST FUND

Submission Date: July 28, 2011
Resubmission Date: September 9, 2011

Expected Calendar (mm/dd/yy)	
Milestones	**Dates**
Work Program (for FSPs only)	06/01/2009
Agency Approval date	09/31/2011
Implementation Start	11/01/2011
Mid-term Evaluation (if planned)	06/01/2014
Project Closing Date	10/31/2016

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 606415
GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 609772
COUNTRY(IES): Republic of Cameroon
PROJECT TITLE: CBSP – Sustainable community-based management and conservation of mangrove ecosystems in Cameroon
GEF AGENCY(IES): FAO
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): Ministry of Environment and Nature Protection (MINEP), Ministry of Forest and Wildlife (MINFOF), Organization for Environment and Sustainable Development (OPED), Cameroon Ecology (CAM-ECO).
GEF FOCAL AREA(s): Biodiversity
GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(s): BD-SP-3, BD-SP-4.
NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: Strategic Program for Sustainable Forest Management in the Congo Basin (CBSP)

A. PROJECT FRAMEWORK (Expand table as necessary)

Project Objective: To strengthen biodiversity conservation and reduce degradation in mangrove ecosystems.

Project Components	**Inv., TA, STA**	**Expected Outcomes**	**Expected Outputs**	**GEF Financing**		**Co-Financing**		**Total ($)**
				($) a	%	($) b	%	
1. Policy and institutional strengthening.	80% TA 20% Inv	The legal and institutional framework for management of mangrove ecosystems is improved.	1. Strategy and national action plan for integrated management of mangrove ecosystems. 2. Draft text for inclusion in the revised Forest Policy and legislation (including land tenure and rights) and National Environment Management Policy (PNGE). 3. Information centre to provide information to government and private-sector decision makers. 4. Four platforms for cross-sectoral and inter-agency dialogue to integrate mangrove ecosystem issues into planning and development agenda, and public-private partnership. 5. One-hundred NGO and government conservation staff trained in PA management and new laws and regulations.	382,893	42	527,000	58	909,893
2. Mainstreaming mangrove conservation in local development.	100% TA	Biodiversity conservation in mangroves is mainstreamed in coastal development plans and projects.	1. Multi-resource mangrove inventory methodology issued as an official protocol by the Ministry of Forest and Wildlife (MINFOF). 2. Report on the State of Cameroon's Mangroves. 3. One-hundred NGO and govt. conservation staff trained in environmental and social impact assessment (ESIA), monitoring and evaluation. 4. Performance evaluation(s) of all existing mitigation plans. 5. Master plans developed and	267,744	22	938,000	78	1,205,744

			approved for the mangroves in Rio del Rey and Cameroon Estuary. 6. Mangrove management and conservation incorporated into Kribi Development Master Plan.					
3. Creation of mangrove protected areas.	70% Inv 30% TA	Mangrove conservation strengthened by the creation and improved management of three PAs. - 57,000 ha of mangrove forests conserved in legally protected areas with improved management effectiveness.	1. Two national parks created (Ndongore National Park and Douala-Edéa National Park) and mangroves in Rio Ntem Estuary designated as Ramsar site. 2. Management plans developed and approved for all three of the protected areas. 3. Long-term financing plan developed and approved for management of the Douala-Edéa National Park.	280,744	31	626,000	69	906,744
4. Sustainable management of mangrove resources.	70% Inv 30% TA	Local communities in the target sites are managing their mangrove resources more sustainably and their livelihoods have improved. - 10,000 ha of mangroves sustainably managed by local communities under simple management plans at five locations.	1. Five mangrove community forests created with simple plans for sustainable management of mangrove resources. 2. Guide for management of mangrove community forests created and disseminated. 3. Eight-hundred villagers trained in sustainable management techniques for mangrove wood and fisheries resources. 4. Four-hundred villagers participating in sustainable income-generating fishery activities (e.g. oyster, fish, and shrimp farming). 5. One-hundred members of local NGOs, communities and government staff trained in conflict management, sustainable fishing techniques and other practices.	635,299	22	2,315,000	78	2,950,299
5. Project management and monitoring.				166,500	40	250,000	60	416,500
Total project cost				1,733,180	27	4,656,000	73	6,389,180

B. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT

Name of cofinancier	***Classification***	***Type***	***Project***	***%***
MINEP	Nat'l Gov't	In-kind	1,495,000	32
FAO	GEF Agency	In-kind	425,000	9
		Grant	382,000	8
OPED	NGO	In-kind	650,000	14
CAM-ECO	NGO	Grant	200,000	4
		In-kind	550,000	12
CWCS	NGO	Grant	890,000	19
		In-kind	64,000	2
Total cofinancing			**4,656,000**	**100.0**

C. FINANCING PLAN SUMMARY FOR THE PROJECT ($)

	Project Preparation	*Project*	*Total*	*Agency Fee*	*GEF and Co-financing at PIF*
GEF financing	85,000	1,733,180	1,818,180	181,818	1,733,182
Co-financing	90,225	3,702,000	4,656,000		3,700,000
Total	**175,225**	**5,435,180**	**6,474,180**	**181,818**	**5,433,182**

D. GEF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), FOCAL AREA(S) AND COUNTRY(IES)[1]

GEF Agency	*Focal Area*	*Country Name*	*(in $)*		
			Project	*Agency Fee*	*Total*
FAO	Biodiversity	Cameroon	1,733,180	173,318	1,906,498
Total GEF Resources			**1,733,180**	**173,318**	**1,906,498**

E. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	*Total person weeks*	*GEF amount ($)*	*Co-financing ($)*	*Project total ($)*
Local consultants	4,971	303,231	120,690	423,921
International consultants	90	121,000	113,281	234,281
Total	**5,061**	**424,231**	**233,971**	**658,202**

F. PROJECT MANAGEMENT BUDGET/COST

Cost items	*Total person weeks*	*GEF amount ($)*	*Co-financing ($)*	*Project total ($)*
Local consultants	1,169	94,769	14,710	109,479
International consultants	31	47,000	37,760	84,760
Facilities and equipment		5,000	138,271	143,271
Travel		0	19,753	19,753
Others (PSC meetings, etc.)		19,731	39,506	59,237
Total	**1,200**	**166,500**	**250,000**	**416,500**

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A "NON-GRANT" INSTRUMENT? yes ☐ no ☒

H. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M&E PLAN:

Project monitoring

Monitoring and evaluation of progress in achieving project results and objectives will be done based on the targets and results indicators established in the project results framework. M&E activities will follow FAO and GEF monitoring and evaluation policies and guidelines. The M&E plan, which has been budgeted at USD 127 600 will be reviewed and refined during the project inception phase. This will involve: (i) a review of the project's results framework; (ii) refining of outcome indicators; (iii) identification of missing baseline information and action to be taken to collect the information; and (iv) clarification of M&E roles and responsibilities of project stakeholders. The project's M&E system will be put in place within the first six months of project implementation.

Monitoring

Project progress will be monitored at three levels:

- Activity. Implementation of project activities will be monitored on an ongoing basis, with summaries of progress reported in six-monthly project progress reports, including activities and outputs completed. ,These six-monthly reports will also include a record of co-financing contributions to the project. The comparison of progress against annual work plans and budget will be an important management tool to identify, discuss and overcome any difficulties in project implementation. At the end of every three months, progress with respect to financial disbursements will be recorded through the Quarterly Progress Implementation Reports (QPIRs) prepared by the FAO Budget Holder.
- Output. The delivery project outputs will be recorded as and when they occur. The information source will be the evidence of outputs - training workshop reports, list of participants in training activities,

meeting minutes, communication material, participatory mangrove management plans, etc. The production of outputs will also be reported in the project progress reports.

- Outcomes. The achievement of project outcomes will be monitored and recorded in the project progress reports and the annual Project Implementation Reviews submitted by FAO to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Evaluation Office. Some of the outcome indicators will be process indicators to capture the institutional strengthening and technical capacity building activities for integrated management of mangrove ecosystems at national and community levels. Outcomes related to training and capacity building will be assessed through training evaluations and reports, personal interviews with participants, independent peer review of reports/products produced by individuals trained by the project and other methods. Impact indicators will include the number of ha hectares under sustainable management practices and number of hectares protected.

Monitoring of project progress will be a central function of the Project Management Unit (PMU), led by the Technical Project Coordinator (TPC) supported by the National Project Coordinator (NPC) and the Mangroves Conservation Expert (MCE). The MCE will lead the establishment the M&E system within the first six months of implementation. The Technical Project Coordinator will manage the M&E system and will be responsible for the preparation of project progress reports.

The FAO Lead Technical Unit (LTU) and the FAO GEF Coordination Unit will provide oversight and monitor project progress largely through the review of recording and verification of inputs, including financial disbursements and technical levels-of-effort, and the Project Progress Reports (PPRs), Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs) and periodic supervision and backstopping missions. Monitoring of financial disbursements will be largely drawn from FAO's financial management system, while technical inputs will be drawn from PPRs and PIRs, reports produced by the project, and technical backstopping and supervision missions.

Evaluation

In compliance with both GEF and FAO evaluation policies, a mid-term evaluation will be undertaken after 30 months of project implementation. This will determine progress being made towards the achievement of objectives, outcomes and outputs, and will identify corrective actions as necessary. It will, *inter alia*:

a) Assess the relevance of the initiative in relation to the country, GEF and FAO policies;
b) review the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation;
c) analyze effectiveness of implementation and partnership arrangements;
d) identify issues requiring decisions and remedial actions;
e) identify lessons learned about project design, implementation and management;
f) highlight technical achievements and lessons learned; and
g) propose any mid-course corrections and/or adjustments to the implementation strategy as necessary.

An independent final evaluation will take place six months prior to the terminal review meeting of the project partners and will focus on progress made since the mid-term evaluation in achieving its objectives and benchmarks; in particular, it will focus on the analysis of the project outcomes and impact and analyze the sustainability of results. The evaluation will provide recommendations for follow-up actions. The collection of missing baseline data, which will be required to compare the situation at the start of the project and at the time of evaluation, will be completed as part of the technical activities in project year 1.

The table below provides a summary of the main M&E activities and budgeted costs.

Monitoring and evaluation plan and budget

Type of monitoring and evaluation activity	Responsible parties	Budget (in USD)	Time frame
Project reporting			
Project Inception Report.	Technical Project Coordinator (TPC), in consultation with all project staff, the Project Steering Committee (PSC) and FAO.	Project staff time (see below)	Immediately after the inception workshop
Quarterly Project Implementation Report (QPIR)	FAO (Budget Holder).	Covered by Agency fee	Every three months.
Semi-annual Project Progress Report (PPR)	TPC with support from NPC and reviewed by FAO Lead Technical Unit (LTU), Forestry Department and GEF Coordination Unit.	Project staff time (see below)	Every six months.
GEF Project Implementation Review (PIR) and preparation of the Annual Work Plan (AWP)	LTU with inputs from the TPC, reviewed by FAO GEF Coordination Unit AWP – TPC, submitted to FAO LTU and PSC	Covered by Agency fee	Annually with the reporting period July to June
GEF Tracking Tools	TPC with support from the National Project Coordinator (NPC) and reviewed by FAO LTU.	Project staff time (see below)	At mid-point and end of project
Project Terminal Report (PTR)	TPC, with assistance of other project staff and the FAO LTU	Project staff time (see below)	Two months before end of project.
Cost of project staff time on reporting (1 month per year).		23,800	
Project steering committee meetings and inception and terminal workshops			
Inception Workshop	TPC and NPC	6,000	Within first month after start of project implementation.
Terminal Workshop	TPC and NPC	6,000	At end of project.
PSC Meetings	TPC and NPC	18,000	At least once per year.
Mid-term review and independent final evaluation			
Mid-term evaluation	External consultant, FAO Office of Evaluation in consultation with PMU, GEF Coordination Unit and other partners.	25,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Independent final evaluation	External consultant, FAO Office of Evaluation in consultation with PMU, LTU, GEF Coordination Unit and other partners.	30,000	Six months before end of project implementation.
Other monitoring and evaluation activities			
Technical and field reports, reviews and workshop proceedings	Project staff and consultants, with peer review as appropriate.	Project staff time + cofinancing + consultant costs	As appropriate.
Visits to field sites	Project staff, consultants, FAO and other project partners (as appropriate).	Visit by FAO (LTU) from agency fee. Visits by PMU (TPC and NPC) included in local travel	As appropriate.
Field-based impact monitoring + verification	TPC, with the assistance of NPC and review by FAO.	23,800	At the end of each year.
Lessons learned	Project staff, short-term consultants and FAO.	FAO cofinancing	As appropriate.
Total indicative cost		**127,600**	

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION:

A. STATE THE ISSUE, HOW THE PROJECT SEEKS TO ADDRESS IT, AND THE EXPECTED GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS TO BE DELIVERED:

This project will address two major issues of importance to the global environment, as well as to the livelihood and well-being of the people living in Cameroon's mangrove ecosystems.

Issue 1: Weak legal and institutional framework. At present, the institutional and legal framework for mangrove management in Cameroon is very weak and these ecosystems are under a lot of pressure from macroeconomic developments in coastal areas. National forestry and environment legislation and strategies do not take into consideration special ecosystems such as mangroves. One of the consequences is that mangroves are not included in the national forest zoning plan and they are part of the "National Domain" (i.e. they are public land, but without any management status). In addition, local communities have weak tenure over mangrove forests as they are not cultivating these wetlands. As such they can be considered "wastelands" that anybody can encroach upon and harvesting of mangrove forests and agro-industrial expansion are unchecked. Furthermore, there is no framework in place for dialogue that could support integrated planning for economic development and coastal conservation. A robust monitoring system to monitor ecosystem health and pollution and other impacts from large industrial developments is also not in place and there is little research or information available about these ecosystems. This information is key to having a meaningful dialogue and integrated planning and to ensure that the value of mangrove ecosystems is integrated into economic development projects.

Issue 2: Current natural resource harvesting and management practices are unsustainable. The current level of mangroves biodiversity conservation is low and unrestricted and unsustainable local harvesting of mangrove resources (e.g. wood-energy, poles, sand, fish and bi-valves) destroys the mangroves and undermines local livelihoods and local development. At present 19 percent (37,500 ha) of Cameroon's mangrove ecosystems are formally protected (i.e. part of Douala Edéa Wildlife Reserve and Campo Ma'an National Park), but this doesn't reflect the importance of these ecosystems. Mangroves ecosystems are being fragmented and degraded due to unchecked exploitation. By their very nature mangrove ecosystems have an open access resource use regime with mobile and migratory fishermen and women populations. Over the past ten years, useful experiences with participatory management of mangrove ecosystems have been gained (including restoration) by working with fisheries communities - mostly women - to promote more efficient use of mangrove wood-energy. However, to date, the up-scaling of these initiatives has not been successful.

In addition to these two fundamental issues, a number of other problems limit the ability of the government to address these issues and try to overcome them. Some of the most important of these problems will be addressed by the project, such as the following:

1. Low integration of communities in the local development planning framework. The level of integration into the local development process is low. This poses a challenge both to enforcing government legislation and to developing community based natural resource management of mangroves and fisheries resources.
2. Lack of coherent integrated planning for development, sustainable use and conservation. Cameroon has no coastal development plan and whilst there are efforts to properly plan large infrastructure program, it remains difficult to ensure participation across sectoral interests and to follow through with environmental and social impact assessments and impact mitigation plans.
3. Lack of tangible information and dialogue amongst stakeholders. Information on the health and status of coastal ecosystems and their value for local socio-economic development is hard to come by. And those research institutes, NGOs and private sector that have some data lack the capacity and mandate to communicate it. Naturally, a lack of viable information renders dialogue and exchange ineffective. This is a real bottleneck in the establishment of trust between stakeholders and the building of partnerships.
4. Lack of capacity to scale-up community-based approaches to sustainable management. Over the past ten years a number of local Cameroonian NGOs have worked with local communities, fishermen and

women to develop participatory approaches to mangroves management and wise use. This includes introduction of fuel efficient fish-drying stoves, elaboration of simple management plans that define a rotation of low impact harvesting, restoration and conservation and regeneration plots in the community management mangrove forests. There is also useful experience with reforestation of degraded mangrove forests. In some areas there is strong support from local government and local councils supporting these developments. What lacks is the capacity to upscale these experiences to a bigger scale.

5. Legal and policy reform. Present forestry and environment legislation and policy frameworks of Cameroon are well developed and do provide for an overall framework for management of Cameroon's forestry and wildlife resources. Yet, special ecosystems such as mangroves are not taken into consideration, thus limiting the application of the national framework to the management of the local mangroves ecosystem and control over its resources.

6. Lack of alternative economic development opportunities. The main source of income in the region is from fishing and trade in fishery products. Although this activity generates significant amounts of income to fishing communities, there are few other commercial activities that potentially could contribute to local households' economies. One of the economic challenges in this particular coastal region is to explore other economic activities such as in the agro-pastoral sector to compensate for dependence on fisheries. The local fishermen should be encouraged to reduce their dependence on mangrove and marine resources but the government and NGOs will have to provide technical assistance if this is to occur.

The project will address the above problems through the following activities:

1. Policy and institutional strengthening. The objective of this component is to improve the legal and institutional framework for the management of mangrove ecosystems. It will include development of a strategy and national action plan for the integrated management of mangrove ecosystems and revisions to policy and legislation to support this. An information centre will be established to support long-term monitoring of the health of coastal wetlands and mangroves, by collecting and disseminating accurate information to government decision makers and the private-sector. This will also be used to integrate issues concerning mangrove ecosystems into the national and local development agenda and local planning, along with the development of platforms for cross-sectoral and inter-agency dialogue. Most project activities will be implemented by local NGOs and government conservation staff, so the project will help these institutions to develop long-lasting capacity so that they can continue to support mangrove conservation activities after the project ends.

2. Mainstreaming mangrove conservation in local development. This component will ensure that mangrove conservation issues are taken into account in coastal development. This will include both large-scale industrial and infrastructure developments as well as small-scale local/community development activities. It will update/complete information about the mangrove ecosystems of Cameroon through multi-resource inventories implemented with local communities (one in each of the three mangrove zones), so that this information can be used as an input to the drafting and discussion of local development plans. It will develop local capacity to monitor and evaluate the environmental and social management plans of developments in coastal areas. This will include reviewing past environmental and social impact assessments (from the perspective of mangrove and coastal wetlands health) and evaluation of performance (i.e. comparison of mitigation activities implemented with activities listed in mitigation plans).Another important mainstreaming activity will be the incorporation of mangrove conservation issues into local development plans (master plans) in each of the three estuaries.

3. Creation of mangrove protected areas. The objective of this component is to support the creation and management of formally protected areas in each of the three estuaries. The outputs of this will be: two national parks created (Ndongore National Park and Douala-Edéa National Park) and mangrove areas in the Rio Ntem Estuary designated as a Ramsar site; management plans developed and approved for all three of the protected areas; and long-term financing plan developed and approved for management of the Douala-Edéa National Park.

4. Sustainable management of mangrove resources. The objective of this component is to ensure that local communities in the target sites are managing their mangrove resources more sustainably and their

livelihoods have improved. Activities to support the development of sustainable management techniques and practices will be funded with GEF resources, with project co-financing focusing on local development activities. Activities will include the identification of permanent settlements in the mangrove areas and the creation of Common Economic Interest Groups and mangrove community forests with simple management plans to support the sustainable management of mangrove resources. Fishing villages will be supported to develop and implement sustainable income-generating fishery activities, with specific attention to women. The project will also support the fisheries and forestry departments to improve monitoring and control through the use of participatory approaches and awareness raising amongst local stakeholders. This will include providing training to local NGOs, communities and government staff in participatory approaches to sustainable mangrove resource management

Global environmental benefits

Mangrove ecosystems in Cameroon contain a number of globally important species and contribute to the rich biodiversity in surrounding terrestrial and marine ecosystems. These species include the following:

Flora: Cameroon's mangroves contain six indigenous tree species: Rhizophora racemosa; Rhizophora harrisonii; Rhizophora mangle (Rhizophoraceae); Avicennia germinans (Avicenniaceae); Laguncularia racemosa; and Conocarpus erecrus (Combretaceae). These species generally share their habitat with more than 40 other plants, known as "companion species".

Aquatic fauna: Mangrove aquatic fauna are the most important category in terms of economical value and number of species. This fauna encompasses a number of groups, such as: aquatic mammals; reptiles; crustaceans; shellfish; fish; and plankton, with the first two groups being of particular conservation value. Aquatic mammals include the otter and the African manatee (Trichechus senegalensis), which is a ubiquitous mangrove mammal that is currently in decline due to intensive illegal poaching. Reptiles include five species of sea turtles: the green sea turtle (Chelonia mydas); the Olive ridley turtle (Lepidochelys olivacea); the leatherback sea turtle (Dermochelys coriacea); the Hawskbill sea turtle (Eretmochelys imbricata); and the Loggerhead sea turtle (Caretta caretta).

Terrestrial fauna: The terrestrial fauna is richly diversified and comprises: reptiles; mammals; birds and insects. The reptiles and mammals that are in most need of conservation include: dwarf crocodiles (Orteolaemus tretraspis); giant crocodiles (Crocodylia); Nile varans (Varanus niloticus); African pythons (Pithon selae); aquatic Najas (Boulangerina annulata); blue monkeys (Cercopithecideae); mangrove antelopes or Sitatunga (Tragelaphus spekei); aquatic Chevrotains (Hyemoschus aquaticus); and bush-pig (Potamochoerus porcus). In addition, more than 70 species of aquatic birds (many of them endemic) visit the mangroves and the coastline every year in search of permanent and temporary shelter.

The global environmental benefits of the project will be the protection of the globally important biodiversity present in these mangrove ecosystems (described above). It will reduce the threats to those ecosystems (both from large-scale coastal developments and local livelihood activities) and, in support of this, help local inhabitants to manage and utilise natural resources more sustainably and more profitably. This will be done by building capacity to manage these ecosystems more sustainably (at the local level) as well as by supporting improved monitoring, development planning and inter-sectoral co-ordination (mainstreaming) at the national level.

Measurable indicators include:

- Strengthened protection of 200,000 ha of mangroves through mainstreaming of mangrove conservation objectives in sectoral policies and legislation;
- 57,000 ha of mangrove forests conserved in legally protected areas with improved management effectiveness;
- 10,000 ha of mangroves sustainably managed by local communities under simple management plans at five locations.

B. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH NATIONAL AND/OR REGIONAL PRIORITIES/PLANS:

The linkage between biodiversity conservation, sustainable land and forest management, national development and local livelihoods is well recognized by Cameroon and its partners of the national and international community. Cameroon is a signatory to the main international environmental agreements (e.g. Convention on Biodiversity in 1994, Ramsar in 2006) and has also made commitments to a number of other international and regional agreements. This project will help the country to meet its commitments and obligations under these agreements.

The project is aligned with the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan and will actually seek to complete the NBASP with a chapter on mangrove ecosystems. This project is also consistent with and complementary to Cameroon's Forest Environment Sector Program in which both MINEP and MINFOF are working together and have made good progress on the sector programs progress indicators.

The management of social and environmental impacts of large economic development projects has over the past years become a mainstream concern of Cameroon's government and civil society (see Chad-Cameroon Oil Pipeline and developments around other large mineral exploration projects) and this project will further build on this policy and dialogue environment and strengthen national capacity for impact assessment and monitoring. Related to this, Cameroon has an Independent Forest Monitor, which supports government in monitoring compliance of legal provision for forest management and exploitation. This project will not seek to replicate this, but the proposed Observatory will certainly benefit from this experience.

C. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH GEF STRATEGIES AND STRATEGIC PROGRAMS:

The project will contribute to both GEF strategic objectives for biodiversity (mostly the second objective), as well as make a modest contribution to some other GEF strategic objectives.

Strategic Objective 1 (BD SO-1). Cameroon has an extensive national protected area network for which an extensive biodiversity vision was developed with the support of WWF, IUCN and a large group of national and international experts during the period 2002/2003. This biodiversity vision is now being implemented through the PSFE and over the past 5 years a number of new National Parks have been created. In the coastal zone Campo Ma'an was upgraded from a wildlife reserve to a national park in 2000, the contours of Douala Edéa Wildlife Reserve and its peripheral zone have been redefined and it is expected that Douala Edéa Wildlife Reserve will soon be gazetted as a National Park. The importance of the mangroves of Rio del Rey is also being recognized in the National Biodiversity vision (with Rio del Rey formally designated as the 5th Ramsar site of Cameroon in May 2010).

Under this objective, the project follows the approaches recommended under GEF Biodiversity Strategic Program 3 (BD SP-3). Specifically, it will strengthen the protected area network by supporting the extension of the current protected area in Douala Edea (to cover the adjacent mangrove ecosystem) and the creation of a new national park to include important mangrove areas in the Rio del Rey. These developments will fill the current ecosystem coverage gap (i.e. that very little mangrove area is, at present, included in the protected area network). The project will also address the issue of financing and resources noted under BD SP-3 through activities to strengthen the capacity of government and NGOs to manage these areas and the development of dialogue mechanisms to encourage more public and private-sector investment in their conservation.

Strategic Objective 2 (BD SO-2). As already noted above, Cameroon's mangrove ecosystems are used by local people for fishing and harvesting of wood and non-wood forest products, so the project will support the introduction of more sustainable and biodiversity-friendly harvesting and management techniques. In addition, given the threats to these ecosystems from developments in other sectors, it will also support the strengthening of existing measures and/or introduction of new measures to monitor, control and limit the environmental impact of these other developments on these ecosystems. This will focus primarily on limiting the environmental impacts of oil exploration and production in the coastal zones, but the outcomes of the project may also be used to reduce the environmental impacts of other development activities.

Under this objective, the project follows the approaches recommended under GEF Biodiversity Strategic Programme 4 (BD SP-4). Specifically, it will strengthen the framework for mainstreaming biodiversity in the following three ways:

1. By supporting the formulation and implementation of national policies and regulations for integrated and inter-sectoral management of the mangrove ecosystems.
2. By increasing the knowledge and information available about the trends, status and threats to these ecosystems. This will be combined with activities to raise awareness about the value of these ecosystems, so that biodiversity conservation and other environmental considerations can be taken into account in land-use planning and decision-making in other sectors.
3. By building capacity for sustainable management of the mangrove ecosystems (by local communities) as well as for the monitoring and enforcement of policies and regulations (related to mangrove ecosystems) by government and other relevant stakeholders.

Other GEF Strategic Objectives. Another important component of the project will be to combat land degradation in these mangrove areas. There is a lot of fragmentation of the mangrove ecosystem due to localised unsustainable use practices in fisheries and in harvesting wood for energy and building. The project will build on experience gained in working with local communities to establish simple management regimes for the mangrove forests, including defining harvesting limits and conservation zones. There are large foreign fisheries communities in some of the mangrove areas and they will be included in these activities.

D. JUSTIFY THE TYPE OF FINANCING SUPPORT PROVIDED WITH THE GEF RESOURCES.

GEF resources will be provided to Cameroon as a grant, because the majority of GEF-funded activities will be technical assistance or scientific and technical advice. Most of this will be focused on improving environmental outcomes (i.e. it is not expected to generate revenue or income) and in the few activities that will support local income generation, GEF funding will be directed towards supporting mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation (and sustainability more generally) in those activities.

E. OUTLINE THE COORDINATION WITH OTHER RELATED INITIATIVES:

The project will collaborate closely with the FAO-led GEF project on the sustainable management of mangroves and coastal wetlands in Congo. FAO will take note of any other GEF funded projects concerning mangrove and coastal forests in Africa and will seek to build linkages with these projects (e.g. one currently proposed by UNEP for harmonisation of policies and management of mangrove ecosystems in Africa).

At a broader level, the project will collaborate with other relevant projects supported by the Strategic Program for Sustainable Forest Management in the Congo Basin (CBSP) and will be linked in two main ways: through FAO's participation in the coordinating mechanisms for the CBSP; and through the GEF Focal Points in countries that are involved in the CBSP. Specific mechanisms for coordination and collaboration will be established with this initiative and with relevant projects and will likely include joint workshops and training events, collaboration on awareness raising activities and sharing of project data, lessons learned and other information.

With respect to other initiatives already under way in Cameroon, the most important linkage will be with the Forest Environment Sector Programme of MINEP and MINFOF, which is supported by GEF and the World Bank, the Government of Cameroon and other bilateral donors. This programme was for the five-year period 2004 to 2009 and was recently extended by 2 years until 2011. In addition, the project is expected to link with activities being supported under the COMIFAC Convergence Plan, the Central African Regional Program for the Environment (CARPE), the Congo Basin Forest Partnership (CBFP) and International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO) mangrove forest projects in Congo and Cameroon. For these initiatives, linkages will be initiated at the national level through, for example, participation of project staff in meetings and workshops organized under these initiatives (and *vice-versa*) and participation of individuals from those initiatives in Project Steering Committee meetings, working groups, technical events and other consultations.

F. DISCUSS THE VALUE-ADDED OF GEF INVOLVEMENT IN THE PROJECT DEMONSTRATED THROUGH INCREMENTAL REASONING :

There are a number of reasons why the Government of Cameroon needs this external support to solve the problems described above. First, there is the lack of capacity in the country to develop and implement many of the reforms proposed in this project (strategy development, policy and legal adjustments, efficient environmental impact assessment and monitoring). International assistance for these activities is needed so that the country can benefit from experiences learned in other countries and emerging best practices in these areas.

A second justification is the need for strengthening of local institutions (government and NGOs) with respect to participatory approaches to natural resource management. The development and implementation of participatory approaches is a stated aim of government policy, but these approaches are still in their infancy and government staff do not have much experience with such approaches. Similarly, local NGOs and civil society organisations are poorly developed compared to many other countries. Through formal and in-service training, the project will help to develop the skills needed to implement such approaches. Furthermore, the policy and legal reforms will help to strengthen these arrangements by providing a formal legal framework for their implementation and mechanisms for inter-sectoral coordination.

The project will also provide seed-capital for investments in sustainable resource utilisation and local income generation (mostly through co-financing). Not only will this allow for pilot testing of various activities, but it will help the country to develop a more sustainable long-term framework for such investments. There are currently significant investments in economic development along the coastline and more are expected in the future. Initiatives are needed to support local development and environmental protection/improvement. Experiences gained and the results of this project can be used to plan and organise this support in the future.

Without project scenario

Without the project, it is likely that current conservation efforts (mostly led by local NGOs) will continue in an uncoordinated manner. As a consequence, the results would not be sustainable in the long-term , and there would be little or no impact on policies and legislation. Successful examples of community-based approaches to conservation and natural resource management will remain localised without efforts to scale-up these successes, and any conservation measures that would be taken would likely occur in areas of little or no economic value rather than areas of high conservation value.

Most importantly, large economic development projects are unlikely to consider the environmental and social impacts of their activities on mangrove ecosystems. The importance of mangroves in coastal land use planning would be insufficiently recognized, and mangroves would continue to be fragmented and degraded by erratic resource exploitation and pollution.

Local capacity to plan and implement ecosystem-based management and sustainable forest and fisheries management activities would also remain weak, and the protected areas that do already exist would provide little protection for threatened and endangered species without more effective management. In addition, although local communities understand the importance of healthy mangrove ecosystems, they would not be able to ensure sustainable use and management if external factors beyond their control continue to have a detrimental impact on the environment in these areas. For instance, many migrant communities along the entire coast (which often use mangrove wood and fisheries resources) are likely to continue to degrade mangrove resources and may even enter protected areas if their concerns are not heard and they do not have a stake in the protection of the area.

With project scenario

The with project scenario will build public-private partnerships for the management of the coastal and mangrove environment of Cameroon. It will complement the national strategies (Forest and Environment Sector Programme – PSFE and National Environment Management Policy – PNGE) that are already being implemented and strengthen their impact on the management and conservation of the important mangrove ecosystems. It will also strengthen government capacity to manage the environmental and social impacts of large development projects.

In working with the private sector, the project will contribute to mitigating the impacts of economic development projects in the coastal zone, reduce pollution and mobilize funding from the private sector for sustainable mangrove management and restoration. The mobilization of resources will allow the up-scaling of support to local communities and empower them to manage the resource base on which their livelihoods depend.

The project will also improve the management effectiveness of the mangrove ecosystem area under protection. Local communities will be equipped with management plans, legal agreements for management, and economic incentives to implement best practices, thus being able to actively contribute to the conservation of mangrove ecosystems and benefit from integrated local development. This will also be supported by intensive capacity building efforts with local NGOs and government conservation staff working in these areas.

Ultimately, the incremental benefit that the GEF project will produce is the protection of the globally important biodiversity present in these mangrove ecosystems. It will improve the protection of these areas by reducing the threats to them (both from large-scale coastal developments and local livelihood activities) and by helping local inhabitants to manage and utilise these areas more sustainably and more profitably.

G. INDICATE RISKS, INCLUDING CLIMATE CHANGE RISKS, THAT MIGHT PREVENT THE PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) FROM BEING ACHIEVED AND OUTLINE RISK MANAGEMENT MEASURES:

The risks and proposed mitigation measures are summarised in the table below. Further details of these are presented in Section 3.7 of the project document.

Risk	Impact	Probability	Mitigation
Environmental risks			
Major pollution from spillages.	Locally high.	Low. Cameroon has no history of this occurring.	Ensure participation of oil, gas and mining industry and support strong monitoring protocols and systems.
Sea level rise due to climate change.	Unknown. Extent and impact to be monitored.	Low in the short term. Potentially high in the long term.	Set up permanent monitoring and research on sea level rise and on capacity of mangroves to adapt to rising sea levels.
Economic risk			
Land-use conflicts.	Moderate (will not result in protection and conservation - but not a problem in all mangrove areas).	Low to moderate.	Through continuous dialogue, information sharing and joint planning with all important actors, compliance of private sector with environmental regulations and coherence between different land uses will be enhanced.
Social and institutional risks			
Weak institutions for meaningful policy dialogue.	High (reduced sustainability).	Low to medium.	Ensure visibility of the project and generate support by decision makers for the project.
Low participation of foreign groups of fishermen and women.	High. (will lead to further mangrove fragmentation).	High in Rio del Rey Estuary, low elsewhere.	Focused effort to encourage the participation of non-resident fishermen and women and support local conflict resolution and peace building at the Nigerian border.
Local NGOs failing to deliver project results and weak financial management.	Low to medium (reduced sustainability).	Low.	Further capacity development through training and close monitoring.

H. EXPLAIN HOW COST-EFFECTIVENESS IS REFLECTED IN THE PROJECT DESIGN:

Cost-effectiveness was considered during project preparation by examining alternative options for three main aspects of the project design.

Institutional arrangements. For the mobilisation of all stakeholders in dialogue and decision making and to assist with monitoring, stakeholders examined different possibilities for co-ordination and consultation and suggested that it would be most efficient for the project to build upon existing mechanisms. The most relevant of these is the CIDE (Centre d'Information pour l'Environnement), which includes a National Emergency Intervention Plan for accidental petrol spillage. It is under the umbrella of the CIDE that the project will support the setting up of a multi-actor information centre for the coastal and mangroves ecosystems.

Environmental monitoring and evaluation. Consultations during project preparation also examined a number of options for the implementation of environmental monitoring and evaluation activities (e.g. government monitoring, self-reporting by private companies, monitoring by NGOs). The main requirements for the monitoring arrangements are that they should be independent, accountable, performed to a reasonably high scientific standard and sustainable.

It was decided that the most-cost effective way of meeting these requirements would be by establishing a multi-actor information centre for the coastal and mangroves ecosystems, which will draw on information collected through the Cameroon Mangrove Network, and implement additional monitoring and research on the status and condition of mangrove and coastal ecosystems and the impacts of developments on those ecosystems in collaboration with relevant university and research institutions. .

To increase the accountability and cost-effectiveness of this information centre, communities will become an integral part of the information gathering process and will be supported in this role by the local NGOs included in the project. The private-sector and government will fund the institution for the duration of the project and, if it proves to be successful and useful a long-term funding arrangement will be developed and implemented.

Funding of mangrove management and conservation activities. The project includes a number of mangrove management and conservation activities. GEF funding is targeted specifically at building capacity in local communities (and supporting institutions such as local government and NGOs) for sustainable management of the natural resources found in these ecosystems. Project co-financing is targeted more towards activities such as development of sustainable local livelihoods.

Management of these resources by local communities will be a far more cost-effective (and sustainable) way of conserving these ecosystems than direct intervention by government or other stakeholders. Furthermore, by focusing on capacity building, GEF funding will leave a lasting legacy of technical competence and experiences gained on the project (by all stakeholders) that can be used to stimulate continued management of these areas and replicated elsewhere.

Quantification of cost-effectiveness

Due to the relatively small area of mangrove ecosystems in Cameroon, the cost of this project is quite high when assessed using typical measures (e.g. cost per hectare). However, the relative scarcity of these ecosystems (and the high levels of biodiversity they contain) and the intense pressures they face from the local population are exactly the reasons why a quite high level of investment is justified.

For the purpose of calculating cost-effectiveness, it is useful to divide the cost of activities into those implemented at the national level (components 1 and 2) and those targeted at the local level (components 3 and 4) and assess them separately.

At the national level, the GEF funding (USD 650 000) will establish a basic level of protection through policy and legal reform, capacity building and improved monitoring, assessment and mitigation at a cost of roughly USD 3.25 per hectare (for the 200,000 ha of mangrove ecosystems). The outcome of the project is that the degradation of mangrove forests in these areas should have stopped and degradation of other resources (either through pollution, development or excessive resource harvesting) should be mostly under control by the end of the project.

Compared with the level of benefits provided by these ecosystems (both in terms of local income from resource harvesting and the global environmental benefits), this investment is likely to have a very high cost benefit ratio. Of course, continued development of the coastline may have an even higher cost-benefit ratio, but platforms such as the CIDE should help the government to minimise the environmental impacts of those developments and, where necessary, develop and implement compensatory mechanisms/projects so that the environmental benefits of these ecosystems are maintained overall.

At the local level, GEF funding for components 3 and 4 amounts to USD 916 000 and will be targeted at the 57,000 ha of the three formal protected areas covered by the project, plus the additional 10,000 hectares of mangroves where sustainable management will be encouraged through community-based interventions. This is equivalent to around USD 13.50 per hectare. However, the income of the 220,000 local inhabitants in these areas amounts to about USD 79 million every year. Viewed in this context, the GEF funding over the five years amounts to roughly one percent of the value of local resource harvesting activities (or much less if the project results in long-term changes in management practices, as is intended), which is a relatively modest investment in changing behaviour for the benefit of the global environment. Furthermore, if successful, mechanisms such as the CIDE will continue to provide support for these communities so that sustainable management and rehabilitation activities will continue into the future.

One final measure of the cost-effectiveness of this project is the expected returns from support to local income generation. This will be funded by co-financing (approximately USD 600,000 of the total co-financing for Component 4), with a little GEF funding to support mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation into these activities (about USD 100,000 to support sustainable fishing techniques, fisheries management and forest management). The target for this activity is to raise the incomes of participants in these income generation projects by 20 percent, which amounts to around USD 60,000 per year or a nine percent return on this investment. Therefore, if successful, this will achieve a respectable rate of return as well as support the production of global environmental benefits from more sustainable resource management and harvesting activities.

PART III: INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION AND SUPPORT

A. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT:

The key institutional partner will be the Ministry of Environment and Nature Protection (MINEP). Within MINEP, the Directorate of Conservation Monitoring and Natural Resource Promotion (DGC) will take the lead role for this project. The DGC is responsible for environmental auditing, monitoring and impact assessments, environmental laws and regulations, biodiversity conservation and government relations with international conventions (CBD, Ramsar). In addition, the GEF Operational Focal Point is a staff member of DGC and is responsible for the coordination of all GEF activities in the country. MINEP will work closely with the Department of Forests and the Department of Wildlife and Protected Areas within the Ministry of Forests and Wildlife (MINFOF) who will lead the implementation of Component 3 – Creation of mangrove protected areas.

B. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENT:

Project Steering Committee

The Project will establish a Project Steering Committee (PSC) that will oversee and guide project implementation, review and approve annual progress reports and project work plans and take necessary actions to overcome major constraints to improve the impact of the project. The primary role of the PSC will be to ensure that the GEF project is executed efficiently and effectively and its outcomes are mainstreamed into government policies, laws and regulations. This will include assisting with the creation of other official consultative mechanisms or multi-sectoral platform(s).

Project Technical Consultative Mechanism

A Project Technical Consultative Mechanism (PTCM) will be established in order to provide advice on an *ad-hoc* or permanent basis to the project and facilitate synergy and co-ordination between the activities funded by the GEF and cofinancing activities. The main role of the PTCM will be to provide technical and scientific advice and guidance to the project. The PTCM will include the following: relevant

technical experts from government, representatives of cofinancing partners; long-term project staff as well as representatives of other institutions with relevant expertise and experience. The National Project Coordinator will call for meetings of the PTCM as and when required.

GEF Agency

FAO will serve as both the GEF agency and executing agency of the project. As the GEF agency, FAO will be responsible for project oversight to ensure that GEF policies and criteria are adhered to and that the project meets its objectives and achieves expected outcomes and outputs as established in this Project Document in an efficient and effective manner. FAO will report on the project progress to the GEF Secretariat and provide financial reports to the GEF Trustee in accordance with the financial procedures agreement between FAO and the GEF Trustee. FAO will closely monitor the project and provide technical guidance and carry out supervision missions.

The FAO Lead Technical Unit (LTU), Forest Conservation Team of the Forest Assessment, Management and Conservation Division (FOMC) within the FAO Forestry Department will provide technical backstopping. The LTU will appoint a Lead Technical Officer (LTO) who will follow-up closely on implementation progress and ensure delivery of technical outputs and outcomes, and undertake regular backstopping missions. The LTU will review and provide clearance to: i) the Terms of Reference of consultancies, letters of agreement and contracts; ii) the selection of the consultants and firms to be hired with GEF funding; and iii) all technical reports and financial reports.

The LTU will also: (i) review and provide clearance to the six-monthly project progress reports prepared by the Technical Project Coordinator (TPC); (ii) prepare annual Project Implementation Review (PIR) to be reviewed and cleared by the FAO GEF Coordination Unit the Investment Centre Division (TCI) and submitted to GEF; (iii) field at least one annual project supervision mission or more frequently as needed; and (iv) review and clearance to the TORs for the mid-term review and final evaluation and participate in the mid-term review.

The FAO Representative (FAOR) in Cameroon will be designated as the Budget Holder (BH) of the project's GEF resources. The BH will be responsible for timely operational, administrative and financial management of the project. In this capacity, the FAOR will authorise the disbursement of GEF project funds. The BH will also prepare Quarterly Project Implementation Reviews (QPIRs) and annual budget revisions for submission to the LTU and FAO GEF Coordination Unit. The BH will manage GEF project resources in close consultation with the LTU and the lead executing partner – the Directorate of Conservation Monitoring and Natural Resource Promotion (DGC).

The GEF Coordination Unit in the Investment Centre Division (TCI) will review and approve project progress reports, implementation reviews and financial reports and budget revisions. The GEF Coordination will review and clear the annual PIR and undertake supervision missions if considered necessary. The PIRs will be included in the FAO GEF Annual Monitoring Review submitted to the GEF Secretariat and the GEF Evaluation Office by the GEF Coordination. The GEF Coordination will in collaboration with the FAO Finance Division request transfer of project funds from the GEF Trustee based on 6 monthly projections of the GEF component funds need.

The FAO Finance Division will provide certified annual and terminal financial reports to the GEF Trustee in accordance with the provisions in the GEF Financial Procedures Agreement and, in collaboration with the GEF Coordination Unit, call for project funds on a six-monthly basis from the GEF Trustee.

National Executing Partners

The Directorate General of Conservation Monitoring and Natural Resources Promotion (DGC) of the Ministry of Environment and Nature Protection (MINEP) will be the lead executing partner within the Government. DGC will support and supervise the execution of the project. Specifically, DGC will: (i) facilitate the establishment of the Project Steering Committee (PSC); (ii) facilitate the establishment of and supervise the project management unit (PMU) which will be hosted at DGC offices in Limbe; (iii) mobilize government co-financing; (iv) coordinate the multi-stakeholder dialogue platform(s); and (v)

ensure optimal coordination and collaboration with other government departments involved in the project.

The Project Management Unit (PMU), will be established and hosted by DGC in Limbe. The PMU will be responsible for day-to-day project operations and will ensure the coordination and execution of the project through timely and efficient implementation of agreed work plans, in close consultation with DGC, FAO (BH and LTU) and the PSC. The PMU will act as secretariat to the PSC. It will ensure timely delivery of inputs and outputs, closely monitor project progress, and facilitate collaboration with other on-going initiatives. The PMU will be responsible for the preparation and submission of project progress reports to DGC and FAO. The PMU will consist of a part-time National Project Coordinator (NPC), a full-time Technical Project Coordinator (TPC), a part-time Mangroves Conservation Expert, a Technical Project Officer (TPO) and an administrative assistant, a driver and short-term consultants. The terms of reference of the PMU project team are provided in Annex 3 of the project document.

Other executing partners

A number of local NGOs in Cameroon already assist in capacity building, communication, advocacy and development of good practices for natural resource management and technology transfer and development. They are key facilitators of local and national platforms and already have recognised roles for dialogue building and local empowerment for sustainable development and poverty alleviation. A number of these NGOs have been identified as partners to execute project activities and two of them will also provide significant cofinancing for the project.

These NGOs complement each other (in terms of thematic and geographical coverage and expertise in mangroves) and they already collaborate. Cameroon Ecology (CAM-ECO) operates in the Cameroon Estuary (strategic planning, community management and livelihoods), and WWF is active in wildlife inventories and management planning in both the Rio del Rey and the Rio Ntem estuaries. OPED is active in participatory mangrove management and fish and shrimp farming in the Kribi area and Cameroon Environmental Watch (CEW) has specialised on environmental education in mangrove and coastal ecosystems. CAM-ECO and the Cameroon Wildlife Conservation Society (CWCS) are also the national focal points for the Regional Mangrove Network of Central Africa. The role of these NGOs will be to provide technical assistance and support at the field-level in their specialised technical fields and in the localities where they are currently operating.

More details about the roles of the different partners involved in this project are summarised in Section 4.3 and Annex 3 of the project document.

Proposed management structure for the project

PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE (PSC)

Chair: Secretary General of MINEP
Members: MINFOF, MINEPAT. MINEE, MINEPIA, MINIMIDIT, and co-financing partners
Secretary: National Project Coordinator (GEF Focal Point)
Secretariat/Rapporteur: Technical Project Coordinator (TPC)
Observers: Other collaborators and key invited institutions and experts

Project Technical Consultation Mechanism (PTCM)

Facilitator: National Project Coordinator - NPC
Core team: FAO, MINEP (DGC), MINFOF (DGEF), CAM-ECO, OPED
Other ministerial partners: MINEPIA, MINEPAT, MINEE, MINDAF, MINIMIDIT, MINADER.
Other collaborators: CEW, GTZ/kfW, WWF, Universities, Prefectures, City Councils, etc.
Secretary: Technical Project Coordinator - TPC

Project co-ordination and execution

MINEP (DGC): General coordination and execution of activities on policies and strategy.
MINFOF: Execution of mangrove management and conservation activities.
FAO: GEF Agency.
PMU: Daily management and supervision of project activities (based in Limbé) in collaboration with local NGOs.

Consultation platform(s) and stakeholders for mangrove and costal ecosystems

Industry (oil companies, mineral)
Agro-Industry
Local and Urban Town Council, Port authorities
Community representatives
Other stakeholders

PART IV: EXPLAIN THE ALIGNMENT OF PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF:

The project design is in alignment with the original PIF. The four original project components have been maintained. The project objective and outcomes have been reformulated for clarity and coherence, without changing the overall focus or results the project is expected to achieve. With the information that was collected and analyzed during project preparation, activities are now more the activities and outputs are more specific. The project objective has been changed from "To have in place planning, managing and monitoring capacities, institutional frameworks and consultative mechanisms for the long-term sustainability of the mangrove forest ecosystems and their biodiversity through participatory and inclusive participation of communicates and other key stakeholders" which basically stated the means through which the ultimate objective "To strengthen biodiversity conservation and reduce degradation in mangrove ecosystems" would be achieved.

The only major realignment has been a shift in some of the cofinancing towards component 4 of the project rather than component 3. This has occurred because the interests and activities of project cofinanciers has changed slightly compared to what was originally envisaged. This is not expected to have an impact on the originally stated aims and objectives of the project, which remain the same.

PART V: AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO Endorsement.

Agency Coordinator, Agency name	Signature	Date *(Month, day, year)*	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Charles Riemenschneider Director, Investment Center Division FAO Barbara Cooney FAO GEF Coordinator Email: Barbara.Cooney@fao.org Tel.+3906 5705 5478 GEF Agency Executive Director		September 9, 2011	Jean-Claude Nguinguiri, Forestry Officer Michelle Gauthier, Forestry Officer,	+241-774783 +39-06 5705 3692	JeanClaude.Nguinguiri@fao.org Michelle.Gauthier@fao.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Objective/outcome	Indicator	Baseline value	End-of-project target	Source of verification	Risks and assumptions
Objective: To strengthen biodiversity conservation and reduce degradation in mangrove ecosystems.	The area and condition of mangrove forests.	Total area of mangrove forests is estimated to be about 200,000 ha at present. Detailed and accurate information about the condition of these forests is currently unknown.	Detailed and accurate information about the area and condition of mangrove forests is available. Condition of all mangrove forests no worse than at start of project.	Baseline data for mangrove area and condition will be collected in year 1 (project inventory reports and maps). Overall condition of the mangroves in year 5 will be assessed by re-sampling as part of final project evaluation.	Risk: Institutions unwilling or unable to have a meaningful dialogue with all stakeholders. Assumption: Project will be successful at mobilising high-level support for meaningful dialogue.
	Mainstreaming of mangrove conservation objectives in sectoral policies and legislation.	Biodiversity conservation in mangroves is mentioned in fisheries and energy policies (oil exploration) and is supported by some legislation (for oil exploration), but there are no regulations and/or enforcement.	Biodiversity conservation is mainstreamed in fisheries, forestry and energy policies, with regulations that are enforced.	Project reports. Reports of the multi-sectoral dialogue platforms. GEF Tracking Tool.	
	Domestic funding and other resources directed towards sustainable management of mangroves.	Currently, annual government and private-sector funding for conservation and community development activities in mangrove areas is: Govt: USD 60,000 Private: USD 60,000	Annual funding increased to: Govt: USD 130,000 Private: USD 200,000.	Project reports; collaboration and investment agreements between communities, government and the private-sector.	

Objective/outcome	Indicator	Baseline value	End-of-project target	Source of verification	Risks and assumptions
Outcome 1 The legal and institutional framework for management of mangrove ecosystems is improved.	Integration of mangroves into relevant policies and laws.	Zero. (No specific consideration of mangrove ecosystems in current Forest Policy and PNGE).	Sustainable management of mangrove ecosystems is included in the revised Forest Policy and legislation (including land tenure and rights) and PNGE.	Revised laws/policies approved by the Government.	Risk: Land-use conflicts lead to ineffective cross sector dialogue and collaboration. Assumption: Improved information and support for cross-sectoral dialogue leads to more rational planning.
	Availability of information about the mangroves.	Very low. (Little information is available at present, especially for national stakeholders).	Information centre established with a clear mandate and adequate resources (from outside the project) for long-term sustainability.	Project reports; government records; and interviews during final project evaluation (long-term sustainability).	
	Effectiveness of the inter-sectoral dialogue about minimising the impact of coastal developments on mangrove ecosystems.	One platform exists for the Cameroon Estuary but is not effective.	Platform(s) for inter-sectoral dialogue and co-ordination functioning properly and meeting regularly (to include , public-private-partnership with oil companies, as applicable).	Discussions with key stakeholders and decision-makers as part of final project evaluation.	

Objective/outcome	Indicator	Baseline value	End-of-project target	Source of verification	Risks and assumptions
Outcome 2 Biodiversity conservation in mangroves is mainstreamed in coastal development plans and projects.	The accuracy and use of information about Cameroon's mangrove ecosystems.	Low. (Some information about mangroves is available in reports by international NGOs, but this information is not used within the country to guide policies, projects or plans).	Information about Cameroon's mangrove ecosystems (maps, inventory results, technical studies of biodiversity, management and uses) is published and used by decision-makers.	Production of information will be recorded in project monitoring reports. Quality and use of this information will be assessed in discussions with decision-makers as part of final project evaluation.	<u>Risk:</u> Large-scale pollution following oil spillages or other industrial accidents. <u>Assumption:</u> Large private-sector companies will participate in the project and will support monitoring and pollution response and mitigation measures.
	Capability of NGO and government conservation staff to perform ESIAs, monitoring and evaluation.	Zero. (At present, no government or NGO staff have experience or training in these areas).	NGO and government conservation staff have adequate skills to perform these tasks.	Reports of training activities (post-training feedback and testing). Independent peer review of ESIAs and/or related reports produced by individuals trained by the project (as part of final project evaluation).	
	Compliance with ESIA mitigation plans and/or mangrove conservation issues in local development plans.	Zero. (At present, ESIA mitigation plans are not monitored and mangrove conservation is not mainstreamed into local development plans).	Actions/activities to support mangrove conservation are implemented in ESIAs and/or local development projects (at least 10 examples in total - with priority given to any future oil sector developments).	Project progress reports. Reports on the state of the environment in Cameroon produced by MINEP every two years. ESIA documents of new infrastructure projects. Reports for the private sector. Independent peer review as part of final project evaluation.	

Objective/outcome	Indicator	Baseline value	End-of-project target	Source of verification	Risks and assumptions
Outcome 3 Mangrove conservation strengthened by the creation and improved management of three PAs	Area of mangrove ecosystems in formal protected area network and legal status of their protection.	Rio del Rey: 20,000 ha of mangroves designated as a Ramsar site. Cameroon Estuary: 16,000 ha of mangroves included in Douala-Edea Wildlife Reserve. Rio Ntem: 1,000 ha of mangroves included in Campo Ma'an UTO.	Rio del Rey: 20,000 ha (Ramsar site) included in new Ndongore National Park. Cameroon Estuary: 36,000 ha included in new Douala-Edea National Park. Rio Ntem: 1,000 ha (in Campo Ma'an UTO) designated as a Ramsar Site.	Government Gazette (record of creation of new national parks). Reports of/to Ramsar Convention.	Risk: Rise in sea level (caused by climate change) leads to reduced effectiveness of formal mangrove conservation efforts. Assumption: The strategy and national action plan and activities of the information centre are successful at strengthening mangrove ecosystem resilience and building adaptation capacity.
	Management effectiveness of protected areas.	Rio del Rey: Zero (national park has not been created yet). Cameroon Estuary: 57/90 (current score for Douala-Edea Wildlife Reserve). Rio Ntem: n.a. (mangrove area is only a very small part of the much larger Campo Ma'an National Park).	Rio del Rey: 57/90 (i.e. equal to current score for Douala-Edea Wildlife Reserve). Cameroon Estuary: 70/90 (improvement of 13 points over current score). Rio Ntem: n.a. (for same reasons given in baseline).	Project progress reports. GEF Tracking Tools.	

Objective/outcome	Indicator	Baseline value	End-of-project target	Source of verification	Risks and assumptions
Outcome 4 Local communities in the target sites are managing their mangrove resources more sustainably and their livelihoods have improved.	Number of fishing camps organised for sustainable management of mangrove fish resources.	10 fishing camps in Cameroon Estuary are already stable and have some mechanisms for local control and management.	50 fishing camps are organised for local control and management of mangrove resources, with economic interest groups and agreed fishing rules.	Mangrove inventory report. Project progress reports. Site visits and interviews with residents about compliance with rules.	<u>Risk:</u> Migrant resource users not interested in sustainable management of mangroves. <u>Assumption:</u> Activities to develop good relationships with foreign fisheries camps, the local administration and security forces are successful.
	Area of mangroves covered by simple management plans (mangrove community forests).	Zero. (There are some draft management plans for areas in the Cameroon Estuary, but these have not been agreed and fully implemented).	10,000 ha of mangroves covered by simple management plans at ten locations.	Project progress reports.	
	Sustainability of local livelihood activities (especially their impact on biodiversity).	Low. (Presently unknown in detail but suspected to be low).	50 percent of inhabitants in mangrove community forests using more sustainable techniques and practices, as outlined in management plans (and targeted by project activities).	Baseline will be established in year 1 in mangrove inventory and other studies (e.g. on fishing techniques and management). Project achievement will be assessed by re-sampling during final evaluation.	
	Improvement of livelihoods (income from extraction of natural resources).	Zero. (Baseline for income will be established through socio-economic studies as part of mangrove inventory).	At least 400 people benefiting from income generating activities supported by the project, with a 20 percent increase in income (e.g. women fishing farming, oyster business, improved smoked and dry fish chain).	Baseline will be established in year 1. Project achievement will be assessed by re-sampling during final evaluation.	
	Monitoring and control mechanism for extraction of mangrove resources.	No control mechanism for wood or fisheries exists except in Douala-	Functional system for monitoring, controlling and reporting wood and	Project progress reports. Assessment of effectiveness of	

Objective/outcome	Indicator	Baseline value	End-of-project target	Source of verification	Risks and assumptions
		Edea (where wood harvesting is controlled to some extent).	fisheries production exists in all three estuaries.	monitoring and control systems as part of final evaluation.	

Objective/outcome	Indicator	Baseline value	End-of-project target	Source of verification	Risks and assumptions
Outcome 5 The successful execution of the project in a cost-effective manner.	Effectiveness of project management.	Zero.	Project activities implemented on time and within budget.	Project mid-term review and final evaluation	Risk: Weak capacity in government and local NGOs to manage and implement project activities. Assumptions: Activities to build local capacity in project management and implementation will be successful.
	Project reporting and dissemination of project results and lessons learned.	Zero.	Progress is reported accurately and on time and results are disseminated widely to assist with replication and sustainability beyond the end of the project.	Project mid-term review and final evaluation	

Objective/outcome	Outputs	
Outcome 1: The legal and institutional framework for management of mangrove ecosystems is improved.	1.1	A strategy and national action plan for the integrated management of mangrove ecosystems.
	1.2	Draft legislation/recommendations/text for inclusion in the revised Forest Policy and legislation and PNGE.
	1.3	Information centre is established and disseminating information to government decision makers and the private-sector.
	1.4	Four platforms for cross-sectoral and inter-agency dialogue are established, meeting regularly and helping to integrate issues concerning mangrove ecosystems into the national and local development agenda and local planning.
	1.5	One-hundred NGO and government conservation staff trained in protected area management (including financial management) and in implementation of the new laws and regulations.
Outcome 2: Conservation issues are taken into account and integrated into coastal development plans in the three mangrove areas.	2.1	Multi-resource inventory methodology for mangroves is developed and published as an official protocol by MINFOF.
	2.2	Report on the State of Cameroon's Mangroves published.
	2.3	One-hundred NGO and government conservation staff trained in ESIA, monitoring and evaluation.
	2.4	Performance evaluation(s) of all existing mitigation plans.
	2.5	Two master plans developed and approved for the mangrove areas in Rio del Rey Estuary and the Cameroon Estuary.
	2.6	Mangrove management and conservation issues (in Rio Ntem) incorporated into the Kribi Development Master Plan.
Outcome 3: Mangrove conservation strengthened by the creation and improved management of three PAs.	3.1	Two national parks created (Ndongore National Park and Douala-Edéa National Park) and mangrove areas in the Rio Ntem Estuary designated as Ramsar site.
	3.2	Management plans developed and approved for all three of the protected areas.
	3.3	Long-term financing plan developed and approved for management of the Douala-Edéa National Park.
Outcome 4: Local communities in the target sites are managing their mangrove resources more sustainably and their livelihoods have improved.	4.1	Five mangrove community forests created with simple plans for sustainable management of mangrove resources.
	4.2	Guide for management of mangrove community forests created and disseminated.
	4.3	Eight-hundred villagers trained in sustainable management techniques for mangrove wood and fisheries resources.
	4.4	Four-hundred villagers participating in sustainable income-generating fishery activities.
	4.5	One-hundred members of local NGOs, communities and government staff trained in conflict management, sustainable fishing techniques and other practices.
Outcome 5: The successful execution of the project in a cost-effective manner.	5.1.	Information about project progress and effectiveness is reported accurately and on time to address and overcome risks and uncertainties during project implementation.
	5.2.	Lessons learned are synthesised and disseminated widely to assist with replication and sustainability beyond the end of the project.

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS

One project review was received from the GEF Secretariat and the responses to this are given below.

Project reviewer	Response
GEF Secretariat	
- Please increase and confirm cofinancing.	Original project budget in the PIF was: - GEF USD 1,733,000 - CF USD 3,700,000 Budget in the project submission is: - GEF USD 1,733,000 - CF USD 4,656,000 Additional cofinancing is expected during project implementation as more partnerships are established. At this moment, some original cofinancing partners (identified at PIF stage) have not been able to commit cofinancing resources to this project. FAO and the Government, will make efforts to mobilize additional cofinancing.
- Develop the incremental reasoning and the risk assessment.	These aspects of project design have been examined in more detail and are presented in Sections F, G and H of the CEO Endorsement Template and corresponding sections of the project document. In particular, more detailed estimates of the unit costs of project activities (e.g. USD/ha) have been calculated and these are, we believe, comparable to the costs of similar activities in other FAO and GEF projects.
- Please remember to deliver the METT with the final package.	Tracking tools have been completed and are attached.
- Explore partnerships with national universities to improve data monitoring in relation to mangrove management and rehabilitation	An emphasis on this project is community-based approaches to mangrove management and rehabilitation (including monitoring of such activities). In this respect, the project will work with a number of well-established and respected local NGOs that are very familiar with the target areas and should be able to work to a high technical standard.
- A particular attention will be requested on gender and indigenous issues.	A number of the activities on sustainable mangrove management (Component 4) will be targeted at women. Care will also be taken to ensure that women have a voice during discussions of local management plans and arrangements. Indigenous issues are not as important as the issue of potential conflicts between migrants and resident populations (especially in the two transboundary areas). A significant part of the project will focus on trying to resolve any such conflicts and providing training in conflict resolution.

ANNEX C: CONSULTANTS TO BE HIRED FOR THE PROJECT USING GEF RESOURCES

Position Titles	*$/PW*	*Est. PW*	*Tasks to be performed*
For Project Management			
Local			
Technical Project Co-ordinator[1]	692	43	The Technical Project Coordinator (TPC) will spent about 25% of his time on project management tasks. The TPC will be responsible for the day-to-day management of the project. He/she will be responsible for the overall planning, coordination of project activities, and monitoring of project results. The TPC will, inter alia: • Prepare and supervise implementation of Annual Work Plans and Budget (AWP/B); • Development of terms of reference for short-term consultants and contracts, in accordance with the approved AWP/B, then monitor and supervise their work to ensure timely delivery of outputs to an acceptable standards; • Review and give no-objection to the technical reports prepared by consultants and institutions under contract with the project; • Monitor and maintain records of actual project expenditures with support from the Operations and Administrative Officer; • Assist in the set-up and implementation of the project M&E system; • Prepare project progress reports
Operations and Administrative Officer	250	260	• Assist in the drafting of initial project budgets • Prepare budget revisions based on project expenditures and annual detailed work plans and budgets and in line with the approved overall project budget • Be responsible for the procurement of all acquisitions needed for the implementation of the project and financed by GEF resources, ensuring that FAO procurement policies and financial rules and procedures are applied. • Maintain project files, records and documents and provide other administrative support as required.
International			
Human Resource and Procurement Officer	3,000	5	In close consultation with the Technical Project Coordinator, prepare bidding documents, recruit project staff and consultants, applying FAO procurement and contracting policies.
Finance and Budget Officer	3,000	6	In close collaboration with the Technical Project Coordinator, ensure that every project transaction is carried out efficiently and in a timely manner. Specifically, the Finance and Budget Officer will be responsible on the financial side for all procurement and recruitment, travel arrangements, etc. (S)He will assist the Technical Project Coordinator in the financial management of the project via the Oracle system and prepare all budget revisions.
Justification for Travel, if any: No travel is required for the project management activities indicated above.			

Position Titles	*$/PW*	*Est. PW*	*Tasks to be performed*
For Technical Assistance			
Local			
Technical Project Co-ordinator	692	217	• Provide inputs in the preparation of project technical reports, working with consultants and institutions contracted by the project • Facilitate, prepare and implement training and capacity building activities working with the Mangroves Conservation Expert and the Technical Project Officer. • Facilitate the establishment of cross-sectoral and inter-agency dialogue platforms, working closely with the National Project Coordinator • Provide technical advice so that the appropriate approaches are followed during project implementation (participatory resource management etc.).
Technical Project Officer	415	260	• Integrate both socio-economic and ecological monitoring systems to produce a comprehensive monitoring programme that addresses both ecological aspects and social development issues including livelihood and poverty alleviation. • Provide training to resource persons of local councils, village communities, technical ministries and other stakeholders in monitoring modules in various disciplines such as EIA, implementation of land use plans, mangroves dynamics and resource use, data entry, analyses and presentation of monitoring system. • Lead the development of multi stakeholder information centre to provide scientific services and other technical information to MINFOF, MINEP including other technical partners. • Develop tools for consistent monitoring and assessment of resource base and exploitation trends, and prepare quarterly technical reports on trends • Working with the Technical Project Coordinator, coordinate the execution of project activities in the areas of (i) protected area management focusing on development of management plans, surveillance, socio economic and ecological monitoring activities (ii) supervision of EIA studies and follow up recommendation (iii) participatory mapping of resources and stakeholders.
State of mangrove consultant	750	10	• In consultation with national and local stakeholders, draft a mangrove strategy framework and present this during a National Workshop on Mangrove strategy and policy development. • Based on the input from this workshop, draft a full Mangrove Strategy document that will be presented for validation to the project's technical committee.
Thematic studies of ESIAs	750	10	• Together with MINEP, select at least 5 impact studies and review these studies with specific

			attention given to impacts on mangroves and coastal ecosystems and fisheries. • Based on the above, provide recommendations for future ESIAs and provide inputs for the development of a training module on ESIA.
Training module development expert on ESIAs	750	8	• Prepare training materials required for capacity building in ESIAs. • Deliver at least one training of trainers course for NGO and Government conservation staff.
Mangrove CMP development guide expert	750	8	• In collaboration with local NGOs and MINFOF staff, adapt the existing MINFOF Manual of Procedures for Community Forests for use in the preparation of management plans for mangrove community forests. • Present the guide to the project's technical committee at a workshop for validation and finalize it.
Assessment of mangrove forest management and harvesting practices	750	8	• Focusing on mangrove wood harvesting and marketing in Rio del Rey (for export to Nigeria), develop a methodology and set-up a monitoring study together with local partners of the project. • Analyse data collected and draft a report with recommendations for a strategy to better manage and control mangrove wood exploitation in this area.
Strategy development for sustainable shrimp production and trade	750	8	• Working with local project partners and shrimp-farmers (often women), assess the strengths and weaknesses of the harvesting, trade and marketing of shrimps (from environmental, social and economic viewpoints). • Based on this assessment, evaluate options and recommend actions to promote the sustainable development of this sector (e.g. better organisation, micro-credit, changing practices, local control measures, etc.).
Study on sustainable development of oyster harvesting	750	8	• Working with local project partners and people harvesting oysters (often women), assess the strengths and weaknesses of the harvesting, trade and marketing of oysters (from environmental, social and economic viewpoints). • Based on this assessment, evaluate options and recommend actions to promote the sustainable development of this sector (e.g. better organisation, micro-credit, changing practices, local control measures, etc.).
International			
Mangroves Conservation Expert	2,000	40	• Set up the project's monitoring and evaluation system, including: refining results indicators; identifying information sources; preparing a plan for completion of the baseline and with support from the Technical Project Coordinator and the Technical Project Officer, ensure the implementation of this plan within 1 year of project implementation. • Work closely with the Technical Project Officer in the development of a multi stakeholder information centre

			• Provide technical inputs on specific emerging issues on mangroves management, such as in the field of research and training, information collection and databases, cartography, sustainable management practices, impact evaluation and policy. • Facilitate networking and information exchange with related projects, including GEF-funded projects in the region and globally.
Evaluation experts	3,000	18	• In accordance with the independent evaluation terms of reference to be prepared in consultation with all project partners, the evaluation expert will assess the degree of fulfillment of project objectives and achievement of outcomes outlined in the project document and other aspects such as the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation • Prepare mid-term evaluation and final evaluation reports
Justification for Travel, if any: Some local travel will be required for consultants to reach project sites. This travel will be essential for consultations with local stakeholders and the development and implementation of community-based approaches to conservation and sustainable land management (i.e. local capacity building).			

ANNEX D: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS

A. EXPLAIN IF THE PPG OBJECTIVE HAS BEEN ACHIEVED THROUGH THE PPG ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN.

The objective of the PPG has been achieved. Key outcomes of project preparation were as follows:

1. Assessment of the environmental/biophysical status of mangrove ecosystems: Major threats to mangrove ecosystems were identified and priority areas for improved mangrove management were identified and activities were prioritised.
2. Baseline data collection: At project target sites, likely numbers of project participants were estimated and potential project activities were discussed and agreed with stakeholders.
3. Stakeholder and institutional analysis: Relevant stakeholders and institutions were identified, their roles in the project were agreed and capacity building needs were developed into project activities. Potential mechanisms for inter-sectoral co-ordination were discussed and agreed for strengthening and further development during full project implementation.

In addition to the achievements of project preparation (in technical terms), local communities in the proposed sites have been informed about the project, local stakeholders at the national level have been consulted (and, where appropriate, have agreed to work in partnership with the project) and the required level of cofinancing has been obtained.

B. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY:

Experiences gained during project preparation do not, at present, raise any concerns about project implementation.

C. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES AND THEIR IMPLEMENTATION STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

Project preparation activities approved	*Implementation status*	*GEF Amount ($)*				*Co-financing ($)*
		Amount approved	*Amount spent to date*	*Amount committed*	*Uncommitted amount*	
1. Conduct 1 inception workshop	Completed	2,500	2,500	0	0	3,000
2. Carry out an analysis of weaknesses and gaps in policies, laws and regulations, etc.	Completed	13,000	12,570	0	430	12,000
3. Undertake a stakeholders and institutional analysis	Completed	16,150	15,550	0	600	12,000
4. Conduct a socio-economic study of local communities and propose priority activities.	Completed	20,000	19,339	0	661	12,000
5. Conduct regional/provincial workshops	Completed	5,000	5,000	0	0	3,000
6. Compile a baseline information and M&E report.	Completed	17,350	16,777	0	573	15,000
7. Synthesis of results and finalisation of project design (including final validation workshop).	Completed	11,000	6,317	4,683	0	33,225
Total		85,000	78,053	6,947	0	90,225