

Document of
The World Bank

Report No: 26746

IMPLEMENTATION COMPLETION REPORT
(TF-20957; TF-28673)

ON A

GRANT

IN THE AMOUNT OF US\$ 6 MILLION

TO THE REPUBLIC OF

CAMEROON

FOR A

BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT PROJECT

September 11, 2003

CURRENCY EQUIVALENTS

(Exchange Rate Effective august 6, 2003)

Currency Unit = CFAF
554 CFAF = US\$ 1
US\$ 1.81 = 1,000 CFAF

FISCAL YEAR
07/01 06/30

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AFD	Agence Française de Développement
BIOGENIC	Biodiversity GIS Experts Network in Cameroon
BPH	Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia
BRAHMS	Botanical Research and Herbarium Management System
CAA	Caisse Autonome d'Amortissement
CAMCOF	Cameroon Mountains Conservation Foundation
CD	Comité Directeur
CDC	Cameroon Development Corporation
CDD	Community-Driven Development
CDP	Community Development Plan
CFA	Communauté Financière Africaine
CFAF	Communauté Financière Africaine Franc
CGS	Comité de Gestion de Site
CLSS	Comité Local de Suivi de Site
CNH	Cameroon National Herbarium
COTCO	Cameroon Oil Transport Company
COVAREF	Comité de Valorisation des Ressources Fauniques
CPSP	Comité de Pilotage et de Suivi du Pipeline
CTP	Conseiller Technique Principal (Chief Technical Advisor)
DFAP	Direction de la Faune et des Aires Protégées
DFID	Department for International Development (UK)
DGIS	Directoraat Generaal voor Internationale Samenwerking (Dutch Directorate-General for Development Cooperation)
DWPA	Department of Wildlife and Protected Areas (=DFAP)
ECOFAC	Écosystèmes Forestiers d'Afrique Centrale
FAC	Fonds d'Aide et de Coopération (France)
FCFA	Franc de la Communauté Financière Africaine
FEDEC	Fondation pour le Développement et l'Environnement
FEM	Fonds pour l'Environnement Mondial (=GEF)
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GESEP	Projet de Gestion et Sécurisation des Espaces Pastoraux (Savanes only) (range management project supported by France)
GFA	Garde Forestier d'Appui (Auxiliary Game Guard)
GIC	Groupe d'Intérêt Commun
GIS	Geographic Information System
GoC	Government of Cameroon
GPS	Global Positioning System

GTZ	Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (Germany)
IRA	Institut de Recherche Agronomique
IRAD	Institut de Recherche Agricole pour le Développement
IRD	Institut de Recherche pour le Développement (France)
IRZ	Institut de Recherche Zootechnique
IVZR	Institute for Veterinary and Zoological Research
MAB	Mission d'Aménagement de la Bénoué (Savanes)
MCP	Mt Cameroon Rain Forest Project
MinBUZA	Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken (the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs)
MINEF	Ministère de l'Environnement et des Forêts
MINEPAT (after 2001)	Ministère des Affaires Economiques, de la Programmation et de l'Aménagement du Territoire
MINPAT	Ministère des Investissements Publics et de l'Aménagement du Territoire (prior to 2001)
MINREST	Ministry of Scientific and Technical Research
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
ORSTOM	Organisation de Recherche Scientifique et Technique Outre-Mer (now IRD)
PAU	Plan d'Action d'Urgence
PCGBC	Programme de Conservation et de Gestion de la Biodiversité au Cameroun
PN	Parc National
PNBN	Parcs National de Bouba-Njidda
PNDP	Programme National Developpement Participatif
PNF	Parcs Nationaux du Faro
PPF	Project Preparation Fund
PRGIE	Programme Regional de Gestion de l'Information sur l'Environnement
PSFE	Programme Sectoriel Forêt-Environnement
QAG	Quality Assurance Group (World Bank)
SAC	Structural Adjustment Credit
SE	Secrétariat Executif
SFC	Société Forestière de Campo
SIBC	Système d'Information sur la Biodiversité au Cameroun
SIG	Système d'Information Géographique
SNB	Stratégie Nationale de Biodiversité
SNV	Organisation Néerlandaise de Développement (Dutch Development Organization)
TCC	Territoire de Chasse Communautaire
TFC	Trust Fund Cofinancing (World Bank)
UFA	Unité Forestière d'Aménagement
UTO	Unité Technique Opérationnelle
WCS	Wildlife Conservation Society
WWF	Worldwide Fund for Nature
ZIC	Zone d'Intérêt Cynégétique
ZICGC	Zone d'Intérêt Cynégétique à Gestion Communautaire
ZIS	Zoological Inventory and Survey

Vice President:	Calisto Madavo
Country Manager/Director:	Ali Khadr
Sector Manager/Director:	Joseph Baah-Dwomoh
Task Team Leader/Task Manager:	Noël Chabeuf

CAMEROON
BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT

CONTENTS

	Page No.
1. Project Data	1
2. Principal Performance Ratings	1
3. Assessment of Development Objective and Design, and of Quality at Entry	2
4. Achievement of Objective and Outputs	5
5. Major Factors Affecting Implementation and Outcome	11
6. Sustainability	13
7. Bank and Borrower Performance	14
8. Lessons Learned	16
9. Partner Comments	19
10. Additional Information	20
Annex 1. Key Performance Indicators/Log Frame Matrix	22
Annex 2. Project Costs and Financing	23
Annex 3. Economic Costs and Benefits	26
Annex 4. Bank Inputs	27
Annex 5. Ratings for Achievement of Objectives/Outputs of Components	29
Annex 6. Ratings of Bank and Borrower Performance	30
Annex 7. List of Supporting Documents	31
Annex 8. Recipient's Project Completion Report	32

<i>Project ID:</i> P000311	<i>Project Name:</i> BIODIVERSITY CONSERV
<i>Team Leader:</i> Noel Rene Chabeuf	<i>TL Unit:</i> AFTS4
<i>ICR Type:</i> Core ICR	<i>Report Date:</i> September 23, 2003

1. Project Data

Name: BIODIVERSITY CONSERV *L/C/TF Number:* TF-20957; TF-28673
Country/Department: CAMEROON *Region:* Africa Regional Office
Sector/subsector: Central government administration (70%); Sub-national government administration (16%); Forestry (9%); Other social services (5%)
Theme: Biodiversity (P); Civic engagement, participation and community driven development (P); Other environment and natural resources management (P); Rural services and infrastructure (P); Environmental policies and institutions (P)

KEY DATES

	<i>Original</i>	<i>Revised/Actual</i>
<i>PCD:</i> 02/23/1993	<i>Effective:</i> 07/01/1995	12/22/1995
<i>Appraisal:</i> 12/03/1993	<i>MTR:</i> 12/01/1996	05/30/1998
<i>Approval:</i> 03/27/1995	<i>Closing:</i> 12/31/1999	03/31/2003

Borrower/Implementing Agency: GOVT. OF CAMEROON/M.OF ENV.&FORES./MOP
Other Partners: Government of the Netherlands (DGIS), Government of the United Kingdom, Government of France (FAC), Government of Germany (GTZ), WWF

STAFF	Current	At Appraisal
<i>Vice President:</i>	Callisto E. Madavo	Jean-Louis Sarbib
<i>Country Director:</i>	Ali Khadr	Michael N. Sarris
<i>Sector Manager:</i>	Joseph Baah-Dwomoh	Nils O. Tcheyan
<i>Team Leader at ICR:</i>	Noel Rene Chabeuf	Ken Creighton
<i>ICR Primary Author:</i>	Nicolas Kotschoubey	

2. Principal Performance Ratings

(HS=Highly Satisfactory, S=Satisfactory, U=Unsatisfactory, HL=Highly Likely, L=Likely, UN=Unlikely, HUN=Highly Unlikely, HU=Highly Unsatisfactory, H=High, SU=Substantial, M=Modest, N=Negligible)

Outcome: S

Sustainability: L

Institutional Development Impact: SU

Bank Performance: S

Borrower Performance: S

Quality at Entry: QAG (if available) ICR
S

Project at Risk at Any Time: Yes

3. Assessment of Development Objective and Design, and of Quality at Entry

3.1 Original Objective:

(From Grant Agreement):

The objectives of the Project were: (i) to provide support to the Recipient in its effort to conserve and manage its biological resources; (ii) to promote involvement of rural populations in biodiversity conservation; and (iii) to encourage sustainable utilization of renewable natural resources and promote sustainable and environmentally compatible development in regions surrounding Protected Areas. This objective, which was globally to protect Cameroon's biodiversity, was recognized and supported by the Government of Cameroon and the Donor community.

3.2 Revised Objective:

The original objectives were recognized as pertinent throughout implementation and therefore did not need to be revised. In addition to the grant funds from the Global Environmental Facility (GEF) and the Government of the Netherlands DGIS Grant, the project benefited from counterpart funds from the Government of Cameroon, financing from the Governments of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and Japan, and financial contributions from the international Nongovernmental Organizations (NGOs) WWF and SNV, who were also implementing agencies. The project included a comprehensive long-term strategy to protect the abundant and highly endemic biodiversity of Cameroon, which was under increasing threat from poaching, logging and habitat destruction from agriculture. The objective of the government was first to protect a significant amount of Cameroon's biological diversity at six sites (including three existing national parks: Faro, Bénoué, Bouba-Ndjidda; four wildlife/nature reserves: Lobéké, Campo-Ma'an, Boumba-Bek and Nki; and three as yet ungazetted sites: Kilum-Ijim, Mt Cameroon, Mt Koupé), including the development of alternative activities in the buffer zones. The project would also facilitate the creation of national parks and gazetted sites. Secondly, the project was to strengthen key national institutions concerned with research, planning and coordination of biodiversity conservation at the national level. Project preparation took a long time and involved a large number of scientists carrying out surveys and studies at all project sites. It included increasing involvement throughout implementation of various stakeholders (local populations, local government, logging companies, safari hunters and local NGOs). The impacts of the program on biological diversity would be overall positive, and, being participatory in nature, would not negatively affect local populations or indigenous peoples.

3.3 Original Components:

The project consisted of the following four Components:

A. Strengthen the *Ministère de l'Environnement et des Forêts* (MINEF) Management Capacity at National, Provincial and Local Levels

1. Strengthen the Department of Wildlife and Protected Areas' (DWPA) capacity for financial and technical administration of biodiversity programs
2. Enhance national capacity to manage information
3. Build capacity for promoting environmental education
4. Prepare a national biodiversity conservation strategy
5. Train field personnel in the application, enforcement and procedure of new legislation
6. Monitor, evaluate and supervise biodiversity conservation programs throughout the national territory

B. Strengthen Biodiversity Related Research

1. Improve the capacity of the Cameroon National Herbarium (CNH) to undertake research needed to document botanical diversity within the project zones and elsewhere in Cameroon through field surveys, inventories and publication of scientific results.

2. Improve collection, analysis and dissemination of information on distribution and status of animal diversity. Develop biological baseline data for improved game management including regulation of game harvesting.

3. Collect socioeconomic data, document the process of community consultation, local participation in the development and implementation of management plans, and evaluate effectiveness of local bylaws and enforcement.

C. Enhance Protection and Management of Protected Areas in the Priority Project Sites

1. Execute baseline biological and socioeconomic studies, collect data and disseminate results
2. Develop, adopt, implement and monitor the application of management plans
3. Gazette or regazette areas in conformity with applicable management plans

D. Support to Priority Project Sites

The project focused on six sensitive ecological regions including ten national parks, faunal reserves and ungazetted sites representative of the country's biological diversity:

1. Mount Kilum / Ijim reserve

With technical assistance provided by Birdlife International, the project goals were to ensure sustainable management of natural resources in the area, and to conserve and restore the remaining montane forest lands to conduct ecological research on flora and fauna (e.g. *Prunus africana* used in the treatment of Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia - BPH) and conservation awareness and training programs aimed at making communities within the project area aware of the values of forests and the need for sustainable utilization of forest resources (e.g. for rain catchment, control of erosion and beekeeping).

2. Mount Koupé

With technical assistance provided by Birdlife International and financial support from the Worldwide Fund for Nature (WWF), the activities supported by the project were to include the establishment of the Mount Koupé forest as a protected area, to develop and promote appropriate agricultural practices, to carry out ecological studies on indicator species, and to continue an existing education program.

3. Mount Cameroon Rain Forest

This component, managed by MINEF through the Limbé Botanic Gardens with technical assistance from the German *Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit* (GTZ) and Kew Botanic Gardens (under financing from the UK's Department for International Development - DfID), was to complete a baseline floral and faunal inventory, carry out community-based program planning and review, complete boundary negotiations and a zoning system, prepare forest management plans leading to gazetting of certain core areas, delineate core conservation zones, and expand environmental awareness and education programs to communities living in the areas adjacent to the forest.

4. Campo Ma'an faunal reserve

The Campo-Ma'an site and adjacent forest comprise an area of lowland forest habitat that is broadly acknowledged to be of exceptional global importance for the conservation of botanical diversity. Of special significance are the few remaining unlogged areas of lowland rainforest. The principal actions of this component were to improve surveillance and control hunting, establish guard posts, carry out biological surveys, socioeconomic studies and baseline forestry research, initiate community development activities, and develop a monitoring program and land-use plan for the Campo-Ma'an project area. The area was to be under the responsibility of MINEF, in partnership with Tropenbos and the Dutch Development Organization (SNV).

5. South-East including the Boumba-Bek, Lac Lobéké and Nki Faunal reserves

The South East region contains three areas of high conservation importance which remained so far unprotected: Lobéké, Boumba-Bek and Nki Faunal Reserves. Their integration into a larger protected area, including the Dzanga-Ndoki National Park in the Central African Republic has been recommended. The program was to establish a project management framework and basic infrastructure, implement studies, and develop a management plan. The program, executed by MINEF in partnership with GTZ, was to provide logistical support and coordinate overall program planning and implementation. GTZ would provide technical assistance to MINEF to refine the existing zoning plan into a regional land use plan. The Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) was to carry out baseline studies. MINEF was to develop a management plans for the core conservation zones of Lobéké, Boumba-Bek and Nki with input from the three NGOs associated with the project (GTZ, WWF and WCS).

6. Savannah Ecosystem region including three national parks (Faro, Bouba-Ndjidda and Bénoué)

This component was to address priority conservation objectives within the Sudanian savannah zone of northern Cameroon at both the species and ecosystem level. Priority consideration sites include three National Parks: Faro, Bouba-Ndjidda, and Bénoué. Faced with increasing population pressure and poaching, a priority was to establish participatory long-term management plans for the area. It included three principal activities: to prepare development plans, to develop a pilot program to involve communities in conservation activities and hunting area management, and to reinforce park infrastructure within the rhinoceros range (radio communication, roads, vehicles). The program was to be executed by MINEF in participation with the Garoua Wildlife School, with technical assistance from WWF, the Institut de Recherche pour le Développement (IRD, formerly ORSTOM), the French *Fonds d'Aide et de Coopération* (FAC) and the Dutch SNV. Finally, there will be a program specifically targeted at the management of the western black rhinoceros.

3.4 Revised Components:

The components and objectives of the project were not revised. However, at mid-term review, the implementation structure was revised, clarifying the role of MINEF and other implementing partners in the field (stressing partnership with, rather than administration by, MINEF).

The Government of Cameroon requested a name change to restate the perennial nature of a national program as opposed to the temporary nature of a project, thereby demonstrating the commitment and ownership on behalf of the Recipient.

3.5 Quality at Entry:

Quality at entry was not formally assessed by the Bank's Quality Assurance Group (QAG), but this ICR rates the Quality at entry as Satisfactory, considering that this program was one of the first GEF supported programs in Africa. The project preparation team (which included not only environmentalists, economists and forestry specialists, but also sociologists, agriculturalists, and operations specialists) correctly planned for the project to be pilot in nature and accurately assumed that the management of forests and wildlife absolutely had to be participatory and community-based to ensure continuity and sustainability. This program was particularly complex being implemented through four components on six sites (+ Headquarters and National Herbarium in Yaoundé) with cofinancing and collaboration from nine partner institutions (GEF, DGIS, GTZ, DfID, FAC, Japan, WWF, SNV and GoC) and nine executing agencies (Limbé Botanic Gardens, Birdlife International, SNV, Tropenbos, WWF, GTZ, Kew Botanic Gardens, FAC and MINEF). Project design was good regarding objectives and activities, but relatively unclear regarding implementation. The project overestimated the initial capacity of MINEF to implement a complex

project, which subsequently had to be restructured (the general design was not modified, but modes of operation were clarified). The mid-term review, which focused on clarifying implementation, was instrumental in turning the project around. It is a tribute to the current commitment and dedication of MINEF that after restructuring at the mid-term review, implementation resumed and helped achieve almost all the original objectives.

4. Achievement of Objective and Outputs

4.1 Outcome/achievement of objective:

The achievement of global objectives is rated "Satisfactory" in view of the project having met all three objectives:

- a) Objective 1 (to provide support to the Recipient to conserve and manage its biological resources). The program helped to gazette two national parks (Campo-Ma'an and Lobéké), elaborated four development plans (for the regions of Campo-Ma'an, Savannahs, South-East and Mt Cameroon), helped gazette the community-managed forest at Kilum-Ijim, and fully rehabilitated the Cameroon National Herbarium (CNH), which resumed normal operation and re-launched the publication of the Flora of Cameroon series. The program thus significantly supported the efforts of the recipient toward effective conservation and management of biodiversity.
- b) Objective 2 (to promote involvement of rural populations in biodiversity conservation) and Objective 3 (to encourage sustainable utilization of renewable natural resources and promote sustainable development around protected areas). The program promoted the participation of local population and stakeholders in biodiversity conservation at all sites and supported the creation of numerous community-based organizations and NGOs; it also created sustainable management plans for protected areas, which included production of non-timber forest products e.g. beekeeping, *Prunus* bark and giant snails.

The program would have been rated "Highly Satisfactory" if similar success had been achieved at Mt Koupé as at other sites, and if problems of counterpart funding had been less recurrent, thus casting a shadow on government commitment, which otherwise was publicly and repeatedly proclaimed.

4.2 Outputs by components:

A. Strengthen MINEF Management Capacity at National, Provincial and Local Levels:

The Rapport d'Achèvement produced by the Government of Cameroon, as well as other program documents, clearly states the successes and shortcomings of this component.

1. The type of capacity building that MINEF was to have received was not specified in any document, and very few MINEF executives received direct training, with the exception of one, who was trained abroad in monitoring and evaluation. Furthermore, because the program is based on decentralized partnership, and because the role of MINEF within the partnership focused only on public service (enforcement of laws and policy) while private partners implemented conservation and management activities (research, studies, local development) the Program is sometimes perceived as not having strengthened MINEF. However, it is unquestionable that MINEF staff has acquired valuable skills and experience through this partnership with international NGOs, as well as valuable administrative skills through membership of the Executive Secretariat (ES); all ES personnel, with the exception of accounting staff, were officials seconded by MINEF. Lastly, most of the senior local MINEF officials on each site were members of Site Management Committees (*Comité de Gestion du Site - CGS*), and thus gained valuable exposure to participatory management of protected areas.

2. At all sites, facilities were built, and MINEF staff was provided with equipment, vehicles, Global

Positioning System (GPS), radio, and was trained in their use, as well as in anti-poaching and conservation techniques.

3. The national Cameroonian capacity to collect, analyze and process data on conservation and management of biodiversity, which falls primarily under MINEF, was greatly enhanced through the establishment of the Biodiversity Information System in Cameroon (*Système d'Information sur la Biodiversité au Cameroun* - SIBC) and the Biodiversity Geographic Information System Experts Network in Cameroon (BIOGENIC), set up among the program sites. It resulted in the creation of databases, networks and the following website: <http://www.biocam.net> , which are valuable tools at the service of MINEF.

4. Environmental education was planned and developed at program sites through the establishment of local NGOs and other activities:

- a) Campo-Ma'an: a poster campaign, comic strips, calendars, an agenda with environmental content and leaflets were produced;
- b) South-East: two publications with environmental and conservation content were produced to raise awareness;
- c) Mt Koupé: signs and information posters were produced in numerous villages;
- d) Savannahs: initiatives by local NGOs to organize field trips for schoolchildren, "environment days", the publication of a journal, and the publication of a bulletin on the environment were accomplished.

5. At field level, the capacity of MINEF to control of poaching, through the Department of Wildlife and Protected Areas (DWPA) was strengthened through:

- a) The recruitment of 50 auxiliary game wardens (*Gardes Forestiers d'Appui* - GFA) who were paid either by the implementing agencies (WWF) or from counterpart funding;
- b) Training of GFA and DWPA officials on conservation and control of poaching (all sites); and
- c) Additional training in ecological monitoring and raising awareness of 65 community guards at the Savannahs site. MINEF agents at this site received training in participatory management of natural resources and took numerous refresher courses.

6. An effective planning, monitoring and evaluation system of analytical accounting at local and central level was established to ensure the evaluation and supervision of the Program. Trimestrial monitoring and evaluation reports and semestrial supervision reports were produced and distributed to government and all actors.

7. The Program created an administrative and financial procedure manual to be used by MINEF.

B. Strengthen Biodiversity Related Research

The main achievement under this component was to rehabilitate the Cameroon National Herbarium (CNH) through a complete overhaul of the institution and to resume the publication of the Flora of Cameroon series. Starting in 1998, through technical assistance from Kew Botanical Gardens in the UK, the CNH was revived after 11 years of inactivity. It started to catalogue plant diversity utilizing the Botanical Research and Herbarium Management System (BRAHMS), and trained scientists to handle and distribute biological data, perform laboratory work and carry out field missions. Laboratory work consisted of mounting, incorporating, identifying and entering 3500 specimens collected in earlier years into databases. The description of new species and the preparation of Flora of Cameroon continued while the CNH actively sought other sources of funding. During the Program, CNH researchers and technicians identified 6000 samples, two-thirds of which came from Campo-Ma'an, while GEF funds permitted the printing of 11 other

CNH publications. By 1999, the CNH was fully operational, with suitable equipment, refurbished offices, laboratories, internet connections, a training program for three employees and membership in the International Botanical Congress. By 2001, Program support to the National Herbarium ceased, the purpose of the Program having been reached.

As regards strengthening zoological research, during project preparation, the principal institute involved, the *Institut de Recherche Zootechnique* (IRZ), was merged with the *Institut de Recherche Agronomique* (IRA) to form the *Institut de Recherche Agricole pour le Développement* (IRAD). The division in charge of wildlife within the new IRAD only became operational in 2000. While the reform of IRAD was being carried out, over a time period of more than three years, the surveys on wildlife and fauna, which were needed under the Program, had to be carried out by the implementing agencies (WWF and Tropenbos). For that purpose, these agencies recruited qualified scientists from IRZ, who were uncertain about their future at IRAD. As a result, the contribution of national scientific capacity in wildlife and biodiversity research was maximized through the incorporation of national scientists into international teams operating under the Program, despite the restructuring of the research institution. The Program therefore carried out its mission to collect, analyze and disseminate data on the distribution and situation of animal diversity, for better management of fauna, through the executing agencies at site level.

Socioeconomic data were collected at all sites by the implementing agencies in charge of local development and conservation (essentially SNV in Savannahs and Campo-Ma'an, GTZ in South-East and Birdlife in Kilum-Ijim). These data helped provide a basis for the local development component in the site master plans. The most remarkable results were achieved in the South-East and Savannahs, where local partnership between villagers, herders, hunters, logging companies and safari hunters were built. These activities were extremely successful in resolving existing conflicts and preventing future ones by establishing dialogue and cooperation amongst stakeholders.

C. Enhance Protection and Management of Protected Areas in the Priority Project Sites

The major achievement under this component was to carry out studies, create management plans and gazette protected areas.

1. All baseline biological and socioeconomic studies that were carried out are recorded in the Sites' own databases and at the Program's website: www.biocam.net/
2. The management plan for the Bénoué national park and its surrounding areas was reached in a participatory manner, validated and approved by the Minister in August 2002. Four other plans are being finalized (Campo-Ma'an, Faro, Lobéké and Mokoko Forest Reserve).
3. The following Decrees, *Arrêtés* and Decisions for the creation of protected areas and national parks were published in the Cameroon Official Gazette:

Before the Program became effective, the three most important sites were defined as priority sites of the Program through the enactment of "arrêtés" taken by MINEF:

- Arrêté No. 091/A/MINEF/DAJ du 4 janvier 1995 portant création de la "Zone Prioritaire du projet GEF/biodiversité de Campo-Ma'an"
- Arrêté No. 092/A/MINEF/DAJ du 8 février 1995 portant création de la "Zone Prioritaire du projet GEF/biodiversité Sud-Est"
- Arrêté No. 093/A/MINEF/DAJ du 8 février 1995 portant création de la "Zone Prioritaire du projet

GEF/biodiversité Écosystème de Savane"

Following the Mid-Term Review, project restructuring and protection of priority sites were further strengthened through the enactment of the following "Arrêtés" and Ministerial Decisions:

- Décision No 0146 D/MINEF/DFAP/SE du 2 février 1999 Portant organisation administrative, financière et technique du Programme de Conservation et de Gestion de la Biodiversité dans le Site Mont Cameroun
- Décision No 0147 D/MINEF/DFAP/SE du 2 février 1999 Portant organisation administrative, financière et technique du Programme de Conservation et de Gestion de la Biodiversité dans le Site Mont Koupé
- Décision No 0149 D/MINEF/DFAP/SE du 2 février 1999 Portant organisation administrative, financière et technique du Programme de Conservation et de Gestion de la Biodiversité dans le Site Kilum-Ijim
- Décision No 0150 D/MINEF/DFAP/SE du 2 février 1999 Portant organisation administrative, financière et technique du Programme de Conservation et de Gestion de la Biodiversité dans le Site Écosystème de Savanes
- Décision No 0151 D/MINEF/DFAP/SE du 2 février 1999 Portant organisation administrative, financière et technique du Programme de Conservation et de Gestion de la Biodiversité dans le Site Sud-Est
- Décision No 0372/D/MINEF/DAJ du 12 mars 1999 portant mise en défens de la zone d'intervention du Projet de Conservation et de Gestion de la Biodiversité de Campo Ma'an
- Note de Service No 0676/NS/MINEF/CAB du 17 mars 1999 portant création d'un comité de gestion et de suivi des sites "Campo Ma'an" et "Mbam et Djerem"
- Arrêté No 054 CAB/PM du 06 août 1999 portant création de l'Unité Technique Opérationnelle de première catégorie de Campo Ma'an
- Arrêté No 055 CAB/PM du 06 août 1999 portant création de l'Unité Technique Opérationnelle de première catégorie dénommé Sud-Est

Finally, full gazettment was achieved through the enactment of the following acts:

- Décret No 2000/004 /PM du 06 Janvier 2000 portant création du Parc National de Campo-Ma'an.
- Décret No (unknown) du 19 Mars 2001 portant création du Parc National de Lobéké.
- Arrêté No 1465/MINEF/DFA/CEP/FB du 18 janvier 2001 portant classement des zones d'intérêt cynégétique à gestion communautaire à la périphérie du Parc National de Lobéké

At the time of preparing the ICR, draft "décrets" creating the national parks of Boumba-Bek and Nki have been submitted for signature to the Prime Minister.

D. Support to Priority Project Sites

Mount Kilum / Ijim reserve

The most important result achieved at the Mount Kilum / Ijim site was to stop the decline in biodiversity quality through the demarcation, by local communities, of the external boundary of the Kilum-Ijim forest, the creation of 18 community forests, the creation of a floral sanctuary and the development of management plans for eight community forests for water catchment, biodiversity conservation, suppression of fires and development of ecotourism (total area under protection: 120 km²). Active enforcement of regulations has largely been centered on actions by forest user groups and traditional chiefs (*fons*). Ecological monitoring was established and includes bird and vegetation monitoring. Although difficulties persist, particularly with incursions of small livestock into the site, the major achievement has been the widespread awareness among local populations of the effectiveness of the protective measures adopted under the Program and of the benefits of the compensatory activities developed.

Mount Koupé

The principal result achieved is the customary protection of land in Mount Koupé (30 km²) and Mount Bakossi (950 km²). An agreement with the traditional chiefs was achieved to delineate the agricultural zone and the forest conservation zone. The process was participatory, as villagers guided the negotiations; the village of Bakossi further invited the Program to expand in that zone. Much progress was made in raising awareness with the local population of the importance of forest conservation e.g. for water catchment. However, Program activities at this site were interrupted for almost two years when WWF was not able to replace its local team leader, who had left because of persistent conflict with local traditional and MINEF authorities. It must be recognized that this site compounded almost every challenge that can be met in Cameroon. It was located across the boundaries between the Anglophone and Francophone parts of the country, between two provinces and two "*Départements*", a situation which resulted in daily conflicts of authority at all levels and huge cultural differences between areas within the site. Some officials who insisted on being involved in activities resided more than 100 km away from the site. The shortcomings at Mt Koupé include the absence of a clear legal status for biodiversity, the absence of a "landscape" approach to conservation, and the insufficient involvement of MINEF in conservation efforts.

Mount Cameroon Rain Forest Project (MCP)

The main output of the Mount Cameroon site is the great increase in land under protection: 2,500 km² have been reserved for conservation of biodiversity. The Program improved the baseline information on Mt Cameroon and developed a zoning plan, natural resource management plan, and information and monitoring systems, which were instrumental in negotiations with the Cameroon Development Corporation (CDC) to ensure the protection of biodiversity hotspots located within the boundaries of this corporation, at a time when it is being privatized. The project strengthened the Limbé Botanical Garden as a biodiversity conservation center and assisted to set up botanical databases. It initiated ecological monitoring, developed a new inventory system for *Prunus africana* and increased the bargaining power of villages for the *Prunus* bark. A foundation (Cameroon Mountains Conservation Foundation - CAMCOF) has been established to manage resources for the sustainable conservation at this site.

Campo Ma'an Priority Site

The principal outputs of the Campo-Ma'an component were the creation of the 2,640 km² national park, within a Technical Operational Unit comprising forestry concessions and agroforestry (total protected area: 7,710 km²). MINEF recruited 25 auxiliary game guards and trained them in environmental management, radio communication and use of Global Positioning System (GPS). The Program helped build or rehabilitate five forestry posts and equipped them with radio communication and vehicles. It launched a series of ecologically friendly development activities (ecotourism, small village activities, agroforestry, and community-based forestry) to support the implementation of the zoning plan for the UTO, which includes a national park, UFAs and community forests. The program also regulated the use of the road by timber transporters, launched a successful marine turtle program, and reduced opportunistic poaching by armed motorized bands. The outputs of the Campo Ma'an project are the most widely publicized and the most highly monitored, partly owing to the creation of the national park of Campo Ma'an in 1999 as a mitigation measure for the Chad-Cameroon pipeline, which received worldwide attention. UFA 024, located in the eastern part of the priority site, was one of the first in Cameroon to which the new Forestry Law was fully applied with *inter alia* the production of a MINEF-approved sustainable logging plan complying with major safeguards. Partial funding for the implementation of the National Park's management plan will be provided by the *Fondation pour le Développement et l'Environnement* (FEDEC), a foundation established under the Chad-Cameroon pipeline program, and WWF has been selected by this foundation to provide technical assistance to MINEF on the site.

South-East including Boumba-Bek, Lac Lobéké and Nki Faunal reserves

The principal achievements at the South-East UTO are the creation of the Boumba-Bek, Lobéké and Nki national parks, and the conversion of two Forestry Management Units (*Unité Forestière d'Aménagement - UFA*) into protected areas, the creation of an additional 22 UFAs, 14 hunting zones, and a common conservation vision, leading to a nearly complete management plan. A total area of 29,000 km² was placed under protection. A radio network was set up between the different watch posts. Agreements were made between MINEF, logging companies, local communities and safari hunters regarding cooperation to control poaching. International agreements were also made with the Republic of Congo, the Central African Republic and Gabon leading to regular, joint international patrols. Local populations have joined in the management of the hunting zones, in the redefinition of UFAs and in the conversion of some UFAs into community forests. The hunting guides have redistributed the mandatory 10% of the hunting tax intended for community development to the villagers. Communities, in collaboration with logging companies, have created forestry management plans and are moving towards environmentally friendly certified timber.

Savannah Ecosystem region including three national parks (Faro, Bouba-Ndjidda and Bénoué)

The project helped create wildlife corridors, improve knowledge of fauna, communities and stakeholders, trained 65 community forestry guards, created NGOs specialized in capacity building, and significantly helped reduce conflicts between pastoralists on the one hand, farmers and safari hunters on the other. A radio network was set up between the Provincial delegation of Garoua and the three national parks, the entrances to the parks were equipped with guard houses, and signposting was improved in the parks. The total area placed under protection is 60,000 km², including existing national parks and adjacent game management areas (ZIC). Wildlife inventories were carried out in all three national parks and five of the hunting concessions. The Program supported the micro-zoning of two additional hunting areas, and implemented small-scale development projects in beekeeping, market gardening and rice cultivation in the multiple use zone. A Geographic Information System (GIS) was made operational for the zone. When the program developed its GIS it became clear that close cooperation to prevent conflicts and rationalize land use in the region necessarily implied establishing a wide regional cooperation with all stakeholders, particularly regional development institutions such as the *Mission d'Aménagement de la Bénoué* (MAB) and SODECOTON, the parastatal in charge of cotton development. Geographic information was exchanged through the compatibility of information systems, and awareness about the need to bring all stakeholders into the land use decision-making system was increased. The project helped promote tourism, refurbish a tourist camp, gazette two community-based hunting areas and improve knowledge on fauna (especially endangered species like western black rhinoceros, African wild dogs, elephants and Derby eland). The project initiated promising contacts with Nigeria and Chad, which could lead to transboundary protected areas and corridors.

4.3 Net Present Value/Economic rate of return:

There was no forecast Economic Rate of Return (ERR) owing to the nature of the project and its objective, which cannot be quantified. No economic calculations have been made either during preparation or evaluation.

Most of the program was in the form of grants, so there is no expected return. The investment was supposed to translate into institutional building, capacity building, conservation of biodiversity, participation of local population and sustainable management of natural resources, but not into financial returns.

4.4 Financial rate of return:

For the same reason as that stated in 4.3 above, no financial analysis has been done for the project as a whole, and no income was expected to be generated.

4.5 Institutional development impact:

Institutional Development is rated Substantial. The project was initially structured in a way that anticipated a cooperative relationship between the the *Direction de la Faune et des Aires Protégées* (DFAP) and the participating NGOs, taking a more decentralized, collaborative and participatory approach to decision-making than the Government had at that time. The pilot nature of this structure, compounded with weak political motivation from the GOC and the Bank, at the beginning of implementation, resulted in inefficient execution until mid-term. Confusion about the respective prerogatives of MINEF and the NGOs during the initial period of implementation caused constant struggles over the management of financial and other resources, resulting, until the mid-term review, in recurrent stalemates and distrust.

After mid-term, the project was restructured, which means that the design remained unchanged, but modes of operation and responsibilities of the various stakeholders were clarified. It started to operate more efficiently: the decentralized and participatory nature of the Program, based on a partnership between MINEF and stakeholders, was reinforced, and the role of MINEF and DFAP clarified. The current Program is structured around a *Comité Directeur* (Steering Committee), chaired by the Minister of the Environment and Forestry, which is the Program's highest organizational body. It acts through its Executive Secretariat (ES), headed by an Executive Secretary. The function of the Steering Committee is to provide overall program guidance, while the ES is in charge of daily program management and coordination.

This was something of a cultural revolution for MINEF and is a rare case of successful implementation of the Government of Cameroon's new policy of disengagement of government services from all private or non-truly public service activities, which was promoted after 1997. These basic principles have been retained under an institutional review of MINEF, which has just been completed. The Executive Secretariat is to be reintegrated into the regular stream of the Ministry, but MINEF is committed to preserving the decentralized management of partnership, which has proven its worth under this program. At all sites except Campo, donors and partners have renewed their support to program implementation thus recognizing their adhesion to the current institutional setup. In Campo, new financing will be provided by FEDEC, a foundation that has been set up to support biodiversity protection in Cameroon. FEDEC administers a trust fund established by the Cameroon Oil Transport Company (COTCO) in connection with the Chad-Cameroon Pipeline, for which the Campo Ma'an National Park provides an environmental offset. WWF has been selected by FEDEC to carry out the implementation of the park management plan.

Regarding institutional development at local level, as indicated above, the Program was instrumental in promoting the birth and emergence of local NGOs in charge of local development and conservation activities at all sites. These NGOs will continue operating under the follow-up projects (PSFE and PNDP). Regarding institutional development at regional level, the most remarkable results were achieved in the South-East site with the multipartner contracts signed between MINEF, local communities, logging companies and safari hunters. Similar but not as advanced partnerships were established in the Savannahs site.

5. Major Factors Affecting Implementation and Outcome

5.1 Factors outside the control of government or implementing agency:

There were no natural disasters, civil strife or international conflict during the course of the project.

A significant factor that helped bring the project to completion is the great attention that biodiversity, especially of the value found in Cameroon, gets from international donors and NGOs.

Another factor is the high visibility and associated leverage for the Bank that was given to the Program, especially the site of Campo-Ma'an, when in 1999 the Government of Cameroon proposed this site as an offset (together with the Mbam and Djerem Reserve in the Center) to mitigate potential environmental damage linked to the construction of the Chad-Cameroon Pipeline, which exports petroleum products from Chad to offshore platforms in Cameroon. The high profile of this pipeline brought international observers to certain project sites, and helped the Bank prioritize this program.

Finally, this was one of the very first GEF projects to be designed, and as such there was little if any institutional knowledge and experience in the management and implementation of GEF or biodiversity projects. The pilot phase of the GEF (under which this project was initially designed) encouraged a project structure that relied heavily on ministries and departments that had very little or no capacity to manage biodiversity.

5.2 Factors generally subject to government control:

MINEF was the Government Department under which the program was implemented. Early in the life of the Program, it was clear that biodiversity management was a concept new to the institutional culture of MINEF, whose main activity had been so far to grant logging concessions, control poaching of big game and enforce forestry and wildlife laws. It took considerable time to be understood and implemented. Furthermore, shortly before Program inception, in 1995, MINEF was created by merging directorates from four other departments: Forestry, Agriculture, Research and Education, and Tourism, which resulted in a ministry that had no culture of historical unity and had no single vision. For this reason, the Executive Secretariat will be integrated into MINEF as a permanent structure only after Program completion. This recent history accounts in part for misunderstandings and difficulties encountered at the beginning of project implementation, although these were mostly overcome after the mid-term review (MTR), when general redistribution of roles was better understood.

Furthermore, because of more than 10 years of structural adjustment and the subsequent freeze in recruitment of civil servants, the program suffered an acute numerical shortage of game wardens and qualified MINEF officials. However, 50 auxiliary wardens were eventually recruited under contract by MINEF and WWF to assist in the enforcement and control of poaching. It was agreed that they would be recruited into civil service when the recruitment freeze was lifted.

Lastly, frequent transfer of key MINEF personnel and local administrators did not always contribute to a fluent execution of the program.

5.3 Factors generally subject to implementing agency control:

Overall, the implementing agency (the Steering Committee and its Executive Secretariat) functioned as it should; it met regularly, the SE carried out supervision missions of the project, and prepared supervision reports. However, for almost a year, after the MTR, the position of Executive Secretary remained vacant until appropriate compensation could be made available from counterpart funding.

The central implementation agency was the Executive Secretariat (ES), which, because it was created shortly after a general restructuring, operated outside the regular structures of MINEF, and will eventually be merged when the ministry is restructured again late in 2003. After a learning period, relations between the ES and the Sites became generally confident and effective, contributing to the overall improvement in implementation. The acceptance of direct payments to site implementing agencies (international NGOs) by

MINEF and the Bank greatly contributed to simplifying financial flows and improving the operation of agencies. The recruitment of an accounting firm to assist in accounting and financial matters after the MTR significantly improved transparency and efficiency of management.

Three of the major problems encountered during the life of the project were:

(1) The perceived conflict between the Program and logging companies and their employees. During preparation and early implementation of the Program, it was perceived by logging companies as a threat to their freedom to exploit forest resources. This situation resulted in antagonism between the Program and logging companies, essentially in the South-East and Campo Ma'an. Being the sole employers, and the sole providers of services, in these regions, locally established loggers initially successfully managed to stir the local population against the Program, spreading the idea that it would restrict their access to the forest and its resources. Eventually the new Forestry Law went into effect, bringing transparency and real competition in the way logging concessions were allocated. Most logging companies understood at that time that partnership rather than conflict with the environmental community and the Program would be more effective to carry out business in Cameroon. The difficult task of gaining back the confidence of the populations was tackled essentially by SNV, GTZ and the local NGOs that they had helped establish. Part of the success was the result of helping to establish the rightful flow of the fraction of logging fees owed to the populations (See "Sustainability" below). This was one of the great battles won by the PCGBC. Through increasing transparency and participation of local populations in the management of the natural resources in their region, the Program at length gained their support.

(2) The second major problem encountered by the Program was the illegal granting of logging permits by MINEF (*ventes de coupes*) inside the Program's Campo-Ma'an Priority Site (UFA 24 and 25) in early 1998, while the Grant Agreement clearly stated that no new, or extension of current, permits would be allowed after the Grant Agreement was signed (May 22, 1995). Although it took several weeks, this issue was successfully resolved. The permits were revoked, responsible officials were removed, and implementation of the Program resumed. However, the delays and disturbances caused by this situation were considerable, and caused the Government of the Netherlands to threaten to suspend financing and withdraw from the Program, thus putting it at risk, in November 1998.

(3) The Dutch DGIS also threatened to suspend financing in February 1999 because of inadequate reporting by the Bank of the activities of NGOs operating as implementing agencies under financing from the DGIS Grant. In this case, the Bank had failed to provide progress reports in a format acceptable to DGIS. This problem was resolved without delay through improved communication between the NGOs, the Bank (trustee of the DGIS Grant) and the Government of the Netherlands.

5.4 Costs and financing:

Financing came from multiple sources: the two major sources, both administered by the Bank, were the GEF grant of US\$ 5,960,000 and the Government of the Netherlands DGIS grant of US\$ 6,336,650. The GEF grant was fully disbursed, while the DGIS grant was disbursed to 95%. Other funds were provided either by the implementing agencies themselves (WWF, SNV, Tropenbos, GTZ), or by other Donors through parallel financing (DfID, FAC). They were administered independently and therefore not accounted for by the Bank. The amounts thus actually spent remain unknown. A technical audit in 2003 by an independent evaluation expert states that the total program cost was US\$ 21 million, although this cannot be confirmed. The DGIS Grant had to adjust its final disbursement amount to compensate for changes in currency rates during project life. Exchange rates varied significantly during the lifetime of the project. One result is the different figures for contributions from various sources (project document, reported disbursement actuals). The DGIS was increased from 1.8 Million USD equivalent at appraisal to 6.3 Million USD equivalent but it was pledged in Netherlands Guilders, and an adjustment became necessary when the closing date of the Grant was extended. The reconciliation of grand totals is therefore somewhat uncertain.

6. Sustainability

6.1 Rationale for sustainability rating:

The program is rated "Likely" for sustainability, on account of its being taken over by two further World Bank projects: Component 3 of the *Programme Sectoriel Forêt Environnement* (PSFE) and the *Programme National de Développement Participatif* (PNDP).

Component 3 (Biodiversity) of the PSFE includes development of protected areas, management of faunal resources and sustainable management of zones of fragile ecology. It will also manage environmental impacts and environmental information. The PSFE is due to be appraised in October 2003.

The PNDP is a national Community-Driven Development (CDD) program to be executed in Campo-Ma'an and other provinces of the country. PNDP provides matching grants to help local communities finance the micro-projects in their community development plans. In the Campo-Ma'an area, already identified micro-projects relate to social infrastructure and income-generating activities as alternatives to poaching. PNDP has already been appraised (July 2003), and is awaiting Board approval. Pilot activities have started under a PPF.

In the South-East and Campo-Ma'an, the implementation of the new Forestry Law will provide very significant financial resources to the local populations through the re-allocation of the fraction of the logging fees (40% of the proceeds of logging taxes will be allocated to communes, and 10% to local populations), which the Law itself has increased significantly. These resources will complement those from PNDP, and provide a powerful and sustainable tool in support of conservation.

At Kilum-Ijim Birdlife International is continuing and expanding its activities with the support of a GEF/UNDP grant. At Mt Koupé, WWF has resumed activities with its own resources. In the South-East, the German Government has renewed its financial support to GTZ for another three years. In the Savannahs, the *Agence Française de Développement* (AFD) has approved a FCFA 3 billion (US\$ 5.4 million) grant for the development of the Faro National Park and adjacent wildlife conservation areas. In Mt Cameroon, CAMCOF has established a trust fund to finance the continuation of conservation efforts.

6.2 Transition arrangement to regular operations:

The SE, although it has acted quite independently of MINEF so far, is going to be integrated into that Ministry (under the Wildlife and Protected Areas Directorate - DFAP), thereby ensuring its continuity. Assets and staff have been reassigned, although final arrangements have not been made.

Support to local communities within the Campo-Ma'an UTO will be provided by PNDP from the start since this area has been selected as one of the four initial implementation areas for the new project. Local communities have already been formally organized and have developed their local development plans, with technical support from the local NGOs established under the Biodiversity project. This initiative is known as "Pilote-Hybride PNDP-PCGBC" in which UTO institutions temporarily fulfill the role of structures to be established formally when PNDP becomes effective, and allow pilot funding to be channeled to the communities.

7. Bank and Borrower Performance

Bank

7.1 Lending:

The overall performance of the Bank during preparation and appraisal is rated "Unsatisfactory". Project

preparation was longer than expected and project design, regarding implementation modalities, was not quite satisfactory and had to be revised at mid-term. The Bank's performance could have been improved if it had done a better stakeholder analysis and/or institutional analysis of DFAP and its role in the Ministry of Environment and Forests.

The Bank changed task team leaders twice (leading to a total of three task team leaders) during the period of preparation through implementation.

7.2 Supervision:

Overall Bank Performance for supervision is rated "Satisfactory", although up to the Mid Term Review (MTR) it clearly was mixed, making adjustments necessary after the MTR. Various factors resulted in unsolved conflicts and issues between MINEF and partner NGOs, but all the issues were successfully addressed after the MTR. The MTR, which took place in 1997-1998, lasted almost nine months, requiring inputs from a large number of consultants. The Bank recommended and helped restructure the project (into a program), and the roles of all parties were clarified, leading to better cooperation between the implementing agency and the collaborating NGOs. Trusting cooperation was restored between the Recipient and all Donors. Bank Performance for supervision can be rated close to "Unsatisfactory" during the early period (before the MTR) and "Highly Satisfactory" after the MTR, giving an overall rating of "Satisfactory".

From the mid-term review onwards, the Bank carried out regular supervision missions (every six months: May and Nov 1998, May and Nov 1999, May and Nov 2000, May and Nov 2001, Interim Support Mission in May 2002, and final supervision in Nov 2002). Support by the Resident Mission, particularly for disbursement, was strengthened. Constant dialogue between the Bank and MINEF helped prevent or address issues arising as reported in previous sections.

7.3 Overall Bank performance:

Overall Bank performance is rated "Satisfactory" at closing. Much progress was made between mid-term and the closing of the project, compensating for the shortcomings during the initial phase of implementation. The Bank was effective in identifying issues, raising them to the Government and proposing solutions to address them. When breaches in the Grant Agreement were suspected in Campo-Ma'an the Bank sent one of its lawyers in the field to assess the legal implications. Subsequently, it initiated a dialogue with the highest levels of Government in order to have the issues effectively addressed. Constant attention and support from the Bank's hierarchy were instrumental in helping the Task Team adequately fulfill its mission.

Borrower

7.4 Preparation:

Preparation by the Recipient is rated "Satisfactory". Numerous studies were carried out before project implementation, thus giving a sound knowledge base to the project. It is not rated "Highly Satisfactory" because in hindsight it is clear that at that stage the true nature and purpose of the project were not really understood. It was essentially seen as an institutional support to MINEF to improve its anti-poaching capabilities, and restore existing National Parks, and the real implications regarding conservation and a participatory approach remained unaccepted.

7.5 Government implementation performance:

Government implementation performance is rated "Satisfactory", although a serious setback in the program was the illegal granting of logging concessions within the priority site of Campo in late 1998, in direct violation to the Grant Agreement. This grave infringement seriously upset program implementation in the

Campo-Ma'an area, and clearly resulted from a lack of transparency in prerogatives of various MINEF officials with responsibilities within the site (Provincial Delegate, Departmental Delegate, Wildlife Reserve Conservator). Overlap of responsibilities together with ignorance bred confusion. This situation was effectively addressed by the creation of a Technical Operational Unit (*Unité Technique Opérationnelle* - UTO) as sole authority in the conservation area of Campo-Ma'an. In that instance, difficult decisions had to be made by MINEF with the support from higher levels of Government, but official international commitments were fulfilled, and project implementation could resume.

The extreme slowness, on certain occasions, of government to provide counterpart funding, for essential activities such as paying salaries of field staff, caused great frustration among auxiliary game guards, who went unpaid for periods of up to eight months. Because of cumbersome administrative procedure, delays were encountered in implementing supervision recommendations and release of counterpart funding, but overall achievements show that essential actions were taken.

7.6 Implementing Agency:

Implementing agency performance is rated "Satisfactory", as the Steering Committee, through its Executive Secretariat, ensured continual monitoring, supervision and reporting on program status. Had the flow of funds been more effective, the performance of the implementing agency would have been "Highly Satisfactory".

7.7 Overall Borrower performance:

Overall Recipient performance is rated "Satisfactory". The Recipient met its obligations, albeit sometimes belatedly. The performance would have been rated Highly Satisfactory if the breaches in the Grant Agreement found in 1998 had been avoided, and if recipient financial contributions had been mobilized more easily and completely .

After mid-term, the project gradually started to meet its targets, and eventually met all of them at closure. Ensuring continuity of the program remains the principal difficulty, as "end-of-program fatigue" set in, when key staff realized that funding was coming to an end, and began looking for alternative employment. Certain implementing agencies have ceased the production of periodic reports. Although all the project donors (DFID, SCAC, AFD, GTZ, WWF, FEDEC, UNDP/GEF) have made a commitment to continue funding the Program, however in the interim period it is incumbent upon MINEF and the Program Executive Secretariat to provide funding to maintain guards and equipment in place.

8. Lessons Learned

The lessons learned in a complex and long-lasting project of this magnitude are many. They can be summarized as follows:

Innovative and collaborative partnerships:

1. Conservation of biodiversity is not the concern of only scientists, government officials, international NGOs, civil society or local population; it requires contributions and cooperation from all of these with the government retaining the initiative and overall leadership. For partnerships to be effective, roles and responsibilities of partners must be clearly spelled out from the start, in contracts for which signatories are fully accountable. The coordination, reporting and information exchange mechanisms must also be defined clearly from the start. In this case, the role of Government (MINEF) was to devise policies (conservation of biodiversity, participatory approach, disengagement of government), to monitor the implementation of the policies contracted to partners, and supervise the implementation of contracts for

"non-public authority" (*non-régalienn*e) activities.

2. Government ministries in charge of forestry and wildlife have "public authority" ("*régalien*") duties, which are to enforce forestry and hunting laws and regulations. This culture of law enforcement needs to be adapted in order to increase compatibility with the participatory and educational approach required to achieve the objectives of conservation. Therefore, although the government institutions are in charge of biodiversity conservation policy at national level, implementation of these policies needs to be entrusted to other partners at local level. Decentralized partnership was a totally new approach for MINEF and gave almost total autonomy to local teams. Each implementing agency was fully responsible for its actions under the contract signed with MINEF, in compliance with original project clauses. This organizational arrangement proved successful and deserves to be repeated.

3. Local populations must further be allowed to seek cooperation with other potential stakeholders (private operators e.g. logging companies, safari hunters and international NGOs). Private operators including NGOs must not interfere with government responsibilities, must be accountable for their actions and use of resources and must provide the results stated in the contracts. Under these conditions, all stakeholders can be expected to perform according to expectations e.g. in the South-East, control of poaching within logging concessions was done in cooperation with villagers, safari hunters and with local MINEF officials. This effective setup was the result of GTZ's persistent initiatives to create a dialogue between all stakeholders.

Decentralization:

4. In a country as diverse in all respects as Cameroon, decentralization is key for the Program to be effective at local level. The implementation of this project after the MTR anticipated and pioneered the enactment of the Government's policy of decentralization. Providing the necessary flexibility in institutional arrangements to allow for an adaptation to local circumstances certainly contributed significantly to the improvement in results achieved.

Participation of local populations:

5. It is unrealistic to expect concrete achievement in the domain of biodiversity conservation without explicit consent and active participation of local populations. To achieve this, it is necessary to empower these to as great an extent as possible, and to give official recognition to this empowerment (e.g. through village natural resource management committees, training of community wildlife patrols as auxiliaries of government game wardens, etc).

6. The PCGBC helped stakeholders to solve problems inherent in the management of commonly held natural resources. In this context, conservation programs are important allies to rural populations through the assistance offered in negotiation and mediation between different groups, reduction in conflict, resolution of situations where the interest of the individual is not in accordance with the interest of the community, and capacity building.

Sustainable sources of funding

7. Sustainable sources of funding must be secured in order to strengthen the local organizations, provide adequate compensation for the sacrifices made by local populations for biodiversity conservation, and to sustain community-based development. In the case of this Program, the implementation of the new Forestry Law, with provisions for the spillover to "*communes*" and local populations of 40% and 10%

respectively of the proceeds of the logging taxes (and safari hunting lease fees in the Savannahs site), created the necessary framework. This was very effectively used in the South-East, where GTZ advertised widely the payments made by logging companies, to make resources available to the villagers, as well as in the Savannah Component. This lesson should be applied to all sites. In addition, the Program facilitated the organization of communities in and around approximately ten out of the 24 leased hunting areas.

Given the Program's success in, among others, increasing the transparency of the distribution of fees from safari hunting and logging to local communities, and in the management of natural resources, further funding of similar initiatives by the GEF in Cameroon should be considered. The GEF Cameroon, GEF Congo and ECOFAC (Écosystèmes Forestiers d'Afrique Centrale) projects are similar in scope, and should therefore be funded in parallel. The solid foundation that this Program offers should be capitalized on by GEF. Furthermore, additional financing of biodiversity research is required. Lastly, the two follow-up projects to the PCGBC (PNDP and PSFE) need to incorporate the lessons learnt from the PCGBC in terms of sustainability.

The principle of closely associating local populations with actions aimed at conservation in and around the protected areas remains essential in the implementation of Component 3 of PSFE.

The Region in which Campo-Ma'an is located has been selected as one of the four regions where pilot activities are undertaken under PNDP, and activities have already started with groups of specialists visiting the villages in the Campo-Ma'an buffer zone, and helping them to get organized and define, in a participatory manner, community development plans which include conservation activities and the development of alternatives to commercial poaching and illegal logging. These activities will receive financial support under PNDP.

Transparency and management of information:

8. Effective GIS on all aspects of natural resource management and biodiversity conservation are key to providing information, which must be made available transparently to all stakeholders in order to help in joint decision-making on very sensitive issues. The use of a monitoring and analytical accounting system at the level of the Executive Secretariat (ES) was very valuable, as was the regular execution of supervision missions, both by the Bank and by the ES (every six months). Better exchange of information between MINEF and the executing agencies regarding the management of counterpart funds and partner funds would have been helpful to fully appreciate the efforts provided by all parties.

Capacity Building and Studies

9. The program initially invested heavily in studies, surveys and consultancies, however without building real capacity in the field or for MINEF. The study phase should have been linked more closely to the sustainable building of capacity in the field. Such an approach would include:

- i. assigning long-term personnel rather than investing in numerous consultancies
- ii. building implementing agencies linked to the site
- iii. assigning an adequate number of national and MINEF staff
- iv. strengthening of MINEF staff, even with partner funds
- v. true ownership of actions by provincial and departmental delegations of MINEF
- vi. team building
- vii. "on-the-job" training
- viii. a clear, simple and unique vision on the mission of the conservation service and how to reach this objective

- ix. direct available limited resources onto certain key activities
- x. operational capacities that grow with time
- xi. progressive spatial expansion, following growing problem-solving capacity
- xii. mobile teams (on foot or motorized) managed by a sworn-in leader
- xiii. financial reward systems to operate structures within which most of the work is to be carried out in the field
- xiv. simple but efficient reporting to allow managers to operate in the field rather than writing long reports
- xv. a simple but efficient monitoring system, introduced progressively

Institutional arrangements for effectiveness of implementation:

10. The PCGBC was implemented through a "program approach", which (i) increases transparency (ii) increases coherence and the cost-benefit ratio of interventions (iii) permits economies of scale in monitoring, evaluation and training, and (iv) acquires a perennial character. This approach greatly facilitated program implementation.

11. The "UTO" approach was very effective in urgently addressing a situation within a zone that required a direct coordination and approach and helped unite stakeholders. The UTO simplified and clarified the chain of command within MINEF and hence within central and decentralized government. It also clarified responsibilities and partnerships with MINEF partners. Following the technical evaluation carried out by a consultant in April 2003, there is an argument as to whether the UTO structure should survive the approval of project site master plans and protected areas management plans. One opinion (shared by the consultant and some MINEF officials) is that UTOs should then be dissolved and the territorial boundaries of decentralized MINEF structures (*Délégations provinciales* and *départementales*) be fully restored. Our opinion is that as long as communication remains problematic, the centralization of MINEF authority for the whole of the protected site should be maintained under UTO status, and cover all the different types of protected areas on the site (national park and adjacent areas; safari hunting concessions, community forestry and hunting areas, etc.) in order to maintain the clarity of the distribution of responsibilities both within MINEF itself and for its partners, including the local populations.

9. Partner Comments

(a) Borrower/implementing agency:

The Recipient ICR has been received and is attached as Annex 8 of this document. It contains the following assessments:

Quote:

"The objectives of the Program are coherent with Cameroon's strategy for the conservation and management of biodiversity, which is based on i) the integration and participation of populations (as provided for in the new Forestry Law of January 1994) ; ii) the concerns for sustainable development and management of the environmental and forestry sector (as spelled out in the National Forestry Action Plan and in the National Environmental Management Plan) ; and iii) the initiatives to fight poverty. The Program's approach complies with the government's strategy of involving local populations in the decision-making process, and of the government's policy of disengagement and the transfer to local communities and NGOs of implementation responsibilities, henceforth limiting itself to support and advice. This approach is seen as more efficient and allows for a redefinition of responsibilities, and a promotion of the new decentralization policy in Cameroon.

The institutional performance of the program was greatly improved following the Mid-Term Review, with the creation of different organizations and frameworks for cooperation (CD, SE, CLSS, CGS, COVAREF, etc), and the exchange of information made possible by the partnerships successfully improved communication. However, the delayed creation of the program implementation manual resulted initially in poor understanding of program implementation and delays in implementation."

Unquote.

The Recipient concludes that:

Quote:

"the Program was executed in a satisfactory way, in spite of its ambitious and complex character and some difficulties linked to its execution. It deserves to be pursued to finalize the implementation of management plans, to strengthen existing partnerships and to monitor the increased responsibility of the populations in the management of forest and wildlife resources."

Unquote.

(b) Cofinanciers:

Expected

(c) Other partners (NGOs/private sector):

Expected

10. Additional Information

This Program was one of the first few financed by GEF in Africa. It is clear in hindsight that at the time of its preparation much was still to be learnt on how to design projects in order to pursue GEF's goals. This explains why in spite of long and intense preparation, particularly with a great number of studies, the stages surrounding appraisal and effectiveness appear somewhat rushed, with insufficient involvement of Cameroonian stakeholders. These circumstances probably account for much of the mishaps and misunderstandings that happened during the early implementation phase.

During the life of this Program, Cameroon underwent a relatively peaceful transition towards democratization and decentralization. However, some events indirectly affected program implementation, the most important of which is the reduction of approximately 30% of civil servant salaries in 1992 and 1993, which was followed in January 1994, by a 50% devaluation of the CFA Franc. As a result, civil servants saw their standard of living deeply affected by a loss of 75% of their buying power. This unprecedented financial pressure on civil servants, including those of MINEF, had a great impact on the morale and performance of the Government of Cameroon and its institutions. Many officials at all levels of Government spent an important part of their time in search of alternative sources of income to avoid an excessive degradation of their standard of living. Their physical and mental availability was therefore reduced, and their commitment to their official duties faded significantly. This situation probably accounts significantly for the misunderstandings and conflicts that plagued project implementation at the beginning. It is a tribute to the quality of the Executive Secretariat staff that they managed to overcome these strains and eventually provided a major contribution to the achievements reported here.

The new Forestry Law, enacted in January 1994, came gradually into effect during project implementation, and its enforcement became effective when it was included as a conditionality in the Third Structural Adjustment Credit (SAC 3). By promoting transparency of MINEF's management of logging concessions and the forestry fiscal system, it encouraged MINEF and operators to adopt policies of sustainable resource management. This was reflected both at Campo-Ma'an and the South-East in the development of dialogue

and consensus between MINEF, other stakeholders and logging companies, which had hitherto been unthinkable.

The Chad-Cameroon Pipeline loan was approved on June 6, 2000, and signed nine months later. As mentioned in Sections 4 and 5, this operation strongly influenced the implementation of the biodiversity program, because the Government of Cameroon assigned the site of Campo-Ma'an as one of the offsets for the environmental impacts related to the building of the pipeline (the other offset was the Mbam and Djerem area). This decision provided leverage to strengthen the protection afforded by the government to the core protection area of Campo-Ma'an and undeniably helped accelerate the gazettement of the national park.

Following complaints from local sources that the Bank was not complying with its own Safeguard Policies regarding the implementation of the Chad-Cameroon Pipeline project, an investigation was carried out by the Inspection Panel. This investigation resulted in the following actions being recommended by the Panel and accepted by the Board: the Bank team is currently assisting to establish closer working relationships between the *Comité de Pilotage et de Suivi du Pipeline* (CPSP), FEDEC and MINEF. Joint meetings at COTCO's headquarters in Douala and CPSP's headquarters in Yaoundé were convened in July 2002, November 2002 and March 2003. The main achievements of these meetings were the acceleration of FEDEC financing, negotiations and signing of the agreements between FEDEC and WCS, and FEDEC and WWF respectively, to begin preparation of management plans for Mbam Djerem and Campo Ma'an, with the cooperation of MINEF and CPSP. Clarification of the roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder in the implementation of the offset will be further discussed during the CAPECE Mid-Term Review Mission and within the proposed Forest and Environment Sector Program (PSFE – Programme Sectoriel Forêts et Environnement), which the Bank is helping Cameroon to prepare and which is expected to be presented to the Board in the next fiscal year.

As regards measures to prevent illegal logging, two complementary mechanisms are in place. The first is an addendum to the concession contract between the GoC and the logging company operating closest to the Park. Signed in April 2002, this addendum ("*cahier des charges*") commits the company to collaborate actively with Government authorities to prevent illegal logging and commercial poaching. The concession contract provides for periodic external evaluations of results and penalties in case of poor or non performance. The second mechanism involves the services of an Independent Observer to assess compliance with logging laws and regulations (a service currently provided by the international NGO, Global Witness) and detect weaknesses by the private sector and government institutions. Through its dialogue with the GoC and the upcoming PSFE, the Bank will closely monitor implementation of the "*cahier des charges*" provisions and will ensure that the Campo Ma'an area remains a priority for MINEF and the Independent Observer.

The proposed Cameroon Community Development Program (*Programme National de Développement Participatif* – PNDP) will finance community-driven investment plans; the Campo Ma'an area was designated as one of the pilot areas during project preparation. This project, along with the community-oriented communication strategy of the CPSP and the future investment program under the PSFE, will constitute a comprehensive action plan to help sustain the protection of the two parks (Campo and Ma'an) and achieve development objectives for neighboring communities and stakeholders.

Annex 1. Key Performance Indicators/Log Frame Matrix

Outcome / Impact Indicators:

Indicator/Matrix	Projected in last PSR ¹	Actual/Latest Estimate
Strengthening of MINEF's capacity at National, Provincial and Local levels		Project restructured in 1999
Strengthening of biodiversity related research		Research carried out by Implementing agencies (WWF, Tropenbos, National Herbarium rehabilitated and operational again)
Enhancement of Protection and management in Priority Project sites		UTOs created for Savannahs, Campo-Ma'an, South-East by Arrêtés on 08/06/1999
Support to Project sites		Partnerships secured for financial support and technical assistance from Donors and NGOs

Output Indicators:

Indicator/Matrix	Projected in last PSR ¹	Actual/Latest Estimate
Gazettment as National Park of the Campo-Ma'an core protection area		Decree 2000/004PM January 6, 2000 for Campo-Ma'an, Decree dated March 19, 2001 for Lobéké Pending Decrees for Boumba-Bek and Nki
Strengthening of MINEF's capacity at national, regional, local level		Decisions 0146-0151/D/MINEF/DFAP/SE dated 02/02/1999 reorganizing the project and sites SIBC established as an effective information system (September 2000)
Strengthening of Biodiversity related research		National Herbarium fully rehabilitated, publication of Cameroon Flora resumed
Support to project sites		Decisions above reorganizing implementation at sites, Master plans and management plans produced before March 30, 2003

¹ End of project

No logframe had been prepared before effectiveness, but a logframe was developed during the MTR and subsequently used to operate the monitoring and evaluation system.

Annex 2. Project Costs and Financing

Project Cost by Component (in US\$ million equivalent)

Component	Appraisal Estimate US\$ million	Actual/Latest Estimate US\$ million	Percentage of Appraisal
National Component	0.00	4.22	
1. MINEF Institutional Support	0.85	0.00	
2. Botanical Survey & Inventory	0.45	0.00	
3. Zoological Survey & Inventory	0.47	0.00	
Local Component	0.00	0.00	
1. Mt Kilum-Ijim	1.02	0.45	
2. Mt Koupe	0.56	0.22	
3. Mt Cameroon	0.42	0.14	
4. Campo-Ma'an	1.82	4.29	
5. Savannah Ecosystems	2.41	2.14	
6. Southeastern Region	2.68	0.94	
Total Baseline Cost	10.68	12.40	
Physical Contingencies	0.21		
Price Contingencies	1.51		
Total Project Costs	12.40	12.40	
Total Financing Required	12.40	12.40	

(1) Appraisal figures are based on the MOP, and pledges from the Government of Cameroon (1M\$), Government of the Netherlands (1.88M\$), Government of Germany (1.5M\$), Government of France (1.24 M\$), European Union (0.04M\$), Government of the United Kingdom (0.77 M\$), GEF (5.96M\$).

(2) Actuals are based on Bank recorded disbursements from the GEF and DGIS Grants (Government of the Netherlands) corresponding to actual disbursements and payments made against contracts with implementing agencies. The large amount appearing under National Component includes the cost of equipment, civil works, goods and consultant services centrally procured through the Project National Coordination before the MTR, and expenditures for Mt Cameroon (outside from the contract with Kew Gardens), for the operations of the Executive Secretariat, and support to MINEF at all sites.

(3) It is incidental that amounts for Appraisal estimates and Actuals are the same because in fact, Actuals are the Bank controlled expenditures, and no data are available for actuals from the Government of Cameroon or other Donors, including contributions from implementing agencies (WWF, SNV) from their own resources. It must also be noted that the contribution from the Government of the Netherlands eventually amounted to 6.336 million Dollars instead of 1.88 as originally pledged. A technical audit carried out by an external consultant (Pauwel De Wachter) in March 2003 estimated total actual expenses for this project at 21 Million USD including estimates for all contribution.

Project Costs by Procurement Arrangements (Appraisal Estimate) (US\$ million equivalent)

Expenditure Category	Procurement Method ¹			N.B.F.	Total Cost
	ICB	NCB	Other ²		
1. Works	0.53 (0.53)	0.13 (0.13)	0.00 (0.00)	0.24 (0.00)	0.90 (0.66)
2. Goods	0.59 (0.59)	0.04 (0.04)	0.04 (0.04)	0.71 (0.00)	1.38 (0.67)
3. Services	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	1.22 (1.22)	2.18 (0.00)	3.40 (1.22)
Technical Assistance					
4. Miscellaneous Studies, Research, Surveys	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	1.29 (1.29)	1.48 (0.00)	2.77 (1.29)
5. Miscellaneous Training	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.40 (0.40)	0.16 (0.00)	0.56 (0.40)
6. Miscellaneous Community development Operating Costs	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.16 (1.56)	0.22 (1.46)	0.38 (3.02)
Total	1.12 (1.12)	0.17 (0.17)	3.11 (4.51)	4.99 (1.46)	9.39 (7.26)

From MOP (with the original 1.88 M \$ pledge from the Government of the Netherlands)

Project Costs by Procurement Arrangements (Actual/Latest Estimate) (US\$ million equivalent)

Expenditure Category	Procurement Method ¹			N.B.F.	Total Cost
	ICB	NCB	Other ²		
1. Works	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
2. Goods	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.74 (0.53)	0.74 (0.53)
3. Services	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	14.84 (7.92)	14.84 (7.92)
Technical Assistance					
4. Miscellaneous Studies, Research, Surveys	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
5. Miscellaneous Training	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
6. Miscellaneous Community development Operating Costs	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
Total					

	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	15.58 (8.46)	15.58 (8.46)
--	----------------	----------------	----------------	-----------------	-----------------

^{1/} Figures in parenthesis are the amounts to be financed by the Bank Loan. All costs include contingencies.

^{2/} Includes civil works and goods to be procured through national shopping, consulting services, services of contracted staff of the project management office, training, technical assistance services, and incremental operating costs related to (i) managing the project, and (ii) re-lending project funds to local government units.

Project Financing by Component (in US\$ million equivalent)

Component	Appraisal Estimate			Actual/Latest Estimate			Percentage of Appraisal		
	Bank	Govt.	CoF.	Bank	Govt.	CoF.	Bank	Govt.	CoF.
Strengthening of MINEF at national, provincial and local level	0.85			4.30			505.9		
Strengthening of Biodiversity related research	0.92			0.14			15.2		
Enhancement of Protection and management of Protected Areas in the Priority Project Sites									
Support to Priority Project Sites	8.91			7.96			89.3		
1. Kilum-Ijim									
2. Mt Cameroon									
3. Mt Koupé									
4. Campo-Ma'an									
5. Savannahs									
6. South East									

(a) There is no breakdown by component and source of financing in the MOP, and final disbursements from financiers other than GEF and DGIS remain unknown; (b) Strengthening of Biodiversity research: the only identified expenses are those for the National Herbarium; most research expenditures are accounted for under "support to sites" (c) Enhancement of protection and management of protected areas cannot be separated from other expenses in NGO contracts for the support to Priority Sites; (d) The Bank was the trustee for both GEF and the Netherlands Government, amounts appearing under "Bank" are therefore contributions from these sources. Those from other Donors remain unknown; (e) "system" doesn't allow the provision of separate figures for sub-components under each component.

Annex 3. Economic Costs and Benefits

It is difficult to figure out economic costs and benefits for a project that by nature does not aim directly at economic benefits. Although preserving biodiversity has direct and indirect economic benefits, and although studies do exist that aim to attribute economic value to natural resources, no such studies were done for this project. Direct benefits of preserving biodiversity e.g. through the protection of forested land are water catchment, prevention of erosion, stability of climate and preservation of rainfall.

Furthermore, the impact of alternative activities at project implementation sites remains uncertain owing to their limited and localized nature.

Annex 4. Bank Inputs

(a) Missions:

Stage of Project Cycle		No. of Persons and Specialty (e.g. 2 Economists, 1 FMS, etc.)		Performance Rating	
Month/Year		Count	Specialty	Implementation Progress	Development Objective
Identification/Preparation/Appraisal	1991	2	ENVIRONMENT SPECIALIST		
		1	SENIOR-ECONOMIST		
		1	AGRICULTURAL		
		1	ECONOMIST		
		1	ENVIRONMENT AND SOCIAL		
		1	ADVISOR		
		1	SENIOR FORESTRY		
		1	SPECIALIST		
		1	OPERATIONS ANALYST		
		1	LAWYER		
		1			
		1	AGRONOMIST		
		1	SOCIOLOGIST		
		1	SOCIO-ECONOMIST		
	1994		ENVIRONMENTALIST		
			PROCUREMENT SPEC.		
			DISBURSEMENT SPEC.		
Supervision	07/28/1995	1	SR. FORESTRY SPEC. (1)	S	
	03/17/1996	1	SR FORESTRY SPEC. (1)	S	
	01/17/1997	2	SR. FORESTRY SPEC. (1); AGRIC. ECONOMIST (1)	U	
	11/10/1998	3	SR. LIVESTOCK SPEC. (1); ENVIRONMENT SPEC. (1); FINANCIAL ANALYST (1)	U	
	03/30/1999	1	SR. LIVESTOCK SPEC. (1)	U	
	10/13/1999	7	TTL (1); ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMAT (1); INFO ANALYST (1); OPERATIONS (1); FORESTRY (1); DISBURSEMENT ASSISTANT (1); FINANCIAL ANALYST (1)	S	
	04/18/2000	2	TTL (1); OPERATIONS (1)	S	
	10/16/2000	2	TTL (1); AGRICULTURAL ECONOMIST (1)	HS	
	10/16/2000	2	TTL (1); FORESTRY SPECIALIST (1)	S	
	10/16/2000	1	TTL (1)	S	
ICR	08/08/2003	1	ENVIRONMENTAL SPECIALIST (CONSULTANT)		

Due to the change in the SAP recording system, it has not been possible to reconcile the information from mission reports and those from SAP about staffing of missions prior to 1995 and the breakdown between identification, preparation, appraisal and negotiation.

(b) Staff:

Stage of Project Cycle	Actual/Latest Estimate	
	No. Staff weeks	US\$ ('000)
Identification/Preparation/Appraisal	118.1	348.6
Supervision	184.8	818.9
ICR		
Total	369.0	1,334.9

ICR costs not available yet at this stage

Annex 5. Ratings for Achievement of Objectives/Outputs of Components

(H=High, SU=Substantial, M=Modest, N=Negligible, NA=Not Applicable)

	<i>Rating</i>				
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Macro policies</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input checked="" type="radio"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Sector Policies</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input checked="" type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Physical</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input checked="" type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Financial</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input checked="" type="radio"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Institutional Development</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input checked="" type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Environmental</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input checked="" type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<i>Social</i>					
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Poverty Reduction</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input checked="" type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Gender</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input checked="" type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other (Please specify)</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Private sector development</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input checked="" type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Public sector management</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input checked="" type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other (Please specify)</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA

Annex 6. Ratings of Bank and Borrower Performance

(HS=Highly Satisfactory, S=Satisfactory, U=Unsatisfactory, HU=Highly Unsatisfactory)

6.1 Bank performance

Rating

Lending

HS S U HU

Supervision

HS S U HU

Overall

HS S U HU

Project preparation was a long and cumbersome process involving several Donors and multiple consultants, which can't be rated HS but only marginally satisfactory because of its duration and shortcomings in coordination, but resulted in a good quality document despite the complexity of the project. There was some confusion and shortcomings in supervision before the completion of the MTR, but subsequently supervisions were carried out at regular six months intervals, and recognized by stakeholders as very effective in providing the necessary guidance and follow-up.

6.2 Borrower performance

Rating

Preparation

HS S U HU

Government implementation performance

HS S U HU

Implementation agency performance

HS S U HU

Overall

HS S U HU

Considering the challenges and cultural revolution the implementation of this project implied from MINEF, in spite of all difficulties and shortcomings encountered throughout the various stages, Recipient Performance is rated Satisfactory.

Annex 7. List of Supporting Documents

1. Global Environment Facility Memorandum And Recommendation of the Director of the Central Africa and Indian Ocean Department of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to the regional vice-president for a proposed grant from the global environment trust fund in the amount equivalent to SDR 4.1 million (US\$6.0 million) to the Republic of Cameroon for a biodiversity conservation and management project.

Part I: Memorandum and Recommendation - March 24, 1995 -

Part II: Technical Appendix

2. République du Cameroun Ministère de l'Environnement et des Forêts: Rapport de la Mission d'Evaluation à mi-parcours du PCGBC (5 décembre 1997 au 31 mai 1998) 69 p

3. République du Cameroun: Plan de Gestion de l'Environnement au Cameroun – Etudes Sectorielles - Conservation , Gestion et Valorisation de la Biodiversité et des Ressources Forestières. septembre 1995

4. Republic of Cameroon Ministry of Environment and Forestry - UNDP - National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan November 1998.

5. World Bank Supervision Mission Reports:

- 8th SPN (10/30/1997)

- Interim support mission (July 28, 1998)

- 9th SPN (November 23, 1998)

- 10th SPN (May 6, 1999)

- 11th SPN (November 4, 1999)

- 12th SPN (May 8, 2000)

- 13th SPN (November 6, 2000)

- 14th SPN (August 6, 2001)

- 15th SPN (January 11, 2002)

- 16th SPN December 9, 2002)

6. Programme de Conservation et de Gestion de la Biodiversité au Cameroun – Audit Technique et leçons apprises - Pauwel De Wachter, Mai 2003

7. République du Cameroun- Ministère de l'Environnement et des Forêts – Programme de Conservation et de Gestion de la Biodiversité au Cameroun – Secretariat Exécutif – Rapport d'Achèvement préparé par le Gouvernement du Cameroun – Yaoundé juin 2003.

Additional Annex 8. Recipient's Project Completion Report

REPUBLIQUE DU CAMEROUN
Paix-Travail-Patrie

MINISTERE DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT
ET DES FORETS

REPUBLIC OF CAMEROON
Peace-Work-Fatherland

MINISTRY OF THE ENVIRONMENT
AND FORESTRY

**PROGRAM FOR CONSERVATION
AND MANAGEMENT OF BIODIVERSITY IN
CAMEROON**

EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT

IMPLEMENTATION COMPLETION REPORT

Prepared by:

THE GOVERNMENT OF CAMEROON

Yaoundé, June 2003

Introduction

The Program for Conservation and Management of Biodiversity in Cameroon (PCGBC), initially entitled the GEF/Biodiversity and Conservation Management Project, is a pilot program supported by two World Bank-administered Grant Agreements (with the Global Environmental Fund (GEF) and the Netherlands' Directorate General for International Cooperation (DGIS)), to which bilateral financing from such agencies as the *Fonds d'Aide et de Coopération* (FAC), the German *Bundesministerium für Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung* (BMZ), the Worldwide Fund for Nature (WWF) and Netherlands Development Organization (SNV) is attached. Negotiated in 1994, the project actually commenced in 1996 after becoming effective on May 22, 1995. The closing date for the Grants, initially set at December 31, 1999, was extended three times for the GEF and once for DGIS, to March 31, 2003. This report summarizes the status of the program's execution and presents the main lessons learned from its implementation.

Recapitulation of project objectives

Project objectives

The objectives of the project are: i) to support the efforts of the Beneficiary, i.e. Cameroon, to preserve and manage its biological resources; ii) to promote the participation of rural populations in the preservation of biodiversity; iii) to encourage the rational use of renewable natural resources and to promote sustainable and ecologically viable development in areas adjacent to protected areas.

Description

The description of the objectives contained in Parts A, B, C and D may be consulted in Annex 2 of the GEF Grant Agreement N° TF 28673 CM.

1. Assessment of project objectives, design and implementation, and lessons learned

1.1 Assessment of objectives

The program's objectives are relevant and perfectly compatible with the Cameroonian government's strategy in the area of biodiversity conservation and management, which is based upon: i) integration of local populations into the management of natural resources, which is extensively covered in Law N° 94-01 dated January 20, 1994 concerning the regulation of forests, wildlife and fisheries; ii) a concern with development and sustainable management of Cameroon's forestry and environmental sector, as defined in the National Forestry Action Plan (*Programme d'action forestier national*, PAFN) and in the National Environmental Management Program (*Programme national de gestion de l'environnement*, PNGE); and iii) poverty alleviation efforts. Relative to the indicative timeframe for their implementation, these objectives were very ambitious.

The Program's intervention approach corresponds to the Government's strategic choices with regard to popular participation in decision-making (in that it promotes community participation) and to Government disengagement, by transferring the implementing role to local communities and NGOs, with government services focusing henceforth on the tasks of accompaniment, support and advice. This seems to be a more efficient way to manage available resources, allowing for a redefinition of responsibilities and paving the way for the decentralization and regionalization that have already begun in Cameroon.

1.2 Assessment of institutional functioning

The various consultative and coordinating bodies and structures (e.g. Steering Committee, Executive Secretariat, Local Site-Monitoring Committees (*Comité local de suivi de site* (CLSS), Site Management Committees (*Comité de gestion de site* (CGS), Wildlife Development Committee (*Comité de valorisation des ressources fauniques* (COVAREF), Union of Wildlife Development Committees (*Union des comités de valorisation de la faune* (UCVF), etc.) designed and introduced subsequent to the project's Mid-Term Review in order to achieve its objectives proved to be relevant, and the exchanges generated by partnerships developed under the program dispelled the misunderstandings and poor communication that had characterized the project's implementation at the time of its start-up.

The fact that the project's logframe was drawn up only after the 1998 mid-term review, and that production of its management manual was delayed until 1999, was an obstacle to proper control over project execution, and caused equally significant delays in implementation.

The project, initially placed under the Department of Wildlife and Protected Areas (*Direction de la Faune et des Aires Protégées*, DFAP), was given an Executive Secretariat for overall administrative and financial coordination of the Program, with flexibility in financial and technical management. The highest organizational body (the Steering Committee), grouping together all the Program's financial and technical partners, was established and its meetings are chaired by the Minister of the Environment and Forestry (MINEF). The primary mandate of this entity is, in addition, to set out broad guidelines, to examine and approve all action plans, annual budgets and implementation reports, and to ensure their coherence with national policies.

1.3 Status of implementation

Part A: Strengthening of MINEF's capacity at the national, provincial and local levels

1- The type of capacity-building that MINEF was to receive was not specified in any document, and very few MINEF executives received any training. One official from the Executive Secretariat received training abroad in modern monitoring/evaluation methods and techniques.

2- The MINEF departments involved in project implementation were strengthened in terms of equipment and data processing materiel. Project buildings were erected (in Yokadouma, Garoua, Ngatto, Foundong and Oku) or renovated (Regional delegation offices at Yokadouma, the National Herbarium, Bel Eland Safari Camp). Forestry posts or checkpoints were either built (at Mokoko, Ndongo, Mambélé and Ma'an) or renovated (at Moloundou and Ngatto). These infrastructures were equipped with a radio communications system and electric power generators (Mokoko).

3- A network of Geographic Information System (GIS) experts was created to harmonize methods, tools and design approaches among institutions. This network devoted much effort to establishing the Information System on the Biodiversity of Cameroon (SIBC), which now has a website (www.biocam.net). This structure replicates the substance of the database content existing at each project site, thereby enhancing the national and local capacity for collecting and disseminating information on the conservation and utilization of biological resources.

4- An environmental education program was designed and developed at the project sites:

Campo Ma'an: a poster illustrating the process of establishing community forests; a school-oriented comic strip entitled "Oveng in Lékié"; two calendars depicting "Treasures of the Campo-Ma'an Technical Operation Unit" (*Unité technique opérationnelle*, UTO) and "Achievements of the Campo-Ma'an Project"; an appointment book for 2003 (15,000 copies) geared to the general public and containing environmental messages; and information brochures about the management of annual forestry fees. South-East: two outreach publications -- the "Jengi Newsletter" and the "Lobéké Voice". Mount Koupe: informational billboards and signs in several villages adjacent to project sites. Savannah region: initiatives on the part of the local NGO, CAPEN (*Conseil agro-pastoral et environnemental*) were supported, particularly in connection with field trips for elementary and high school students, worldwide environment days, and the publication of the Kilifoori Bulletin, a school quarterly covering such subjects as brush fires, poaching and wildlife.

5- Auxiliary game wardens (*gardes forestiers d'appui*, GFA) were recruited and deployed in the field at

Campo Ma'an (25) and in the South-East (26). GFAs and MINEF officials at the South-East project site received training in such modules as conflict management, mediation, project management, and the use of Global Positioning System (GPS) and cyber-tracker technology. Sixty-five (65) community forestry guards at the Savannah project site were trained in anti-poaching techniques, environmental monitoring and community outreach. MINEF employees at the same site received training in the participatory management of natural resources, as well as several refresher courses.

6- An integrated system of planning, monitoring/evaluation and computerized analytical accounting, based on the program budget approach, was developed and put in place at the Executive Secretariat with technical support from the World Bank. Quarterly monitoring/evaluation reports and twice-yearly joint (World Bank/MINEF/other administrations) supervision reports were produced on a regular basis and distributed to the Government and all actors.

PART B: Strengthening of Biodiversity-related Research

1- The Program enabled the Cameroon National Herbarium (*Herbier national du Cameroun*, HNC) to acquire modern tools; to resuscitate its partnerships after eleven years of inactivity; to publish a number of articles in well-known journals (e.g. the Kew Bulletin); and to make data on Cameroon's flora available on the Internet. With the support of the PCGBC, publication of the "Flora of Cameroon" series resumed with the issuance of Volume 34, vol. I "Orchidaceae". This support also made it possible to prepare, with financing from the Central African Regional Program for the Environment (CARPE), Volume 35 vol. II "Orchidaceae", Volume 36 vol. III "Orchidaceae" and Volume 37 "Dichapetalaceae", which appeared in 2001. Thanks to the HNC's efforts during program implementation, Cameroon has since 2000 been an ex-officio member of the International Botanical Congress, with voting rights on modifications to the Code of Botanical Nomenclature. The HNC has improved its capacity to collect, process and disseminate data on biodiversity. It has also created a website to serve a worldwide audience.

2- The collection, analysis and dissemination of data on the distribution and status of animal diversity, and the development of baseline biological data for purposes of improved wildlife management, were carried out entirely by the implementing agencies responsible for the bio-ecological studies, since the component that had initially been assigned responsibility for the zoological studies (i.e. the Institute of Zootechnical and Veterinary Research, IRZV) was non-functional due to some institutional problems.

3- The socio-economic studies performed at all project sites were documented and enhanced the understanding of the lifestyles and traditional rules of local populations, with a view to organizing them for the exploitation of biological resources.

PART C: Enhanced protection and management of protected areas in the priority project sites

1- All baseline biological and socio-economic studies were carried out and documented. The resulting data is stored in the project sites' databases and is available on the program's newly-created website (<http://www.biocam.net>).

2- The development plan for the Bénoué National Park and its surrounding area was drawn up in a participatory manner, validated and approved in August 2002 by the Minister of Environment and Forestry. Four plans (for the Campo-Ma'an, Faro and Lobéké National Parks and for the Mokoko Forest Preserve) are currently being finalized.

3- The official proceedings creating the National Parks of Campo-Ma'an and Lobéké were published in the Official Gazette.

PART D: Support to priority project sites

1- Mount Kilum-Ijim Reserve component

- a) The Kilum-Ijim Forest was entirely demarcated in cooperation with administrative and traditional authorities, and a management strategy, embodied in a proposed zoning consisting of a Floral Sanctuary and some community forests, was put in place.
- b) In order to ensure the harmonious coexistence of all actors, a boundary line between field and forest -- the so-called “farm-forest boundary”-- was defined and put into practice. A number of grazing enclaves and corridors for domestic livestock movement were also demarcated within the forest. Seventeen agro-forestry and soil conservation demonstration farms were established in order to provide a visual illustration of the best techniques identified. Indigenous species (e.g. *Prunus africana*, oil palm and raphia palm) were proposed for agriculture and reforestation. Fruit tree orchards, including the technique of grafting, were promoted. In order to modernize apiculture, Kenyan “top bar” beehives were introduced.
- c) A qualitative inventory of forest flora was drawn up, thus producing a checklist of species at Mount Oku, as well as reports on the phenology of key tree and shrub species, birds, squirrels and climate.
- d) In addition to outreach campaigns organized for local populations, training was provided to populations and MINEF officials in connection with the establishment of community forests.

2- Mount Koupé Forest component

- a) The boundaries of the Mount Koupé forest were entirely demarcated by a 5 m wide corridor serving as a border, and were flagged by means of markers placed at 500-meter intervals. The 26.5 km distance was planted with *Draceana* spp, a species traditionally used to delineate fields. In addition, the Project helped draw up proposals for the creation of two protected areas on the summits of Mount Koupé and Mount Bakossi, with community forests on the slopes.
- b) Following the project’s outreach campaigns, village bodies were set up, trained, and are henceforth handling oversight, ecological monitoring, and alternative and/or income-generating activities: e.g. apiculture, low-input crop production, snail farming, safe water supply, ecotourism, etc.
- c) The bio-ecological studies carried out on Mount Koupé substantially enhanced the knowledge of flora and fauna. They resulted in the discovery of new plant species, e.g. a new coffee bush (*coffea montekupensis*).
- d) In order to involve the population in resource management and boost awareness of the importance of biodiversity, the project developed and implemented a program of environmental education. Thus, ‘village resource persons’ were selected to work with project officials on ecological monitoring, the delineation of the ‘farm-forest boundary’ and other activities. These individuals are conduits for the flow of information between the project and the communities.

3- Mount Cameroon component

- a) Knowledge of the flora and fauna of the forests of Etinde, Mokoko and the Onge region was enhanced and perfected by the studies and biological inventories performed. In the area of botany, a reference herbarium is now operational, and a database created using the BRAHMS (Botanical Research and Herbarium Management System) software is available and already includes over 30,000 of the region’s species. An ecological monitoring system has been set up.
- b) The program of community consultation has been expanded, and local and provincial commissions for participatory land use planning have been established. This is a partnership model that improves information-sharing, thus alleviating local tensions among stakeholders with an interest in land. Planning and decision-making methods that bring all actors together were developed and several levels of planning were differentiated.
- c) The project helped develop the Zoning Plan for the South-West Province, which sets out the broad outlines of land occupation, along with a definition of the boundaries of all types of utilization (e.g. Mokoko and Bomboko Preserves, and the sanctuaries (2) and community management zones of Bakingili and Bimbia-Bonadikombo.)

- d) The management plan for the Mokoko Forest Preserve was drawn up in a participatory manner and based upon agreements regulating forest access and utilization.
- e) The demarcation, delineation and actual creation of essential buffer zones and other boundaries was not entirely finished. However, joint surveillance of forest utilization and hunting was instituted, and agreements were signed between the local MINEF and the population, stipulating the roles and responsibilities of both sides. These agreements, which are still informal, empower communities to seize illegal products and turn them over to the local MINEF.
- f) The program of environmental outreach and education was expanded to communities in zones adjacent to the Etinde and Mokoko forests.

4- Campo-Ma'an component

- a) A number of conservation activities were carried out: i) twenty-five (25) auxiliary game wardens (*gardes forestiers d'appui*, or GFAs) were recruited by MINEF and trained in environmental management, communication techniques and the use of Global Positioning System (GPS) technology; ii) directional and informational signs were erected around the borders of the UTO and at the entrances to the Campo-Ma'an National Park; iii) five (5) checkpoints were built and/or improved, including the community forestry post in the village of Nkoélong; iv) barricades with guard houses were built at the Park's entrances by the logging company *La Forestière de Campo* (HFC) in accordance with specifications agreed upon with MINEF; v) overpasses intended to facilitate the movements of animals were also installed along the road traversing the Park.
- b) The necessary biological studies were completed, and four (4) species of sea turtle were recorded (hawksbill, leatherback, green, and Olive Ridley). Outreach campaigns were mounted and aimed at artisanal fishermen, the populations of villages with beaches where egg-laying occurs, and schools located along the coast. In connection with these activities, several turtles were sponsored, tagged and returned to the sea. With the help of the project, turtle eggs were also gathered and incubated and the hatchlings released into the sea.
- c) The socio-economic studies carried out in the project area made it possible to assess current modes of resource utilization and to envisage improved practices that would enhance the standard of living of the region's population. Thus, a number of village-level cacao producers' organizations are now active after having received training in techniques of negotiating with buyers. This has enabled them to substantially increase the selling price of their product, which has risen from CFAF 60/kg to CFAF 160/kg.
- d) The in-depth forestry research studies were not carried out. They are prescribed, however, in connection with the implementation of the Master Plan (*Schéma Directeur*), and in order to lay the foundation for managing multiple use zones for sustainable lumber production.
- e) Three types of village-level micro-projects were set up in the Akom II region in order to improve living conditions for the local population. They are: oil palm seedling nurseries, fish ponds installed by communities with a view to supplying local agro-industrial firms, and eco-tourism activities developed in the village of Ebodjé. A center was built for this purpose by the local population with support from the project. Various activities (e.g. fishing, canoe trips, forest and beach excursions, etc.) are offered to visitors and simple accommodation has been developed.
- f) An ecological monitoring program has been developed and implemented. It is based on a new participatory approach of 'pooled expert opinion' and is yielding satisfactory results compared to existing techniques.
- g) In order to better coordinate conservation and development activities, a Technical Operational Unit (*Unité Technique Opérationnelle*, UTO) was created and a Master Management Plan (*Schéma directeur d'aménagement*) drawn up on the basis of a new zoning scheme derived from that used for the 1995 *Cameroun Forestier Méridional* project. In 2000, the Campo-Ma'an National Park was created and designated as one of the offsets for environmental damage caused by construction of the Chad-Cameroon oil pipeline. Details of its management are described in the management plan, a draft of which is currently being finalized.

5- Savannah Ecosystem component

a) The Regional Development Plan, to be drawn up in connection with the Master Management Plan for the Sudano-Sahelian Zone, is turning out to be one of the main mandates of the Ministry of Economic Affairs, Programming and Regional Development (MINEPAT), which produced a Regional Management Plan. MINEF's contribution to the finalization of this document entails the production of a Sectoral Management Plan setting out the general principles of conservation and proposals for the use of space within the project's zone of intervention. This contribution is not yet available. However, a series of thematic maps has been prepared, and in particular a land utilization map and a map showing zones of conflict. Proposals for the creation of three (3) UTOs, each comprised of a National Park and its surrounding hunting areas (*zones d'intérêt cynégétique*, ZIC), are under preparation.

b) Ways of involving adjacent populations in resource management were tested. In this connection: i) a Co-Management Agreement (*Convention de cogestion*) was negotiated in 2002 between the populations of ZICs 1 and 4 and the northern office of MINEF. These ZICs were initially managed under State control of by MINEF. This Agreement sets out rules for land occupation, natural resource management, recreational hunting, the sharing of hunting revenues, and the joint management of the Bel Eland Safari Camp. ii) Community-managed hunting areas (*zones d'intérêt cynégétique à gestion communautaire*, ZICGC) with the status of protected areas, were classified as being for the benefit of the populations of Doupa and Voko/Batandje. Sixty-five (65) persons native to these two zones were selected by their community, trained and equipped by the project as Community Forestry Guards (*gardes communautaires*), in collaboration with MINEF and the Garoua Wildlife School (*école de faune*). These community forestry guards are made available to MINEF, with which they collaborate closely on anti-poaching efforts and ecological monitoring, while being primarily responsible for protecting their zones. iii) Innovative and income-generating conservation-related activities (e.g. agricultural intensification, market gardening, village nurseries, eco-tourism, improved stoves, beekeeping, etc.) were developed by populations with the support of the project. At the project's initiative, 105 groups were created around these activities, of which 60 were mixed-gender groups, 30 were women's groups and 15 men's groups. In 50% of cases, the population organized itself into a legal entity (e.g. economic interest group (GIC), association, etc.). iv) Since the 1999/2000 hunting season, the government has decided to re-lend 50% of its tax-derived revenues to adjacent populations (40% to the relevant communes and 10% to communities adjacent to ZICs for carrying out social welfare works). The other 50% are deposited in the public treasury. The Project has therefore endeavored to organize communities around this tax. The sums thus obtained have served mainly to build desks and purchase instructional materials for schools, as well as equipment for health posts and other socially beneficial works.

c) A radio communications network was established between MINEF's Provincial Delegation and the conservation stations of the three National Parks of Bénoué, Boubandjida and Faro. All entrances to the Bénoué National Park were equipped with barricades and guard houses, and signage was improved. The checkpoint at Ex-Djaba was refurbished and the Bel Eland Safari Camp renovated and equipped by the Project. In addition, several buildings at MINEF's Northern Provincial Delegation were rebuilt and new offices built and equipped. Each year, paths and concrete pads inside the Bénoué National Park are maintained.

d) Studies of the distribution, ecology and status of the Western Black Rhinoceros were carried out under the project. One specimen was even tracked, caught and fitted with a radio transmitter. The animal was unfortunately killed by poachers. Other searches were recently conducted out by WWF without success. A national coordinator of rhinoceros research was appointed by MINEF, however, in 2002. Apart from the rhinoceros, three elephants were tagged and fitted with radio collars. With data obtained by GPS, maps of the elephants' movements between the Bénoué and Boubandjida National Parks were created and serve as a basis for the management of these pachyderms, particular as regards the monitoring and control of human/elephant conflicts.

6- South-East component

a) In order to better coordinate its core public service tasks and activities associated with sustainable resource

use in the South-East zone (comprised of three protected areas and their surrounding zones), the Government created the South-East UTO in 1999 with project support. This unit represents an important accomplishment for conservation, given the complexity of coordinating all of MINEF's field-level services and activities, the overlap of a number of conservation areas over several administrative units, as well as the great distance separating the Provincial Delegation of Bertoua and the Departmental Delegation based in Yokadouma.

The building housing MINEF's Departmental Delegation was refurbished and equipped, as were the forestry posts of Moloundou and Kika. Six (6) project bases were also built and equipped. In addition, a VHF radio communications network was installed and is operational at the various surveillance posts (Yokadouma, Ngatto, Manbele, Moloundou, Ngoïla, Salapoumbe, Njembe, Kumela, Ndongo and Kika). This network also serves the surveillance posts in the neighboring countries in the context of the Sangha Tri-National Conservation Area. Fixed and moveable surveillance barricades were created and 26 GFAs recruited and trained for anti-poaching efforts.

b) Baseline studies were performed, as were a number of specific studies, and particularly some zoological inventories in the ZICs and in certain ZICGCs. Biological studies in four (4) Forest Management Units (*unités forestières d'aménagement*, UFA) near the Lobéké National Park were carried out in order to identify the biologically important sites for purposes of drawing up management plans for the UFAs.

With regard to the migrations of large mammals observed, on the one hand, between the regions of Boumba-Bek /Nki and the Dja Wildlife Preserve, and cross-border exchanges with Gabon's Minkébé Preserve and Congo-Brazzaville's Odzala National Park on the other, a cross-border conservation effort is in the process of being set up with a view to creating a Tri-National Conservation Complex. A second cross-border development has already taken shape with the creation, in 2000, of the Sangha Tri-National Conservation Area. According to this eco-regional vision, the national parks of Lobéké (in Cameroon), Sangha-Ndoki (in the Central African Republic) and Nouabale-Ndoki (in Congo-Brazzaville) are linked together into a single protected area of 7,750 km², surrounded by 21,000 km² of multiple-use zones. Joint cross-border patrols are organized every three months by the three countries.

In the context of conservation efforts, certain joint activities were also formalized through collaborative agreements. One such case is the Mambélé Agreement signed on June 8, 1999, instituting a platform for collaboration between MINEF, local populations and hunting guides for the exploitation of wildlife. Another example is the Yokadouma Agreement of December 1999 between all forest users and hunting guides, the MINEF, WWF and the *Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit* (GTZ), for the purpose of organizing anti-poaching efforts.

In order to ensure balanced development of the ecological, economic and social functions, the draft Zoning Plan of 1995 was updated. Proposals were made for the classification of three national parks and twenty-two (22) UFAs in the district of Boumba and Ngoko. The classification of ZICs, ZICGCs and community forests was also proposed. In the updated zoning plan, the national parks henceforth serve as a genetic reservoir for the usage areas, and, by the same token, the UFAs, ZICs and ZICGCs can be regarded as a safe haven, or buffer zone, around the national parks. The essential protected zone of Lobéké was elevated to the status of national park in March 2001, with the distinction of having a multi-use zone designated within it for the adjacent populations. The paperwork concerning the designation of the essential protected zones of Boumba-Bek and Nki as national parks is currently awaiting the Prime Minister's signature. To date, fourteen (14) ZICGCs have been created, of which five (5) are actively managed by village organizations termed 'village wildlife management committees' (*Comités villageois d'aménagement des ressources fauniques* (COVAREF)). Three (3) community forests are also slated to be designated as being for the benefit of the Communes of Gari-Gombo, Yokadouma, and Moloundou. Ten (10) villages have submitted requests for community forests.

d) After collaboration and negotiations in the field, the boundaries of the UFAs, ZICs, ZICGCs and Parks were defined. Management Plans (for some) and simplified management plans (in the case of others) are currently under preparation.

1.4 Lessons learned

From the institutional standpoint

- 1- The Project configuration that was put in place at the time of start-up was not sufficiently conducive to its effective operation, or to that of MINEF, due to its failure to take its environment into account at the design stage. The project's operational mechanisms put in place following the mid-term review brought about the desired changes and streamlined the roles and responsibilities of all parties involved in implementation. Indeed, the project's elevation in 1998 to the status of Program, and the creation of new collaborative and coordinating bodies (e.g. the Steering Committee, CLSS, CGS, etc.) gave the project an appropriate management framework involving all partners in the process, and particularly the beneficiary populations, economic operators and donors.
- 2- The fundamental principles of decentralization, Government withdrawal from implementing functions, and partnership among all actors at all levels of Program implementation, constitute the cornerstone of success, ensuring a certain degree of follow-up and sustainability for the actions undertaken.
- 3- The semi-independent position of the Executive Secretariat in relation to the Ministry's organizational chart, and the Program's managerial flexibility due to the existence of a special program account at the Autonomous Amortization Fund (*Caisse Autonome d'Amortissement, CAA*), have greatly contributed to its dynamism and to the efficacy of its interventions.
- 4- The staff of the Program has derived maximum benefit from the various training and outreach sessions provided during the implementation period.
- 5- The introduction in 1999 of rewards (i.e. bonuses) for staff loyalty has made it possible to maintain and improve the levels of enthusiasm and performance observed.

In terms of physical implementation

- 6- The identification and formulation phases of the Program's various projects did not account sufficiently for the time required for the participatory process and for the large volume of work involved in the studies and in the elaboration of management plans. For this reason, some objectives of the components proved too ambitious, particularly in the Savannah and South-East priority sites, which contain several protected areas. In addition, the time required to draw up Master Management Plans and management plans for all the national parks, as well as simplified plans for the surrounding forest management units, was underestimated in terms of the schedule and available human resources.
- 7- The activities of the implementing agencies and MINEF delegations at the priority sites did not always start at the same time, due to the staggered effectiveness dates of the various financings. The project started in 1995 with neither a logframe nor strategic plan, and without a management manual, a situation that necessitated an ad hoc style of management. These distortions caused problems in developing intervention strategies and in coordinating operations, which were, in addition, unsynchronized from the start of the Project. Attempts to harmonize the approaches entailed several changes to the planning and reporting scheme that those responsible for the components did not always find easy to implement. However, the introduction of a monitoring/evaluation system and analytical accounting at the level of the Executive Secretariat, with technical support from the World Bank, finally stabilized these changes.
- 8- The quarterly monitoring/evaluation missions led by the Executive Secretariat and the joint twice-yearly supervision missions conducted by the World Bank and the Executive Secretariat, served as good guides for Program management.
- 9- Matching funds earmarked for implementation were not always commensurate with the activities to be carried out, and they were often released after considerable delay. This made it impossible to proceed in a timely manner with budgeting and operational planning, aside from the fact that many of the collaborative bodies (e.g. CLSS) at the provincial level were not organized.
- 10- There is no exchange of information between MINEF and the implementing agencies regarding the

management of counterpart funds and of the funds specific to the partners, although this would have made it possible to gauge the efforts put forth by those involved in Program execution.

11- The participatory approach at the grassroots level afforded certain marginalized groups (e.g. women's groups, Pygmy groups, etc.) an opportunity to integrate themselves into community life and to benefit from interventions developed by the Program and the Government, through the payment of 50% of the tax on timber exploitation (*taxe d'affermage*) and game hunting fees (*taxe d'abattage*). The operations of the village committees that were organized around these taxes gave community management a new impetus, by organizing elections and by renewing, through democratic means, the mandates of those responsible.

12- Communities that were beneficiaries of the Program's technical outreach (e.g. Doupa and Voko/Batandje in the Savannah region) learned to manage the implementation of development plans for their localities, and can thus take charge of their own affairs, with slight support and total assumption of responsibility.

13- Experience gained and lessons learned from implementation of the PCGBC are being taken into account in implementing the Cameroonian Government's other programs, such as the Forestry/Environment Sectoral Program (*Programme Sectoriel Forêts et Environnement*, PSFE) and the National Community-Driven Development Program (*Programme National de Développement Participatif*, PNDP).

2. Performance of the Beneficiary

2.1 Performance factors

The Cameroonian Government has taken official steps to create and organize the Program's new coordinating, collaborative and managerial bodies and has appointed the heads of those entities (i.e. Executive Secretariat, UTOs, CGS, CLSS, CGU, etc.). It has signed legislation creating new protected areas or assigning community forests to local populations. It has drawn up its National Strategy on Biodiversity. It has authorized collaborative workshops charged with drawing up management plans and has approved, by means of an official order, the management plan for the Bénoué National Park. Withdrawal and reimbursement requests have been submitted on a regular basis thanks to the dynamism of the Executive Secretariat and of the CCA.

The Government has also honored its commitments in connection with implementation of the Campo-Ma'an project, in particular by relinquishing logging concessions and other permits within the project's priority site, and by signing and adhering to clauses contained in the specifications agreed upon between MINEF and the logging company HFC.

All technical and administrative recommendations made by the various appraisal, mid-term review and supervision missions were implemented.

The Government, through MINEF, published and distributed to all national and international partners a number of informational documents on project accomplishments, experiences and lessons learned from Program execution. Among these are a summary document on project accomplishments during the 1995-2003 period (400 copies), videotapes (40 copies) and a brochure (200 copies).

2.2 Difficulties

- 1- The Program went through several Coordinators and the staff involved in implementation was not always the same, which created a certain instability in terms of administration and knowledge transfer.
- 2- Equipment (i.e. vehicles and data-processing equipment) was delivered with great delay, which caused problems in the execution of certain tasks.
- 3- The Program's staffing needs were not always fully met, since the Government was unable to recruit additional personnel while undergoing structural adjustment.

2.3 Lessons learned

- 1- The political and administrative authorities in most project sites proved to be open-minded, thereby establishing a climate of confidence that was crucial to the success achieved.
- 2- The inadequate motivation of MINEF's field agents was not indicative of great interest on their part.

2.4 Background of Program execution

The Program was implemented in a context of democratic openness and political stability and was solidly in line with the Government's policy of disengagement and poverty alleviation. In order to mobilize all of the country's human resources and all development partners around this policy, a Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper was drawn up with particular emphasis on community participation. This component was integrated into the Program as one of its intervention priorities.

2.5 Continuation of the Program

The Program's accomplishments are being exploited under the Forestry/Environment Sectoral Program (PSFE), and particularly under the latter's Component III. This is a Cameroonian Government Program established with the help of its development partners. Steps have already been taken for the start-up of this program and for the transfer of skills developed under the Project. Two other opportunities exist to take advantage of the conservation and participatory management efforts developed under the PCGBC: the National Community-Driven Development Program (PNDP) and the Heavily Indebted Poor Country (HIPC) Initiative, which are national intersectoral programs.

3. Performance of the World Bank

3.1 Performance factors

The World Bank, in its capacity as administrator of both Grants (GEF and DGIS), played a crucial role in steering the program. The mid-term review and joint supervision missions (of which there were 17 in all) provided good guidance and fresh impetus to the program. The World Bank team responsible for the project (Mr. Noël Chabeuf in Washington; and Mme. Clotilde Gomba, Mr. Laurant Debroux, Mme. Helene Ndjebet Yakana and Mme. Carole Megevand at the Resident Mission in Cameroon) greatly facilitated the processing of dossiers submitted by Cameroon to the Bank (disbursement requests, replenishment of the special account, reallocation of GEF and DGIS funds, non-objections, etc.). The Executive Secretariat benefited, via video-conference, from the World Bank Institute's training module on the "Planning of Project/Program Assessments".

The Program also benefits from three supporting missions: the first, led by Mr. Richard Senou, to pave the way for the installation of an accounting system; the second, by Mr. François Rantrua, for the design of the Information System on the Biodiversity of Cameroon (SIBC); and the third, by Luc Lecuit and François Rantrua, to set up the integrated monitoring/evaluation and analytical accounting systems.

3.2 Difficulties

- 1- The substantial delays in the Dutch Government's replenishment of the DGIS account in Washington sometimes had negative impacts upon the program's operations.
- 2- The program had three Task Team Leaders during its design and implementation phase.
- 3- The staff of the disbursement section in Washington underwent frequent changes, which caused variations in the way in which disbursement and reimbursement requests were processed.

3.3 Lessons learned

1- Disbursement and procurement procedures must be discussed and adapted in collaboration with all partners (donors, beneficiaries and implementing agencies) at the very outset of program implementation.

4. Conclusion

The program was executed satisfactorily, despite its ambitious and complex nature and the small number of difficulties associated with its implementation. It deserves to be continued with a view to finalizing and implementing the management plans, enhancing the partnerships established, and monitoring the increased assumption, by local populations, of responsibility for managing forest and faunic resources.

