



**INTERNATIONAL TROPICAL  
TIMBER COUNCIL**

**COMMITTEE ON  
REFORESTATION AND FOREST MANAGEMENT**

Distr.  
GENERAL

CRF(XLVIII)/4 Rev.1  
5 November 2014

Original: ENGLISH ONLY

FORTY-EIGHTH SESSION  
3-8 November 2014  
Yokohama, Japan

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**Ex-post Evaluation**

**PD 66/01 Rev.1 (F)**

**« Establishment of the Mengamé-Minkebé Transboundary  
Gorilla Sanctuary (MMGS) in the Cameroon-Gabon Border »  
(Cameroon)**

**Prepared by**

**Marc J. Dourojeanni (International Consultant)  
Etienne NKOMO (National Consultant)**

**Establishment of the Mengamé-Minkebé Transboundary Gorilla Sanctuary (MMGS)  
in the Cameroon-Gabon Border (Cameroon)  
Project PD 66/01 Rev. 1 (F)**

**DRAFT Ex-post evaluation<sup>1</sup>**

**Overall Executive Summary**

**1. Introduction**

An ex-post evaluation of the ITTO Project PD 66/01 Rev.1 (F) “Mengamé-Minkebé Transboundary Gorilla Sanctuary (MMGS) in the Cameroon-Gabon Border (Cameroon)” was conducted in June and July 2014 with a 10 days-long visit to Cameroon (July 2-10). A visit has been planned to Gabon<sup>2</sup>. A field visit to the execution site in Cameroon has been made (July 5-8). A large portion of the limits of the Mengamé Gorilla Sanctuary and of the proposed Kom National Park were visited.

The Project aimed at the protection of the gorillas and their environment in the Mengamé area of Cameroon, in collaboration with the Government of Gabon. Mengamé, in Cameroon, and Minkebé, in Gabon are densely forested areas reputed for the presence of exceptionally high density populations of gorillas and elephants among other endangered or rare species. The approved execution time was 24 months. The total budget approved for the Project was US\$ 968,091, being US\$ 770,751 provided by **Japan, Switzerland and USA** through ITTO and US\$ 197,340 as counterpart by the Cameroon Government. The Directorate of Fauna and Protected Areas of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry was the implementing agency with a contractual participation of the World Wildlife Fund (WWF-Cameroon).

The Project has been approved by the ITTO Council at its Thirtieth Session in June 2001. Full financing was pledged by the governments of Japan, Switzerland and USA at the Thirty-first Council session in November 2001. The Agreement regulating the implementation of the Project was signed on 24 April 2002 and the first disbursement of funds was made in September 2002. Four Project extensions were granted until June 2008 without additional funding by the ITTO Secretariat, based on official requests including proper justification with appropriate detailed work plan and budget. An acceptable version of the Project completion report was received in May 2011. The final financial audit report was received in January 2013. The Project has been presented as completed during the Forty-Seventh Session of the Committee on Reforestation and Forest Management on November 2013.

Despite the funding and the execution correspond exclusively to Cameroon, this Project was planned to have some outputs achieved also in Gabon. This country was to make a separate coinciding and coordinated Project proposal that has indeed been prepared (PD 145/02) but did not prosper. A pre-Project PPD 147/10 Rev.1 (F) was carried out in 2011 to develop a Project proposal somehow on line with the follow up of the Project PD 066/ Rev. 1 (F). This new proposal is the PD 663/12 (F) that so far has not been approved by ITTO, for the Gabonese component.

**2. Project facts**

The development objective of the Project was defined as “*to contribute to the development of an integrated approach for the protection of the forests with the conservation of the gorillas and the development of mechanisms to generate income opportunities for local communities*”. Two specific

---

<sup>1</sup> Conducted by Marc J. Dourojeanni (international consultant) and Etienne Nkomo (national consultant) with the assistance of M. Nziengui (ITTO Regional Officer based in Gabon).

<sup>2</sup> The Gabonese Embassy in Brasilia mistakenly emitted a visa with a validity ending before the arrival of the consultant. No solution to the problem was provided neither by Gabon’s Embassy in Yaoundé (Cameroon) nor the immigration authorities in Libreville (Gabon).

objectives were proposed: (i) “To initiate processes of community participation and awareness in order to conserve Mengamé Protection Forest Area (MPFA or ZPFM)” and; (ii) “To initiate a process for cooperation between Cameroon and Gabon for the joint management of the Mengamé-Minkebé Gorilla Sanctuary (MMGS or SGMM)”.

It was expected that the proposed Mengamé-Minkebé Gorilla Sanctuary may cover up to 122,400 ha in the Cameroon side and 137,500 ha in the Gabon side, forming an ecologically viable patch of forests still in natural conditions. Cameroon also planned a zone of influence including a buffer zone (ZPMF) of 513.000 ha in the region around the protected area.

Seven outputs were planned: (i) The ZPFM’s management structure is in place, (ii) MMGS’s management goals are shared by local population and other stakeholders, (iii) guidelines for management of production forests and others in the ZPFM are elaborated, (iv) trans-frontier cooperation structures is established (v) agenda definition and strategy building process is initiated, (vi) illegal activities in the MMGS are prohibited and poaching is reduced and, (vii) a project management plan for the MMGS is elaborated. Twenty-two activities were designed to achieve these outputs (see Table 1).

### 3. Findings

#### 3.1 Project results

The duration of this project implementation had lasted 104 months (September 2002 to January 2011) instead of 24 initially deigned. The project Completion Report was submitted in May 2011 and its final audit was received in January 2013. However it is important to point out that the effective project termination has been 2008 as no activity directly related to the Project has been realized after that year. US\$ 70,947 of the ITTO contribution was to be returned to ITTO in 2013, after submission of the financial audit.

As can be seen in Table 1 six out of 22 activities were not achieved. But, even considering carried out activities none of the five outputs, nor the two specific objectives or the development objective were attained. The activities that were carried out, including those made with adequate quality, were largely unsuccessful or had no follow up.

Two explicit or implicit pre-conditions of the Project were not fulfilled: (i) the establishment of coalescent protected areas in each side of the international limit and, (ii) the collaboration of Cameroon and Gabon to jointly manage the protected areas.

<b>Table 1. Achievements of the Project since initiation until its technical finalization</b>		
Product/Activity	Achievements 2002-2008	Comments
<b>Output 1.1 The ZPFM’s management structure is in place</b>		
• Staffing	Project Director, Technical Advisor, technical staff (biologist, accountant, social-economics affairs, secretary, GIS specialist, driver)	Staff has been in place since October 2003 or later. The Project Director and eco-guards were the first in place. Most appointments were late in the process.
• Headquarters (160 m <sup>2</sup> ) & herbarium	Not done	This small building was never built. The headquarters operated in a rented house for a while.
• GIS	Done	It was installed and operative for a while. Products are unknown.
• 4 guard posts	Not done	The posts were never built.
• Equipment	A 4-wheel drive truck, 4 radios, SIG equipment, computers, camping material, electric generator (mostly purchased in 2003)	During the first two years the vehicle’s Project has been provided by the Government. No equipment is left over.

<b>Output 1.2 MGS's management goals are shared by local population and other stakeholders</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sensitization planning</li> <li>Seminars &amp; workshops with local authorities and villagers</li> <li>Socioeconomic research</li> </ul>	The work to raise awareness and sensitize local policy makers as well as villagers has been intense over the period (2003-2007).	Over 200 meetings with villagers and others. However, much interference compromised the work that has not been continued.
<b>Output 1.3 Guidelines for management of production forests and others in the ZPFM are elaborated</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regulations for logging</li> <li>Directives for participatory management in buffer zones</li> </ul>	Prepared in 2006 No specific document available. Directives are included in the management plan.	The regulations are quite good and, in theory, accepted by some logging enterprises.
<b>Output 2.1 Trans-frontier cooperation is established</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordination meetings between Cameroun and Gabon officers to establish</li> </ul>	Most meetings, workshop and other actions planned were carried out (2003-2007). Two workshops were particularly important (Sangmelina, 2004 and Oyem, 2005) to elaborate an anti-poaching strategy.	However, the Gabonese side did not develop its part of the agreements or strategies nor the planned twin ITTO Project.
<b>Output 2.2 Definition &amp; launching of a Cameroun/Gabon strategy for the SGMM.</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft strategy and national validation workshops</li> </ul>	A draft was produced with Gabon's staff participation.	No validation workshops. Gabon's abstention to approve it.
<b>Output 2.3 Illegal activities in the Sanctuary are prohibited and poaching is reduced</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building of 3 control posts</li> <li>Capacitation of 30 eco-guards</li> </ul>	Not done Training was carried out for 15 Cameroon's eco-guards	These posts could have been built in the Cameroon side. Not for Gabonese guards.
<b>Output 2.4 Trans-frontier cooperation is established</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Multi-resources inventory</li> <li>Special studies about elephants and gorillas</li> <li>Ornithological study</li> <li>Study about non-timber products</li> <li>Study about aquatic biota</li> <li>Study on ecotourism potential</li> </ul>	Done in 2006 Done in 2006 Done in 2006 Done in 2006 Done in 2006 Done in 2006	The studies were not published or divulgated. All these reports were made under agreement with the WWF. They are of sufficient quality for a first management plan. Some reports are much more wildlife resources inventories or census than comprehensive ecological studies.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Management plan for the MGS</li> </ul>	Done as a draft only for Cameroun's side, in 2007. It was validated at local level in 2007.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>International workshop for management plan validation</li> </ul>	Not done	

However some unexpected results were achieved during and after effective project termination (see Table 2), including the establishment of the Mengamé Gorilla Sanctuary in 2008 however much smaller than as previously planned. The Cameroon Government is currently planning significant investments in this area: a director and 22 eco-guards are in place, its management plan is ready for approval, a headquarters will imminently be built and an operational budget for the Sanctuary is considered for 2015.

<b>Table 2. Achievements not included as original Project's outputs or attained after its technical termination and their limitations</b>	
Establishment of the Mengamé Gorilla Sanctuary (2008)	A pre-condition of the Project was the establishment of a large protected area in the Cameroun side, under the name of Mengamé Gorilla Sanctuary. It was decided to establish two separate protected areas: (i) the Mengamé Gorilla Sanctuary (27,723 ha) and the Kom National Park (67,838 ha).

	However, until today only the first was established.
New draft management plan for the MGS (2014?)	On the basis 2007 draft a new actualized and specific management plan for the MGS was prepared and validated at local and national level. It is waiting for approval by the MINFOF and expected for this year.
Documentation (draft decree) for the establishment of the Kom National Park (2008)	The decree is since 2009 in the Prime Minister's office. No official reason has been provided for the delay.
Regularization of the eco-guards as permanent MINFOF staff (2009-2014)	This has been an important step as previously they were contractual without any stability. Today 20 eco-guards serve in the ZPFM.
New <i>Conservateur</i> (Director) of the MGS (2010)	From 2009 to 2010 the <i>Conservateur</i> & Director of the Project has been located in Yaoundé. A new professional <i>Conservateur</i> is in place since 2010 but based in Sangmelina.
GEF/UNDP TRIDOM Project provided a new 4-wheel drive truck for use in the ZPFM and limited funding (2012-2014) for poaching control.	This Project oriented to poaching control is near ending and had limited impact in the region. The vehicle provided is the only that is partially available to the MGS.
Approval of a Manual of Procedures for the financing of micro-Projects (2005)	This has been quite an extraordinary initiative approved by the Directors Committee of the Project in 2004 and ratified in 2006.
Establishment of a Provincial Commission for the selection of micro-projects to be financed (2006)	In 2008 the Provincial Commission approved 6 projects including chicken production, sheep management, production and distribution of plantain bananas in villages along the limits of the MGS.
Establishment and operation of a Special Revolving Fund and Account to manage the funds for micro-projects (2008)	The Directors Committee approved the use of around US\$60,000 for these projects aiming at improving living conditions and the economy of local villagers. With Project's ending this initiative was lost. Most micro-projects failed due to lack of technical assistance.
Instauration of a 50 FCA F/ha/year voluntary contribution by forest concessionaires (2005)	Interesting initiative that was accepted by some forest enterprises to contribute to improve economy and quality of life of villagers around the MGS. This money was to be used through the mayors of the villages. Between US\$ 25-30,000 were collected and used for small infrastructures such as wheels. This practice has been discontinued.
Demarcation of a portion of the MGS (2009)	The western portion of the Sanctuary (20 km) has been demarcated in the field with active participation and individual agreement of concerned villagers. This essential task has been interrupted and not continued over the remaining 21 km. The demarcation has included the opening of a path line but no permanent marks were used. Today these limits are again covered by vegetation.
Every member of the government and large sectors of the society are aware of the gorilla issue and of the MGS	The Project through its Directors Committee, its international and many national meetings has often been in the press and it contributed to inform and raise public awareness on the issue of transboundary conservation especially with regard to gorillas and elephants.
Headquarters of the MGS in Oveng may be built in 2014	A CFA F 150 million budget has been allocated for this infrastructure and a public bidding has already approved an enterprise.
Staff may receive equipment in 2015	The so much needed equipment for the eco-guards has been budgeted and may be purchased in 2015.

### 3.2 Assessment of project design

The Project proposal contained all elements and requisites that are usual in such documents, including a clear strategy or project rationale, definition of executing and collaborating agency, costs and also an appropriate logical framework. However, searching for an explanation to the poor project results some aspects may be highlighted (more are mentioned in the full report):

- 1) There was not a clear correlation between the development objective and the two selected specific objectives and budget allocation. The specific objectives somehow excluded the matter of income generation for the villagers that is highlighted in the development objective (... and the

*development of mechanisms to generate income opportunities for local communities*). This fact has been a source of criticisms. It is obvious that this aspect was the essence of a future Phase II but as the second phase never took place it looks as if the Project planned disproportionately high investments in studies and almost “*nothing for people*”. Indeed, out of a budget of almost one million dollars only US\$22,500 (2.3%) was originally allocated to the output “*MMGS management goals are shared by local people and other stakeholders*”.

- 2) Many comments were made about the proportionally high cost of the studies -subcontracts- included in the Project. These studies were, beyond doubts, indispensable. However, they represented (output 1.3 and 2.4) 32.6% of the total cost of the Project and 41% of ITTO's contribution.
- 3) The non-fulfillment of the implicit pre-Project conditions had a strong influence on the Project, especially the establishment of the protected areas. However, the lack of participation of Gabon cannot be used as excuse for the bad results of the Project in Cameroon.
- 4) The real difficulties to install the Project in the field seem not to have been enough considered in project design. Oveng, the nearest “large” village near the proposed Sanctuary offered absolutely no conditions to receive the project staff. The obstacles decurrently of the isolation explain most of the delays in field activities. Also the projects failed in assess the cultural condition of the local populations that made it very difficult to develop the sensitization/awareness component of the project.
- 5) The budget distribution and the real costs of each activity were probably under-estimated. In addition the Project suffered a strong impact of the dollar devaluation that took place during execution.
- 6) Compensations for wildlife damages in crops -even being small amounts- were not included among project's costs.
- 7) The assumptions for success made in the logical framework depend very much on direct or indirect political willingness of concerned authorities of Cameroon and Gabon. The actions directly depending on political willingness were the establishment of the Mengamé Gorilla Sanctuary and of the Kom National Park, the participation of Gabon in the joint venture, approval of the management plan. But political will was also indirectly present in matters such as the building of the headquarters and the posts, the opportune liberation of budgeted funds, etc. Political will with regard to all these aspects seems to have been much below expectations. However to define political will is not easy as it assumes several forms and levels. It is also intimately associated with an extremely rigid and complex public administration that is often used as a pretext. The logical framework seems also to have underestimated the real dimension of the influence of the national bureaucracy on the success of the Project.

### **3.3 Project implementation**

Excepting for the enormous delays the project implementation has been as planned. The Directors Committee (Project steering committee) has been in place and met ten times during Project's life, annual operations plan were prepared every year, annual reports were produced, Cameroon delivered on time and in excess its agreed contribution to the budget, a mid-term review was made, the money management was correct, etc.

The commitment of the Government -especially the MINFOF- with the previously mentioned limitations, has been obvious. However other stakeholders such as many local authorities and especially the local people were and are not in favor of the Project concept. Most were indifferent and their only expectation has centered in rapid direct advantages. As soon as these benefits were not confirmed many of them turned to be against the Project. Others, especially villagers, consider themselves as victims of the project arguing that hunting is more difficult and that they are unarmed against the raids by gorillas and elephants in their agriculture fields.

Ownership is much more difficult to define in the context of this and its related projects (PD 145/01, PPD 147/10 and PD 663/12). Some interviewed persons consider that the project has had a top down approach. As a matter of facts the dominance of the large international environmental NGOs in the region is enormous. PD 66/01 had a strong influence of the WWF and this has been drastically

accentuated in the case of PD 145/01 (WWF), PPD 147/10 (IUCN) and PD 663/12 (IUCN and WWF). There is no doubt that their technical contribution is very important, may be indispensable under current circumstances. However it is advisable they develop a more participative and somehow discrete modus operandi.

The Project has been perfectly on line with ITTO's Objective 2000, Libreville Action plan and other policy and strategy instruments of the ITTO as well as with other international agreements regarding biodiversity conservation in the Congo Basin and elsewhere. However Project's contribution to these efforts has been minimal.

The quite consistent efforts of the Project staff to raise awareness amid local people were essentially infructuous. It may be a consequence of the style of sensitization developed, too much "emitter-receptor" style and focused in the "carrot and stick" model despite the Project had no "enough carrots" to offer. However, the main reason of failure has probably be the lack of continuity as well as frequent interferences of a rich and influential entrepreneur who wants to administer the Sanctuary to develop an ecotourism business. To control this situation the Project developed some actions that were not included in the original design, such as the establishment of a small revolving fund for micro-projects and the collection of a voluntary contribution from the logging enterprises acting in the influence zone to also contribute to small improvements in local public services. Both activities were promising but discontinued adding discontentment amid local stakeholders.

The studies made were of a good quality, certainly enough for the preparation of a management plan for the Sanctuary and to provide guidance for the forest management in the influence and buffer zone of the Sanctuary. However, as the management plan has not been approved nor applied, these important inputs are not yet being truly used. Considering that all these studies -essentially wildlife inventories- were prepared 9 years ago, their validity today is relative as this area has been submitted to heavy poaching and exploitation of resources.

Effectivity and effectiveness, considering the delays and its ending products, were obviously very low or nil. However, the administration of the funds has been correct and followed ITTO as well as Cameroon rules, as demonstrated by an independent audit.

Contrarily, there is hope for sustainability. Protected areas when legally established have reasonable possibilities of survival.

### **3.4 Conclusion about project implementation**

The Project has not been successful. Its outputs were all late and extremely limited if compared with what was planned to achieve. The problems it intended to solve when designed (2000) are all much worse today. The gorilla and the elephants and the ecosystem that support these species are much more endangered today than 14 years ago. The small and still unprotected Mengamé Gorilla Sanctuary is the only concrete result achieved.

However, it is also evident that today's situation would be even worse without this Project.

## **4. The situation today, new threats and opportunities**

As today the concrete achievements of the Project and their limitations are:

- 1) The Mengamé Gorilla Sanctuary has been established over 27,723 ha (21% to 40% of what has been planned). It is not managed, not demarcated nor well protected. However, as per evidence collected during the mission it still contains gorillas and elephants and other valuable species and its forests are still relatively intact. If effective protection begins soon the area may recover and become a asset for wildlife and in general for forest conservation as part of the TRIDOM concept.
- 2) There is a draft legal instrument for the establishment of the Kom National Park waiting for approval since 2009 in the Office of the Prime Minister. This area is still in good natural conditions and it is essential to complement the small MGS as to have a viable representative

- sample of the Cameroon portion of the Central African forest, as planned since 2000. In theory the MINFOF is providing some protection to the area through the eco-guards.
- 3) There is a well-trained *Conservateur* for the Sanctuary. However:
    - He is based in Sangmelina.
    - The only vehicle available to him pertains to the anti-poaching component of the GEF/UNDP TRIDOM program.
    - His responsibilities additionally cover the proposed Kom National Park and the 512,000 ha of the ZPFM as well as the anti-poaching control of the mentioned program.
  - 4) Twenty relatively well trained eco-guards are located in strategic locations around the Sanctuary and also around Kom area and the entire ZPFM. However:
    - They have no equipment of any kind except their uniforms. No vehicles, camping equipment, arms, communication nor GPS or photographic capacity to document their actions.
    - Non demonstrated accusations of corruption (complicity with ivory trafficking) against some of them are frequent.
  - 5) Local people and villagers are aware of the situation of the endangered species, of the existence of the MGS, of the legal risks of hunting prohibited species and are informed other conservation initiatives in place. However:
    - Their participation is almost inexistent and many of them are hostile to the initiative.
    - Their main objection is that they obtained no benefits from the Project.
    - The forest enterprises acting in the ZPFM were and probably continue to be much more positive with regard to the protected area proposal. They even made voluntary contributions. Pitifully, this initiative has not been continued.
  - 6) There is good technical baseline information on the Project area thanks to the studies developed by the WWF. However these were not published, are little known and as they are nine years old some of the information is already outdated, especially with reference to the big game census made.
  - 7) A management plan specific for the Mengamé Gorilla Sanctuary has been prepared and was submitted in 2014 to an ample discussion with relevant stakeholders. It is supposed to be approved soon by the MINFOF.
  - 8) The guidelines for the forest and buffer zone management are good and will be useful as soon as applied.
  - 9) The construction of a relatively large headquarters for the MGS has been budgeted, the work has already been adjudicated in a public bidding and it is expected that the construction enterprise may deliver the building in 2014.
  - 10) After the MGS management plan is approved it is expected that the next annual budget will allocate funds to equip the rangers and resources for management.
  - 11) Progress is arriving to the village of Oveng and to the region of Mengamé and Kom. A road (N9) is being paved to link Sangmelina with the Congo Republic, passing not far from the northern limit of the proposed Kom National Park and easing the access to Oveng. A railway is also considered to be constructed to pass even nearer the northern limits of both areas. Additionally, the road N17B that goes from Sangmelina to the frontier, passing through Oveng down to Aboulou, between Mengamé and Kom areas, may also soon be paved or at least improved. And, the road between Ebolowa and the Gabon frontier (N2) that passes not far from the western limit of the MGS is already paved and getting more and more traffic.
  - 12) The improvement of the highway N9 and especially the planned construction of a railway, in addition to promote regional integration, are related to the mining potential in the Congo Republic as well as in Cameroon. Mineral deposits were discovered in the area between the Dja National Park and the proposed Kom National Park and will be exploited by three large mining enterprises. But informal mining is already going on. Large scale agriculture has also been announced in the region, especially oil palm and rubber plantations.
  - 13) An investment by the Government is actively building a relatively large facility in Aboulou to promote frontier market in expectation of the improvement of the road including the building of



a bridge over the Kom River. This road has been the reason of the division of the initial proposal for a large protected area in two separate ones.

- 14) The most surprising recent event with regard to the officially established Mengamé Gorilla Sanctuary has been the inopinate opening of a new road cutting it in two pieces. This road has been constructed in 2014, not long before the visit of the ex-post evaluation mission. The work was carried out by the Ministry of Public Works with support of the Prime Minister's office.

## **5. Gabon's participation**

It is not clear why the Gabonese authorities did not follow up on their own initiative to establish the Minkebé Gorilla protected area in the limit with the proposed Mengamé Gorilla Sanctuary of Cameroon. A project has been prepared (PD 145/01) but it received no follow up after the ITTO Panel of Experts requested modifications. The specific objectives of this project (US\$1,373,504 of which US\$841,679 from ITTO) were very similar to the PD66/01. Instead, Gabon established in 2002 the large Minkebé National Park (757,000 ha) excluding the portion that has been considered for the Minkebé-Mengamé Gorilla Sanctuary. Otherwise this Park has no common limits with the protected area in Cameroon. Nine years after Gabon submitted the PPD 147/10 which was achieved giving place to the PD 663/12 that is under review. The objectives of PPD 147 and PD 663 are far more ambitious and pretend to establish ecological corridors among the protected areas in the forests of Cameroon, Congo and Gabon. The original idea about Mengamé and Minkebé is still present but under a much more general approach.

## **6. Lessons Learned**

- 1) Projects that include financing in protected areas management must be conditioned to their previous legal establishment ("gazettment"). It is not possible to have any precision on the date when a government will officially or formally establish a protected area. Therefore it is advisable not to develop projects that finance management or other development actions only on the basis of an offer or even of a formal compromise of establishment of new protected areas. Otherwise, the establishment of the protected area must be a condition for any project that intends to contribute to their management.
- 2) A different case is when the project is exclusively oriented to assist in the preparation of the documentation (scientific justification research, delimitation studies, public consultation, draft decree or resolution, etc.) necessary for the country to establish a new protected area. In such a case no investments must be included in protection, management or any other action not strictly related to the establishment and appropriate formal insurances of its future gazetting must be provided by national authorities.
- 3) Transboundary or bi-nationally managed protected areas, as well as international ecological corridors, are unquestionably necessary but their possibility of success is limited and very difficult to achieve. When ITTO accepted the commitment of promoting transboundary biodiversity conservation it entered in the most difficult and complex aspect of nature conservation through protected areas in tropical developing countries. In addition to the well-known growing difficulties to establish new protected areas everywhere, in frontier areas several factors make it even more difficult and complex. To invest in these projects requires a much more careful approach, longer time and higher costs than any other ITTO project made at a national level. In most cases undoubtedly more than a decade of sustained effort is necessary for such initiatives to make substantial progress towards their three goals: biodiversity conservation, community participation and development, and international peace and cooperation.
- 4) Projects related to protected areas with transboundary implications must not overlap actions in the neighbor country. Twin parallel projects are more appropriate. It is not realistic to have a national project spending money to achieve goals in another country, even if such money is an international donation. This has been the case of PD 66/01.
- 5) To have a well-controlled frontier does not require as pre-condition to have transboundary or bi-national protected areas nor joint management plans. This may be desirable but two adjacent well

managed protected areas will be as effective for poaching control. Even more, the collaboration at the level of protected areas's local staff and rangers will come alone, without national authorities meetings or international agreements.

- 6) Careful attention must be given to the implications of logistics in remote or isolated areas. This Project has been another example of the consequences of not taking enough into consideration the reality of the locality where the project must be developed.
- 7) The assessment of the socio-economic and cultural reality of the region must be well known and taken into consideration in project design. The sensitization effort to raise awareness among local people and villagers has not been successful mostly because it did not take into account the real situation of the population. Extremely low level of education, installed deception with regard to the Government, special cultural aspects and poverty condition were all underestimated factors. In addition the initial budget provision for this activity has been unrealistically small and despite more money has been utilized for this purposes it has not been sufficient. Also raising awareness and keeping information on date must be a continuous process that in the case of the Project begun late and has been abruptly abandoned in 2008.
- 8) Activities related to economic incentive programs should form part of project design. The inclusion of mechanisms to provide some tangible benefits or compensations to affected local population since the first phase of this kind of projects is essential. Revolving funds, as timidly intended in this Project because it was not initially included -it was planned for the second phase- are an important tool to captivate attention and good wills of the villagers and provide an opportunity to promote the message of long term conservation. However, their administration is costly and it is indispensable they have supervision and continuity.
- 9) Mid-term evaluations are always very useful tools. This Project demonstrated once again the relevance of realizing mid-term evaluations or reviews, especially when it is not starting or it is significantly delayed. Mid-terms reviews made by ITTO's own staff, such as it was in this occasion, are cheap and efficient.
- 10) Flexibility on Project deliverables should be allowed especially when currency fluctuations outside of the Project control significantly increase costs. Unexpected exchange rates particularly affected the Project's implementation. Project budget design should anticipate this and accordingly make provisions. Ten percent of the total budget could be held in reserve as a contingency fund, only to utilize if such fluctuations require, and with specific ITTO authorization.
- 11) Economic sustainability for protected areas is almost a dream, but it is possible to be partially achieved. As it is very well known almost no protected area in the world is self-sustained even if they generate massive tourism. They usually depend upon national or regional public budgets. However, their contributions to local economic development may be substantial, often much more than their annual costs or budgets. Tourism or eco-tourism potential is the most commonly mentioned alternative for protected areas direct or indirect financing. However, the inexorable condition to take advantage of this possibility is adequate tourism infrastructure (roads, public services, hotels, etc.) and a reasonable management of the protected area. These requirements may be taken in charge by governments, by private sector or by a combination of both. None of these conditions exists in the Project area. But they may progressively become a reality.
- 12) Political willingness or support and country's bureaucracy must be carefully evaluated and prudently considered in project design. This Project in particular rested too much, directly and indirectly, on political willingness in the two countries, as shown in its logical framework. And, as demonstrated by the facts, the lack of political support has been the cause of almost every not achieved result. As mentioned before the absence of political support did not come, in general, from the Forestry or Environmental branches but from higher levels of government or from other sectors.

As political will is difficult to separate from bureaucracy this factor must also be taken into account when expecting to realize actions in brief periods of time. Public budgets in developing countries are always insufficient and excessively rigid. However, budget cuts may happen in any moment disrupting planning. All these facts are well known and the only answer possible, in addition to be prudent in expected outputs, is to plan longer execution periods. Two years is too short.

## 7. Recommendations

### 7.1 Recommendations regarding the project and project's follow up

It may seem contradictory, but the first and most important recommendation is not to abandon the idea of having a complex of protected areas in both sides of the limits of Cameroon and Gabon, taking into consideration new facts and concepts, such as the proposal to establish international ecological corridors linking all TRIDOM protected areas.

The worldwide biological importance of the area is such that no effort must be disregarded to save an ecologically viable sample of it. Moreover if considering the impacts of new massive being installed in and around the area. It is a world's obligation to save it.

The main recommendations are:

- 1) A follow up for the PD 66/01 in Cameroon is still necessary. It could be a second phase or a new project that assists the country to effectively implant the Mengamé Gorilla Sanctuary and the Kom National Park if this is gazetted. Such a project must include the following elements:
  - Install and launch the management of the protected areas.
  - Renewal and enhancement of the sensitization program.
  - Management of the buffer zone of the protected areas.
  - Develop a set of demonstrative sustainable economic activities with villagers that are compatible with protected areas including wildlife management.
  - Active promotion of investments to facilitate ecotourism in the area.
- 2) The conditions for such a new operations should be:
  - The legal establishment of the Kom National Park (the MGS alone is not an ecologically viable sample as it is too small).
  - The prohibition of public use of the new illegal road opened inside the Mengamé Gorilla Sanctuary that must remain entirely under control of the MINFOF exclusively for service's use.
  - The official approval of the MGS management plan.
  - The building and equipment of the Oveng headquarters and the installation of the MGS staff in Oveng.
  - The demonstration of the budgetary provision for the MGS operations and for project.
- 3) The establishment of the Minkebé complement (Gabon) for the Mengamé Gorilla Sanctuary as originally planned is still highly desirable. It would be ideal that the Minkebé complement for the Mengamé Minkebé Gorilla Sanctuary be established as originally planned. If this requires technical assistance from ITTO it is worth to be done. The preconditions to approve such a project are similar to those mentioned for Cameroon, especially with regard to a legal instrument for the protection of the Minkebé area. Eventually it may be better to enlarge the existing Minkebé National Park to cover this area and to make it coalescent with the Mengamé National Sanctuary.
- 4) Another much more ambitious project (PD 663/12) is the intent to build ecological corridors within all protected areas included in the TRIDOM. This can be achieved, as proposed in the PD 663, as an international project executed by an agreed international agency to be developed with participation of the three countries. However, it may be advisable to develop it through three coordinated national projects to warrant national ownership and support. Even accepting that the ideal is to complete all proposed corridors only to make corridors in each country will already be a very important result.
- 5) The needs for similar projects in the future. The lack of success of this operation is by no means an argument to justify not continuing ITTO's contribution to the conservation of biodiversity in tropical forests. Projects dealing with existing or new protected areas and especially with those that are located coinciding with international boundaries are everyday more important. Most of what remain as natural forests in tropical countries is precisely located in remote frontier areas. Additionally the need of close collaboration among neighbor countries to jointly combat poaching, logging and other illegal extractive activities is evident. These coordinated actions are

also parts of the larger goal of establishing ecological corridors. These are the superior reasons that justify the consultant's recommendation to consider a follow-up project to the PD 66/01 in Cameroon and of parallel coinciding initiatives in Gabon.

- 6) The objectives of such future projects. The tropical forests biodiversity conservation objective of future similar projects must not be changed. As mentioned, issues that affected the PD 66/01 do not modify the urgent need of such projects.
- 7) Innovative approaches/designs for projects aiming at biodiversity conservation in TBCA. There is no much room for innovation in such a well-known matter. However, based in the evaluation of several similar projects of ITTO and of other agencies it is considered advisable to take into consideration the following suggestions:
  - No project must be approved if the protected area to be managed -or improved in any way- is not previously duly legally established (gazetted). If projects are of a transboundary nature the same rule would be applicable to both sides.
  - The only exception to the previous recommendation is when the project is limited to the realization of studies conducting to the establishment of new protected areas.
  - ITTO's participation in truly international projects -directly administered by an international organization, as in the case of the GEF/UNP-TRIDOM- must be conditioned to the same previously mentioned requisites.
  - ITTO's long experience in natural forest management, afforestation and reforestation, agroforestry and, especially, in community forest development can be more and better used in biodiversity conservation projects that pretend to manage protected areas buffer zones or ecological corridors. As a matter of facts this can be a very important contribution of ITTO to conservation efforts as buffer zones's population are at the origin of most management problems inside protected areas.
- 8) The organizational arrangements of the project in relation to the transboundary aspects. Transboundary issues must be discussed at two levels:
  - Practical operational local level -in situ- reuniting protected areas managers or rangers or appropriate police officers of both countries, without intervention of diplomacy;
  - Overall planning or coordination binational meetings. These last are essentially to provide political support to protected areas managers when involved in eventual joint field operations, such as required to combat poaching.Again, if so required by both countries studies may be carried out in adjacent areas of both countries but, in such an event, the project must be international in nature, conducted by an international organization under agreements with each country.
- 9) Follow-up and evaluation practices. There is nothing new to add to this question that has not been mentioned earlier:
  - Mid-term evaluations are extremely useful in relatively large projects, especially if their progress is not as planned. It is also cost-effective.
  - Not every large project that is unsuccessful requires an ex-post evaluation. The present ex-post evaluation only confirmed what was quite evident before making it.
  - As so often stated an ex-post evaluation loose effectiveness in proportion to the time elapsed since project termination. The PD 66/01 has been evaluated five years after its effective termination. It would be impossible to make this evaluation without the participation, as national consultant, of the former Project Director who is probably the only available memory of most of the process.

## **Annex : Terms of Reference**

### **Ex-Post Evaluation of ITTO Project on Biodiversity Conservation / Conservation Areas**

#### **I. Background**

ITTO is an intergovernmental organization established in 1986 to administer the provisions and operation of the International Tropical Timber Agreement (ITTA), particularly in the promotion of the conservation and sustainable management, use and trade of tropical forest resources through international cooperation, policy work and project activities.

The project that will be the subject of the Ex-post Evaluation is the following:

PD 66/01 Rev.1 (F):      Establishment of the Mengame-Minkebe Transboundary Gorilla Sanctuary (MMGS) at the Cameroon-Gabon border

The background information of the project is provided in Annex to the Terms of Reference.

#### **II. Purpose and Scope of Evaluation**

##### **A) Purpose**

The primary purpose of the evaluation is to provide a concise diagnosis of one project related to *Biodiversity Conservation / Conservation Areas*, through the establishment and management of a transboundary conservation area (TBCA), so as to point out the successful and unsuccessful outcomes, the reasons for successes and failures, and the contribution of the project towards the achievement of ITTO's Objective 2000, and to draw lessons that can be used to improve similar projects in the future. The evaluation should refer to the appropriate recommendations in the report on the Meta-Evaluation of previously evaluated ITTO projects [ITTC-JC(XLV/2)].

##### **B) Scope of Work**

###### **a) Analyze and assess for each project:**

1. The overall role and contribution of the project in light of sectoral policies, development programmes, priorities and requirements to achieve biodiversity conservation in the transboundary region concerned by the project implementation (Cameroon and Gabon).
2. The current status of biodiversity conservation within the project's area of influence, the effectiveness of the project's implementation and its effectiveness in promoting transboundary biodiversity conservation and sustainable management.
3. The contributions of the specific studies/surveys in various disciplines (biodiversity conservation and management, ecology, socio-economy, community participation, transboundary aspects, etc.) prepared by the project for the conservation and sustainable management in the project's area of influence.
4. The impact of project activities on the livelihoods of target populations in the area covered by the project implementation.
5. The effectiveness of dissemination of project results in both countries covered by the project implementation.
6. The overall post-project situation in the project's area of influence.
7. The unexpected effects and impacts, either harmful or beneficial, and the reasons for their occurrences.
8. The cost efficiency in the implementation of the project, including the technical, financial and managerial aspects, in relation to transboundary aspects.
9. Follow-up actions in order to enhance uptake of project results.
10. The project's relative success or failure, including a summary of the key lessons learnt; and the identification of any issues or problems that should be taken into account in designing and implementing similar projects in the future. The transboundary aspects

should be subject to a special assessment in both countries (Cameroon and Gabon), in relation to the failure to achieve the second objective of the project.

b) Provide a synthesis to:

1. assess the overall role and meaningful contribution of the project in achieving the biodiversity conservation in ITTO Producer Member countries taking into account ITTO's objectives, Libreville Action Plan, and Objective 2000.
2. assess the potential and actual contribution of the project to ITTO's TBCA work.
3. evaluate the overall impact on and relevance of the project for the environmental authorities, Executing Agency, the forest conservation sector and local communities being served and the countries concerned (Cameroon and Gabon).
4. evaluate the overall attainment of the objectives and assess the overall effectiveness of the project.
5. evaluate the overall appropriateness of the costs, cost structure and use of financial resources for the project implementation.

And make recommendations on:

1. the needs for similar projects in the future.
2. the objectives of such future projects.
3. innovative approaches/designs for projects aiming at biodiversity conservation in TBCA.
4. appropriate target groups, e.g. countries, government, organizations, forestry sector, local communities.
5. the organizational arrangements of the project in relation to the transboundary aspects.
6. follow-up and evaluation practices.
7. supplemental, alternative activities, processes, procedures, and/or follow-up programmes in the field of biodiversity conservation in TBCA, if appropriate.

### **III. Approach**

A) Composition of the evaluation team

The team will be composed of two following consultants who will work together: an international consultant as Team Leader and a local consultant. The assignment of specific tasks within the TOR will be left to the consultants based on their individual expertise. The Team Leader will be in charge of the final report and the presentation of the results at the Fiftieth Council Session in Yokohama, Japan, in November 2014.

B) Consultation during evaluation exercise

The team will maintain close liaison with ITTO and will carry out its work in close cooperation with the concerned project Executing Agency and Governments (Cameroon and Gabon). Although the team should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned all matters relevant to its assignment, it is not authorized to make any commitments on behalf of ITTO.

C) Activities and report of the team

The work required in this evaluation will consist of:

1. Desk review of project-related documents and materials provided by ITTO.
2. Missions in Cameroon and Gabon. The evaluation team will visit the project's Executing Agency headquarters for a further desk review of project materials and to carry out evaluation work in connection with the Executing Agency. The mission shall also include a field visit to the project's area of influence in order to review field implementation and to evaluate the project results and impacts, and should include discussions with project stakeholders and target beneficiaries. Within a period of two weeks, a minimum of one week is required for Cameroon due to the field visit of the project area, while 2 to 3 days can be used for meetings in Libreville, capital city of Gabon.

3. Preparation of an Ex-post Evaluation Report for the project in English or French in accordance with the Scope of Work, and format and the checklist contained in the ITTO Manual for Project Monitoring, Review and Evaluation.
4. Preparation of an Overall Executive Summary [see b) Scope of Work] of the ex-post evaluation report focusing on the overall assessment of the project's relative success in contributing to ITTO's Objective 2000 and Libreville Action Plan, summarizing the key lessons learnt.
5. Presentation of the Overall Executive Summary at the Fiftieth Session of the International Tropical Timber Council (November 2014, Yokohama, Japan).
6. Preparation of an article for possible publication in the ITTO Tropical Forest Update (TFU), in consultation with the editor, containing an overview of the projects and summarizing the lessons learned from the evaluation work. Appropriate high-resolution photographs should be provided.

In writing the Ex-post Evaluation reports, the team will have the opportunity to discuss its preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations with the representatives of the Executing Agency, Governments of Cameroon and Gabon, and ITTO Secretariat before the final version of the report is made. Responsibility for the final content of the reports, however, remains with the evaluation team.

#### D) Duration of the assignment

The duration of the assignment will be nine weeks for the international consultant as Team Leader, and four weeks for the local consultant (dealing particularly with Cameroon). Travel time for both countries (Cameroon and Gabon) to be visited will be approximately two weeks. The remaining time will be used for the preparation of the evaluation and report writing.

#### E) Proposed Work Schedule

- May – June 2014: Desk review
- July 2014: Missions in Cameroon and Gabon
- 07 Aug 2014: Submission of draft reports to ITTO Secretariat and to the Project Executing Agency, and Governments of Cameroon and Gabon, for comments and suggestions.
- 31 August 2014: Submission of both the full ex-post evaluation report and the overall executive summary to ITTO Secretariat.
- November 2014: Presentation of the findings, recommendations and conclusion of the ex-post evaluation of the project at the Joint Session of the Committees during the Fiftieth Council Session in Yokohama (Team Leader). Submission of the final version of the full ex-post evaluation report, taking into account the comments made by the delegates during the Joint Session of the Committees.

#### F) Proposed Consultants

- Dr. Marc Jean DOUROJEANNI, International Consultant (Cameroon & Gabon – 9 weeks)
- Mr. Etienne NKOMO, National Consultant (Cameroon – 4 weeks)

REPUBLIQUE DU CAMEROUN  
Paix-Travail-Patrie

-----  
MINISTERE DES FORETS ET  
DE LA FAUNE

-----  
SECRETARIAT GENERAL

-----  
DIVISION DE LA COOPERATION  
ET DE LA PROGRAMMATION

4690

N° \_\_\_\_\_ /L /MINFOF/SG/DCP/PPP/CEA1



BP : 34 430 YAOUNDE  
Tél : 22 23 92 28

REPUBLIC OF CAMEROON  
Peace-Work-Fatherland

-----  
MINISTRY OF FORESTRY  
AND WILDLIFE

-----  
SECRETARIAT GENERAL

-----  
COOPERATION AND  
PROGRAMME DIVISION

22 SEPT 2014  
Yaoundé Le,  
The

THE MINISTER

TO

Mr Emmaneul ZeMEKA  
Executive Director, International Tropical  
Timber Organisation (ITTO)  
Pacifico-Yokohama 5F, 1-1-1, Minato-Mirai  
Nishi-ku Yokohama 220-0012, JAPAN  
Tel:(81-45)223-1110 Fax: (81-45)223-1111  
Email: [itto@itto.int](mailto:itto@itto.int)

**Subject: MINFOF Response to ITTO Ex-Post Evaluation**

Sir,

I have the honour to forward our response to the Ex-post evaluation of the Project PD 66/01 Rev. 1 (F) "Mengamé-Minkebé Transboundary Gorilla Sanctuary (MMGS) in the Cameroon-Gabon Border (Cameroon)" that was conducted from July 2-10, 2014.

Kindly accept, Sir, the expression of my sincere regards.

**Attached:**

- Response document (4pages)



*Ngole Philip Ngwese*



REPUBLIQUE DU CAMEROUN  
Paix-Travail-Patrie

MINISTERE DES FORETS ET  
DE LA FAUNE

SECRETARIAT GENERAL

DIVISION DE LA COOPERATION  
ET DE LA PROGRAMMATION



BP : 34 430 YAOUNDE  
Tél : 22 23 92 28

REPUBLIC OF CAMEROON  
Peace-Work-Fatherland

MINISTRY OF FORESTRY  
AND WILDLIFE

SECRETARIAT GENERAL

COOPERATION AND  
PROGRAMME DIVISION

<b>Management Response to ITTO Ex-Post Evaluation</b>	
Project Title: Establishment of the Mengame-Minkebe Transboundary Gorilla Sanctuary (MMGS) at the Cameroon-Gabon Border (Cameroon)	
Project ID: PD 066/01 Rev.1 (F)	
<b>A) Overall Response to the Evaluation:</b>	
<p>Generally, Cameroon being a bilingual country and mostly dominated by French, it would have been preferable, that a French version of this report be made available for a large broadcast and wider reading audience. Nevertheless the report is worth commending, as in a limited time the evaluator succeeded to present an in-depth analysis of the situation of the project years after completion. The report was well structured, and the section of lessons learned and recommendations were well highlighted.</p>	
Evaluation Report Recommendations*	B) Response to recommendations (e.g. 'accept', 'partially accept' or 'reject' – please provide a brief explanation)
<p>Recommendation 1</p> <p><u>A follow up for the PD 66/01 in Cameroon is still necessary.</u> It could be a second phase or a new project that assists the country to effectively implant the Mengamé Gorilla Sanctuary and the Kom National Park if this is gazetted. Such a project must include the following elements :</p> <p>a. Install and launch the management of the protected areas (MGS and Kom)</p> <p>b. Renewal and enhancement of the sensitization program.</p> <p>c. Management of the buffer zone of the protected areas.</p> <p>d. Develop a set of demonstrative sustainable economic activities with villagers that are compatible with protected areas including wildlife management.</p> <p>e. Actively promote investments to facilitate ecotourism in the area.</p>	<p><u>Accept:</u> reason being that there are still unfinished activities that undeniable will warrant a second phase of the project for their completion.</p>
<p>Recommendation 2</p> <p><u>The conditions for such a new operations should be:</u></p> <p>a. The legal establishment of the Kom National Park</p> <p>b. The formal prohibition of use of the new illegal road opened inside the Mengamé Gorilla Sanctuary that must remain entirely under control of the MINFOF exclusively for service's use. A control must be established at its entrance.</p> <p>c. The official approval of the MGS management plan</p> <p>d. The demonstration of the budgetary provision of adequate counterpart funding.</p> <p>e. The installation of the protected areas authority in the Oveng headquarters that is to be built.</p>	<p><u>Accept:</u> Since it is equally the view of MINFOF under the framework of the Protected Area Emergency Action Plan elaborated in 2012 after the elephant killing in Bouba-Njida National park, to secure all protected areas especially of trans-boundary origin, and allocate more funding.</p>

<p><b>Recommendation 3</b>  <i>The establishment of the Minkebé complement (Gabon) for the Mengamé Gorilla Sanctuary as originally planned is still highly desirable.</i></p> <p><i>The previous recommendation is standing alone. However it would be ideal that finally the Minkebé coalescent protected area be established. If to do this requires technical assistance from ITTO we consider it is worth to be done. However the preconditions to approve such a project are similar to those mentioned for Cameroon, especially with regard to a legal instrument for the protection of the Minkebé area. Eventually it may be better to enlarge the existing Minkebé National Park to cover this area and to make it coalescent with the Mengame National Sanctuary.</i></p>	<p><u>Accept:</u> <i>without corresponding protecting measures on the adjacent protected areas in Gabon, will lead to increase human pressure on the wildlife in Mengame Gorilla Sanctuary, as the minkebe might serve as a haven for poachers to penetrate the MGS.</i></p>
<p><b>Recommendation 4</b>  <i>Another much more ambitious Project is the intent to build ecological corridors within all protected areas included in the TRIDOM.</i></p> <p><i>This can be achieved, as proposed in the PD 663/10, as an international project executed by an agreed international agency to be developed with participation of the three countries. However, it may be advisable to develop it through three coordinated national projects to warrant national ownership and support. It is important to remember that even accepting that the ideal is to complete all corridors; to make corridors in each country will already be a very important result.</i></p>	<p><u>Accept:</u></p>
<p><b>Recommendation 5</b>  <i>The needs for similar projects in the future.</i></p> <p><i>The lack of success of this operation is by no means an argument to justify not continuing ITTO's contribution to the conservation of biodiversity in tropical forests. Projects dealing with existing or new protected areas and especially with those that are located coinciding with international boundaries are everyday more important. Most of what remain as natural forests in tropical countries is precisely located in remote international frontier areas. Additionally the need of close collaboration among neighbor countries to jointly combat poaching, logging and other illegal extractive activities is evident. If, additionally the continuity of an ecosystem sample to be conserved overlap the boundaries it is logical that the coordinated establishment of protected areas in each country is highly desirable. Additionally, these coordinated actions also are part of the larger goal of establishing ecological corridors to maintain the genetic viability of species that migrates or that need very large areas to survive.</i></p> <p><i>These are the superior reasons that justify the consultant's recommendation to consider a follow-up project to the PD 66/01 in Cameroon and of parallel coinciding initiatives in Gabon.</i></p>	<p><u>Accept:</u> <i>Cameroon shared its boundary with six countries, five in the central Africa and one in west Africa. These boundaries are very enclave and porous and only project of international dimension can facilitate government action towards the protection of surrounding forest and biodiversity. More so, Government has taken certain international engagement relative to trans-boundary management of protected area under the banner of COMIFAC to increase its network of protected areas and strengthening sub regional cooperation in matters of biodiversity conservation.</i></p>
<p><b>Recommendation 6</b>  <i>The objectives of such future projects.</i></p>	<p><u>Accept</u></p>

<p>The tropical forests biodiversity conservation objective of future similar projects must not be changed. The issues that affected the PD 66/01 do not modify the urgent need of such projects.</p> <p>However, the objective of achieving bi-lateral or multi-lateral cooperation for the management of protected areas in international frontiers requires a different approach. It is definitively not advisable to develop a single national project including actions in two or more countries, as in the case of PD 66/01. Only coordination meetings may be included. The reasons not to have national projects handling activities in a neighbor country, as seen in the previous text, are multiple.</p>	
<p>Recommendation 7</p> <p>Innovative approaches/designs for projects aiming at biodiversity conservation in TBCA.</p> <p>There is no much room for innovation in such a well-known matter. However, based in the evaluation of several similar projects of ITTO and of other agencies we consider advisable to take into consideration the following suggestions:</p> <p>(i) No project must be approved if the protected area to be managed -or improved in any way- is not previously duly legally established (gazetted). If projects are of a trans-boundary nature the same rule would be applicable to both sides.</p> <p>(ii) The only exception to the previous recommendation is when the project is limited to the realization of studies conducting to the establishment of new protected areas. In such a case the investments must be strictly limited to the studies and to the preparation of the legal requisites for approval</p> <p>(iii) ITTO's participation in truly international projects -directly administered by an international organization, as in the case of the GEF/UNP-TRIDOM- must be conditioned to the same previously mentioned requisites.</p> <p>(iv) ITTO's long experience in natural forest management, afforestation and reforestation, agroforestry and, especially, in community forest development can be more used in biodiversity conservation projects that pretend to manage protected areas buffer zones or ecological corridors. As a matter of facts this can be a very important contribution of ITTO to conservation efforts as buffer zones's population are at the origin of most management problems inside protected areas.</p>	<p><u>partially accept:</u> new protected are being earmarked every day in the tropics for gazette, and if ITTO has to only select protected areas with legal status or limit their action to studies, this will not have a great impact on the country, since most of the difficulty faced by tropical countries especially Cameroun is in the phase of securing and developing the initial management plan of these areas. More so this must equally goes alongside with some socio-economic incentives for the local population.</p>
<p>Recommendation 8</p> <p>Appropriate target groups, e.g. countries, government, organizations, forestry sector, local communities.</p> <p>The situation of nature conservation in Asian and, especially in African tropical forests is absolutely critical. It is much more serious than in Latin America. Therefore, priority must be given to these continents. Inside Africa there in no doubts that the Congo basin tropical humid forests have absolute priority.</p> <p>Dealing with protected areas it is unavoidable to target governments. However, as it has been almost in every case with ITTO transboundary projects, the executing agencies were large international NGOs,</p>	<p><u>Accept:</u>Co-management should be the principle underlying protected area management in the tropics. Community based management approach should be the ideal.</p>

<p>especially the WWF and the IUCN. If the projects include buffer zones or deal with categories of protected areas that allow utilization of resources and human population inside, then the local communities become the obvious central target. However, as seen in the PD 66/01 much attention must be given to the forest users, as sound truly sustainable forest management is an excellent warrant for neighboring protected areas and even for endangered wildlife species in the managed forests.</p>	
<p>Recommendation 9 The organizational arrangements of the project in relation to the trans-boundary aspects.</p> <p>Trans-boundary issues must be discussed at two levels: (i) practical operational local level -in situ- reuniting protected areas managers or rangers or appropriate police officers of both countries, without intervention of diplomacy; (ii) overall planning or coordination binational meetings. These last are essentially to provide political support to protected areas managers when involved in eventual joint field operations, such as required to combat poaching.</p> <p>Again, if so required by both countries studies may be carried out in adjacent areas of both countries but, in such an event, the project must be international in nature, conducted by an international organization under agreements with each country.</p>	<p><u>partially accept</u>: this will equally depend on the nature of government or mode of governance of each country, whether centralized or unitary state or federal republic. In the former the local representatives must always consult the central government for any action. Hence organizational arrangements should be adapted to the country or national context.</p>
<p>Recommendation 10</p> <p>Follow-up and evaluation practices. There is nothing new to add to this question that has not been mentioned earlier:</p> <p>(i) Mid-term evaluations are extremely useful in relatively large projects, especially if their progress is not as planned. It is also cost-effective.</p> <p>(ii) Not every large project that is unsuccessful requires an ex-post evaluation. The present ex-post evaluation only confirmed what was quite evident before making it.</p> <p>(iii) As so often stated an ex-post evaluation loose effectiveness in proportion to the time elapsed since project termination. The PD 66/01 has been evaluated five years after its effective termination. It would be impossible to make this evaluation without the participation, as national consultant, of the former Project Director who is probably the only available memory of most of the process.</p>	<p><u>Accept</u></p>

Name, Title and Institution of Respondent: \_\_\_\_\_

Date, Signature: \_\_\_\_\_