

Integrated management of Cameroon’s forest landscapes in the Congo Basin GEF Project ID: 10287

Stakeholder Engagement Plan

This Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) was prepared as part of the process to develop the project titled “Integrated management of Cameroon’s forest landscapes in the Congo Basin”, a child project of the Congo Basin Sustainable Landscapes Impact Program (Congo IP). It was informed by an extensive process of stakeholder identification, analysis and engagement that spanned from the Project Identification Form (PIF) stage of project development through the finalization of the Project Document (ProDoc). The document aims to present the main project stakeholders, provide an overview of stakeholder consultations to date, and lay out a preliminary plan for stakeholder engagement during project implementation. Given the project’s focus on engaging indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLCs) in sustainable forest management (SFM), particular attention has been given to ensuring their participation in the project design process as well as the means to ensure their continued participation during project implementation. The SEP is intended to be updated at the start of project implementation to take into consideration any changes in the overall context of the project and will be implemented in an adaptive manner in accordance with official guidance as regards social distancing and based on communication and engagement needs.

Project context

This project seeks to strengthen the integrated management of Cameroon’s globally important forest landscapes in the Congo Basin to secure its biological integrity and increase economic opportunities and livelihoods for forest dependent people. As a child project under the broader Congo Basin Sustainable Landscapes Impact Program (Congo IP), it will address this challenge through the concurrent implementation of five project components over a six year period: (i) mainstreaming integrated land use planning (LUP) and management; (ii) improving management effectiveness and governance of high conservation value forests, and targeted interventions to protect their endangered species; (iii) advancing SFM through non-timber forest product (NTFP) and hardwood value chains; (iv) improving benefit generation from biodiversity through sustainable tourism development; and (v). Monitoring and evaluation (M&E), knowledge management (KM), and regional coordination .

The project targets Cameroon’s southern trans-frontier forest belt (7,904,952 ha), including the Cameroon segments of three transboundary forest landscapes: (i) the Campo Ma’an-Rio Campo (CMRC) landscape (769,446 ha), (ii) the Tri-National Dja-Odzala-Minkebe (TRIDOM) landscape (4,949,174 ha) and (iii) the Sangha Tri-National (TNS) landscape (1,490,552 ha) (Figure 6). These areas were identified as targets for the project based on their alignment with the GEF criteria for SFM landscapes, including their transboundary nature, their potential to contribute to transformation and multiple benefits, their high carbon storage values, the presence of globally endangered species, the presence of forest dependent IPLCs, and the presence of significant baseline investments in relevant sectors.

Given the thematic focus of the project to work with the government, civil society, and the private sector to progress SFM across the southern forest belt, the stakeholder engagement process will require consideration of a wide range of actors concerned with the integrated management of Cameroon’s forests at the local, national, and regional levels. These include government ministries and other public administrations; civil society, including IPLCs and their representatives; the private sector; technical organizations and partners; academic institutions; and other interested parties. Ensuring the stakeholder engagement process is gender inclusive and promotes the meaningful participation of target groups, notably IPLCs, is paramount to the project objective.

SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

Early stages of project development

Stakeholder engagement began in 2019 with a national dialogue to identify priorities for GEF 7. This was followed by a workshop in Mbankomo January 9-10, 2019 to launch the process to develop a child project under the Congo IP. The process continued during the PIF stage of project development. On February 20-21, 2019, the Ministry of Environment, Nature Protection and Sustainable Development (MINEPDED) organized a workshop in Mbankomo to improve understanding on the process to develop a PIF and progress the technical design of the project. A second workshop was held March 13-15, 2019 to review the project components and complete the PIF. The main stakeholder-related outputs of these workshops were: a draft Stakeholder Analysis; a preliminary identification of landscapes and sites for implementation of individual strategies; and preliminary lists of baseline projects and potential partners and co-financing by component. At the end of the participatory process carried out during the PIF stage of project development, the Congo IP, including the Cameroon child project, was submitted to the GEF Secretariat on April 9, 2019. It was approved by the GEF Council in their June 10-13, 2019, meeting.

ProDoc stage of project development

The objectives and methodologies for stakeholder engagement during the ProDoc stage of project development were laid out in a document entitled “Stakeholder consultation process for the development of the ProDoc for the Cameroon child project under the Congo Basin Sustainable Landscapes Impact Program”. The process built on the efforts made during the PIF stage and its outputs, including the preliminary Stakeholder Analysis. It included three main steps: i) a kick-off workshop to launch the ProDoc development process; (ii) national and local (or site level) stakeholder consultations; and (iii) a validation process. The outcomes of each step of the process were documented in a series of reports as detailed below.

Kick-off workshop

A kick-off workshop was held in Ebolowa from July 23-25, 2019 with approximately 67 participants, representing sectoral administrations (i.e., MINEPDED, MINADER, MINFOF, MINTOUL, and MINAS), national and international civil society organizations working in the environment sector, IPLCs, the private sector, local elected officials, universities and research institutions. The objectives of the workshop were to: (i) officially launch the ProDoc development process; (ii) increase the awareness of participants on the foundations of a GEF project and the Congo IP; (iii) increase understanding of participants on the Cameroon Project Concept and the ProDoc development process; (iv) review the project scope and focus, including objectives, strategies, outcomes, baselines and key targets; (v) collect observations and recommendations for the development of the project; and (vi) agree on an action plan for further development of the project, including draft processes for site selection, stakeholder engagement, and gender and safeguards requirements.

Among the main outputs of the workshop were the further identification of national stakeholders, including government institutions, the private sector, technical partners, and baseline projects. The workshop also contributed to the refinement of strategies and criteria for site selection, which were taken into consideration in planning for site level consultations. Finally, ToR were elaborated for the establishment of a Project Development Working Group (PDWG). Subsequent to the kick-off workshop a decision was made that the effective engagement of government stakeholders, one of the main objectives of the proposed PDWG, would be more effectively managed through inter-ministerial meetings and information sharing coordinated by MINEPDED. As such, the PDWG was not continued.

Additional details on the participants and identified stakeholders from the kick-off workshop can be found in MINEPDED's "*Rapport atelier de lancement du processus d'élaboration du document de projet de la composante Cameroun du Programme à Impact pour la Gestion Durable des Paysages Transfrontaliers du Bassin du Congo*".

National and local (or site level) stakeholder consultations

Following the kick-off workshop, a more in-depth process of stakeholder consultation was launched. To facilitate this process the Stakeholder Analysis was used to categorize each identified stakeholder into a set of groups based on their type and their potential interests and role in the project. For each category of stakeholder, an approach to consultation was identified and materials to support a gender responsive consultation process were developed. Among the groups and approaches/materials which were identified the following:

- National and local state actors (Interview guides + meeting)
- Civil society (Interview guides + meeting), including IPLCs (Questionnaires + meetings) and National/local non-governmental organizations (Questionnaires + meetings)
- Regional and international organizations, development partners (Interview guides + meeting)
- Private sector actors (Interview guides + meeting)
- National/international research institutions (Questionnaires + meetings)

National level consultations

National-level bilateral consultations were organized in Yaoundé and as relevant by phone for numerous national and regional level stakeholders (Table 23). Among the main aims of these consultations were to: (i) build understanding on the project and promote its appropriation by relevant actors; (ii) ensure project alignment with national priorities and policy frameworks; (iii) gather relevant technical inputs to the project design process; (iv) promote discussions on the project framework and risks, and a means to debate strategies for intervention; and (v) identify and develop potential partnerships, including aspects related to co-financing.

Table 1: Overview of stakeholders consulted as part of the national level consultation process.

| Stakeholder group | Stakeholders consulted |
|--|--|
| National and local state actors | Ministry of Environment, Nature Protection and Sustainable Development (MINEPDED), Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development of Cameroon (MINADER), Ministry of Territorial Administration (MINAT), Ministry of Defense (MINDEF), Ministry of Finance (MINFI), Ministry of Forests and Wildlife (MINFOF), Ministry of Economy, Planning and Regional Development (MINEPAT), Ministry of Tourism and Leisure (MINTOUL), Ministry of Justice (MINJUSTICE), Network of Parliamentarians for the Sustainable Management of Forest Ecosystems in Central Africa (REPAR) |
| Regional and international organizations, development partners | French Development agency (AFD), Funds for the Environment and Development of Cameroon (FEDEC), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), World Bank (WB), African Wildlife Foundation (AWF), International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), Zoological Society of London (ZSL), Sangha Tri-National Trust Fund (FTNS), World Wide Fund for Nature – Cameroon (WWF) |
| International research institutions | Congo Basin Institute (CBI), Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), University of California Los Angeles (UCLA), International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA) |
| Other | Conference on Dense and Humid Forest Ecosystems of Central Africa (CEFDHAC), National Institute of Statistics (INS), Forests and Rural Development |

| Stakeholder group | Stakeholders consulted |
|-------------------|--|
| | (FODER), African Aid Organization, Inc. (AFAID), Tropical Forest and Rural Development Association (TR-RD), Organization for Wildlife Conservation in Africa (OCFSA), JMN-Consultant, Taylor Guitars, Crelicam (ebony sawmill) |

Feedback received through the national consultation process was overall positive about the proposed project, particularly its focus on forests and community livelihoods, as well as gender and IPLCs empowerment and engagement. Stakeholders found these aspects of the project innovative and generally realistic considering existing dynamics in the landscapes. Technical partners also stressed the need to ensure clear synergies and avoid overlaps with ongoing field activities in the target landscapes. Specific landscape-related observations were also collected and used to further inform the local consultation process and the project development process (Table 24).

Table 2: Recapitulation of main feedback of national consultation process by landscape

| Landscape | Feedback |
|-----------|--|
| CMRC | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Importance of community livelihoods • Importance of strengthening various multi-stakeholder consultative platforms, including with civil society groups, conservation services, etc. • Need for capacity building of local stakeholder groups in NTFP value chains • Importance of critical analysis and solid arrangements for gorilla habituation project • Relevance of ecotourism development in Ebodjé • Need to strengthen transboundary initiatives between Rio Campo and Campo Ma'an |
| TRIDOM | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine clear geographical focus of activities and areas of engagement, especially given number of ongoing interventions, wide range of active partners, private sector actors, etc. • Avoid overlap with GEF 6 UNDP project, and build on possible synergies • Need for support for land use planning process • Discuss potential of technical partners in place to play an executing role (e.g., CBI/IITA, ZSL) • Support multi-stakeholder consultative platforms as well as platforms concerning indigenous peoples (e.g., ASBABUK-MINFOF) |
| TNS | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operationalize ASBABUK IP-MINFOF convention • Operationalize GRM • Invest in community livelihoods using Man & Nature Model for different NTFP • Consider addressing land use planning issues in UFA 023 & Russian mining comp with MINEPDED-MINFOF-MINER • Complementarity with FTNS support for LNP • Reactivate and reinforce Mambele convention |

Additional details on the national consultation process were recorded in a report submitted to MINEPDED in December 2019. All recommendations were considered in the design of the project, which includes significant investments in strengthening stakeholder platforms and NTFP value chains as prioritized by stakeholders.

Local (or site level) consultations

The local consultation process was organized around a series of simultaneous site visits to the three project landscapes between October 26th and November 2nd, 2019. The methodology used to carry out stakeholder consultation was participatory and transparent with the objectives to: (i) finalize short list of potential project sites; (ii) improve understanding on the potential project sites, including potential beneficiaries; (iii) build understanding on the project and promote its appropriation by relevant actors; (iv) discuss the project framework and risks, and debate strategies for intervention; (v) collect updated information and data to

inform project indicator baselines; (vi) discuss potential teaming arrangements and contributions to project implementation; (vii) examine possible synergies with other ongoing projects/activities on site; (viii) identify and hold meetings with vulnerable or minority groups to ensure their understanding of the project and solicit feedback, including any potential concerns or opportunities; (ix) ensure gender considerations are well understood and can be used to inform Gender Action Plan, including through the identification of gender-responsive activities; (x) document stakeholders' opinions, concerns and suggestions on the project, and ensure their views are being considered in the project's design and subsequent implementation; and (xi) preliminarily consult and inform stakeholders on safeguards issues (in anticipation of subsequent safeguards assessments).

WWF appointed Focal Points (FP) worked with the consultant team to develop appropriate consultation programs taking into consideration the vast area of the landscapes. In each landscape, the consultation process started with one day plenary meetings (in Campo, Lomié and Moloundou). Among the key groups of stakeholders that participated in these meetings were administrative authorities, institutional actors, local associations, IPLCs community representatives, international NGOs providing technical assistance to protected areas and private sector actors. The plenary meetings were followed in each landscape by one-on-one and small group meetings in and around Moloundou or Salapombe for TNS, Lomie or Djoum for TRIDOM, and in and around Campo Ma'an (Table 25). In each landscape efforts were made to meet with women's and indigenous people's groups or their representatives separately to encourage active participation in the process.

Table 3: Overview of stakeholders engaged during local (or site level) consultations

| Groups | CMRC | TRIDOM | TNS |
|--|--|--|--|
| Plenary meetings | Approximately 20 participants including local authorities, central and decentralized administration services, civil society, private sector, local communities, and indigenous populations | Approximately 40 participants including local authorities; public administration, including the local councils of Lomie, Messok, Ngoyla, and Mintom; civil society organizations, representatives of local associations, the private sector, and international development partners. | Approximately 50 participants including central and decentralized administration services, local authorities, civil society, private sector, local communities, and indigenous populations. |
| National and local state actors | MINEPDED, MINFOF (including conservation services of CMNP), MINADER, MINTOUL, Campo Council | MINEPDED; MINFOF; MINAS; MINAT; MINJUSTICE; councils of Lomie, Messok, Ngoyla, and Mintom; communes of Medoulou; Gendarmes; Police | MINEPDED, MINFOF (including conservation services of LNP), MINTOUL, MINADER, councils of Moloundou and Salapoumbé |
| Civil society, including IPLCs and national/local non-governmental organizations | Alliance, APED, BACUDA, BASS-PROTOMAR, EBOTOUR, PDCAM, Tubé Awù, PLATFERCAM | RACOPY, AAFEBEN, CEFAID, CIFED, COTRAMO CIERAD, CREDI, Nature Vision+, CEW, TF-RD, ASBAK, ASTRADHE, CAFT-Coop-CA, GIC CODENZOP, NGOMITRI, REFEDEM, Women's Network of Somalomo, RAFASO/AFAIRD | ASBABUK; community wildlife management committees (COVAREFs) numbers 1, 2, 3, and 10; community forest enterprises (CODDUMA, ASDEBYM, ADBAM, TO'OKPASSI, ASBAM and EMERDI); village committees (Kika-Socambo, Mambélé-Mbatéka , Mbangoe 2-Malapa Fleuve , Moloundourivière-Ndongo); Women Health |

| Groups | CMRC | TRIDOM | TNS |
|---|-------------|---------------------------|---|
| | | | Conservation Society: AAFFEBEN, CEFAID, CIFED, CIERAD, CREDI, Nature Vision +, Multifuncional Center of Mambele |
| International organizations, development partners | AWF, WWF | CBI, ZSL, WWF, IITA | WWF |
| Private sector actors | Jengi Tours | SIM (forest exploitation) | |

Feedback received through the local consultation process covered priorities, challenges, and opportunities related to each of the project's main intervention strategies and was used to inform project development (Table 26). Additional details on the local consultation process were recorded in three reports submitted to MINEPDED.

Validation workshop

A validation workshop led by MINEPDED was held in Mbankomo from March 03-05, 2021, with participants representing sectoral administrations (i.e., MINEPDED, MINFOF, MINAS, MINEPAT, and MINTOUL), public sector programs (i.e., PNDP, PADI-DJA, FEDEC), the Human Rights Commission of Cameroon, decentralized authorities, national and international CSOs, traditional leaders and IPLCs representatives. The objectives of the workshop were to: (i) continue to strengthen understanding of the Congo IP; (ii) present the results of the project development process; (iii) collect observations and recommendations on the core content of the project to finalize the ProDoc and associated products; (iv) reconfirm the commitments of partners; and (v) validate at the national level the ProDoc. The main output of the workshop was the validation at national level of the ProDoc for the Cameroon child project of the Congo IP.

Table 4: Feedback on project strategies by landscape and how it was addressed in project design

| Strategy | Priorities | Challenges | Opportunities | How project addresses concerns raised |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| CMRC | | | | |
| High value conservation forests/wildlife management | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve management effectiveness of CMNP - Manage wildlife-human conflicts - Address lack of GRM - Improve collaboration with the judiciary system - Improve transboundary coordination - Improve multi-stakeholder involvement in supporting wildlife management and its associated costs - Outside of CMNP, improve understanding of wildlife management regulations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increasing pressures on forests and wildlife due to increasing population pressure, land conversion, poaching, unsustainable practices, etc. - Insufficient capacity to manage threat from poaching - Lack of involvement of private sector in establishing sustainable wildlife management - Absence of collaborative framework with EG (e.g., little progress on MOU with Rio Campo) - Lack of clear legal framework and compensation mechanisms to manage wildlife-human conflicts and GRM - Need for awareness raising on legal regulatory texts on wildlife management - Lack of alternatives for marginalized individuals who are more likely to turn to poaching | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Important wildlife resources - Potential to generate employment and other benefits from ecotourism - Presence of technical partners to support improved management effectiveness in and around CMNP such as AWF and WWF | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project integrates strategies to improve management effectiveness of CMNP, notably through increased means of multi-stakeholder engagement, capacity development and transboundary cooperation - Project integrates strategies to develop alternatives to unsustainable resource use - Project includes development of GRM |
| Sustainable forest management | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of NTFP value chains - Improved land use planning and recognition of forest values and IPLCs rights - More harmonized transboundary regulation and improved transboundary collaboration | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Community forests have been abandoned or overtaken by other development initiatives - Threats to forests from land conversion and infrastructure & lack of transparency in decision-making processes that leads to questions on the consideration of local community rights - Need to harmonize laws, develop partnerships across the border with EG - Lack of sustained technical assistance to support the development of NTFP value chains, including the identification and selection of products with high enterprise development potential - Need for further development of commercialization of NTFP - Need for more support on labelling/certification of NTFPs - Need for more support for successful woman led, NTFP based initiatives - Need for capacity building in conflict management, guarantee funds to cover risks, financial management, legalities, etc. - Limited access to markets, in part due to poor infrastructure maintenance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Abundance of NTFPs. - Potential to provide sustained technical assistance, building on ongoing and previous work such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ AWF/Tropical Rainforest and Development in Nyete ▪ Forêts modèles and RAFM in UTO ▪ ICRAF, SNV, APED - Potential to develop MOUs between some key actors, such as HEVECAM and local communities - Potential to revitalize community forests in Ma'an and Akom II | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project prioritizes strategic development of NTFP value chains and builds on previous work in this area |

| Strategy | Priorities | Challenges | Opportunities | How project addresses concerns raised |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need to engage FMU operators and other private sector actors in regulations on the sustainable management of NTFPs - Inability to predict availability of some NTFPs, changes in production due to climate change | | |
| Sustainable tourism development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of inclusive and equitable tourism products, including gorilla habituation - Importance of zoonotic surveillance program to tourism development - Income generation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of returns - Poor infrastructure maintenance/road access - Weak organization and capacity of IPLCs, including local associations, to develop tourism despite ambitions to that effect - Failure of some previous tourism initiatives due in part to lack of sustained technical or operational assistance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PPP for ecotourism development currently under elaboration between MINTOUL, MINFOF and Jengi Tours - Established history of tourism at some sites and tourism products under development - Existing local associations supporting ecotourism development - Existing disease surveillance system and health program for key stakeholders | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project builds on existing opportunities and aims to establish increased income generation for IPLCs from sustainable tourism - Project integrates under Component 2 an output on strengthening disease surveillance and associated awareness raising - Project includes transboundary cooperation |
| TRIDOM | | | | |
| Land use planning | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land use planning is required to mitigate threats on protected areas and forest massifs - Important to improve recognition of rights and reduce conflicts | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Weak inter-sectoral planning - Development of agro-industries, dams for energy production and mining activities (and the associated infrastructures) - Local councils (communes) are not properly informed about legal land use planning processes and their roles - IPLCs are not informed about legal land use planning processes and their roles - A coherent land use plan is required for the entire TRIDOM - Unknown status of the GEF-6 UNDP TRIDOM project regarding land use issues - Synergies with the on-going gazettelement of TRIDOM transboundary biosphere reserve | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legal enabling conditions for sustainable land use planning in place - MINEPAT has already conducted preliminary missions to assess the situation regarding land use planning in each local councils (communes) - Natural capital mapping (e.g. carbon sequestration for climate change mitigation) is perceived as an effective mean to foster sustainable land use planning | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project will support natural capital mapping and accounting and builds on the work and frameworks established by MINEPAT to support integrated planning - Project will invest in raising understanding of stakeholders on land use planning - Project will support transboundary LUP cooperation |
| High value conservation forests/wildlife management | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase support to protected area management - Increase information to stakeholders on wildlife laws - Increase support to IPLC-based local associations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unknown status of the GEF-6 UNDP TRIDOM project that is meant to support wildlife and protected area management in the Cameroonian segment. - Poaching and other threats are acute and are not effectively managed because of the limited financial and technical support to wildlife and management | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing local associations involved in wildlife management - Presence of technical partners to support wildlife and | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Protected areas in TRIDOM were not retained on the project's short list for this project component. Despite significant levels of |

| Strategy | Priorities | Challenges | Opportunities | How project addresses concerns raised |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| | involved in wildlife and PA management | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of alternatives for poachers - Human-wildlife conflicts - Weak transboundary coordination | <p>management (AWF, ZSL, IUCN, WWF)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interest in understanding more the concept of a feedback and grievance redress mechanism | <p>threat protected areas in TRIDOM were not considered to meet all other project criteria. In particular, criteria related to co-financing and partnerships.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project integrates regional cooperation on addressing threats to wildlife |
| Sustainable forest management | Strengthening of NTFP value chains | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In general, lack of sustained support to strengthen on-going NTFP value chain initiatives - Lack of expertise to further development of storage, primary and secondary processing, packaging, and commercialization of NTFP - Lack of expertise to approach labelling of NTFPs - Lack of adequate training to ensure proper entrepreneurial skills are in place - Yearly/seasonally variability of NTFP availability and the lack of knowledge about the associated drivers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Abundance of NTFPs, potential for diversification - Strong market demand for NTFPs - Numerous past and on-going projects to support the development of NTFP value chains can provide critical lessons learnt and opportunities for synergies - Numerous existing local groups, local associations and small-scale enterprise developing NTFP value chains. Some groups engaged include Somalomo women association and Baka communities - Potential partnerships with private sector operators (e.g. logging company could facilitate NTFP harvesting through granting transport opportunities). - Agroforestry models have been developed | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project prioritizes strategic development of NTFP value chains |
| TNS | | | | |
| High value conservation forests/wildlife management | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Governance - Partnerships and benefit sharing - Wildlife-human conflicts | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Collaborative frameworks - Local and national advocacy - Developing alternatives to wildlife - Employment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wildlife resources - Active private sector (safari hunting outfits) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project will work to strengthen governance frameworks both for protected areas (i.e., |

| Strategy | Priorities | Challenges | Opportunities | How project addresses concerns raised |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Business contracts negotiations - Multi stakeholders' consultative platforms - Knowledge capacities wildlife inventories and establishment of hunting of quotas - Understanding of wildlife management regulatory texts - Development and implementation of simple management plans | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GRM in development - Biodiversity offsets - Awareness raising on legal regulatory texts on wildlife management | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Engagement of traditional rulers in management of certain wildlife conflicts - Presence of local services of technical ministries notably MINFOF - Potential of local wildlife enterprises - Institutional and technical backstopping from local councils and local NGOs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - LNP) and in other forest management units in their peripheries - Project will work with community hunting zones to raise capacity for sustainable management through formal agreements with equitable benefit-sharing - Project will support targeted actions to address threats to wildlife, including disease surveillance and building capacity for enforcement of environmental laws - Project will support regional cooperation in TNS |
| Sustainable forest management | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Partnerships and benefit sharing - Business contract negotiations with buyers and benefit sharing - Governance - Structuring of timber trade sector including markets - Management of cultivable agricultural lands - Best practices - Community forests network - Development and implementation of simple management plans | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Functional community forestry networks - Absence of collaborative framework - Local and national advocacy - Wood transformation technology and marketing - Food security - Biodiversity offsets - Employment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Abundance of NTFPs - Presence of local services of technical ministries and municipal councils to provide technical and institutional assistance, capacity building and follow up action - Active private sector (logging companies & safari hunting outfits) - Agro-forestry initiatives with exploitation of forest areas in community forests for agriculture (orchards, cultivation of vegetables etc.) - Intensification of cocoa production - Local entrepreneurs in cocoa sector - Availability local and national markets | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project includes initiatives to improve the governance of different types of forest management units, both through the development of NTFP value chains and in periphery of protected areas - Project will result in more formal agreements to address governance issues - Project will promote best practices and equitable benefit-sharing - Project builds on existing capacity and opportunities |

PROJECT STAKEHOLDERS

The table below summarizes the main stakeholders that were consulted during project preparation (PPG) and/or who will play a role in the project implementation. It also indicates the methodology for consultation or engagement.

Types of stakeholders

- Key Stakeholders: Have skills, knowledge or position of power to significantly influence the project
- Primary Stakeholders: Directly affected by the project / direct beneficiaries
- Secondary Stakeholders: Only indirectly or temporarily involved / indirect beneficiaries

Table 5: Stakeholder engagement matrix

| Stakeholder Name | Stakeholder Type | Stakeholder profile | LS concerned | Component concerned | Issues raised (during PPG) and how they were addressed | Role in project implementation, and/or Consultation methodology | Interest in the project/ Impact by the project |
|---|--|---|--------------|---------------------|---|--|--|
| <i>National and local state actors</i> | | | | | | | |
| Ministry of Environment, Nature Protection and Sustainable Development (MINEPDED) | Key Direct beneficiary and Lead Executing Agency | MINEPDED is the responsible ministry for the formulation, coordination and implementation of legislation, policies and programs on environment, forest and grasslands, protected areas, climate change, sustainable/green development, and ensuring inter-sectoral coordination on environment. It is also responsible for minimizing environmental degradation and pollution, and promoting the appropriate use, protection and restoration of natural resources. MINEPDED also hosts the GEF Operational focal point. | ALL | ALL | Led project design. Participated in consultation process at national level and in all three landscapes. Contributed to development of all project strategies. | Lead Executing Agency (EA) Chair of Project Steering Committee (PSC). Responsible for coordination with other ministries, other technical partners, NGOs, IPs, etc. via the Technical Advisory Group which will advise the Steering Committee. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |
| Ministry of Forests and Wildlife (MINFOF) | Key | MINFOF is the authority responsible for all forestry resources, which are | ALL | ALL | Participated in consultation process at national level and in all | Member of PSC. | Interest: High |

| Stakeholder Name | Stakeholder Type | Stakeholder profile | LS concerned | Component concerned | Issues raised (during PPG) and how they were addressed | Role in project implementation, and/or Consultation methodology | Interest in the project/ Impact by the project |
|--|------------------------|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|
| | Direct beneficiary | governed in accordance with the 1994 Forest Law. It is the main competent body for the implementation of the regulations on wildlife protection. Its Department of Fauna and Protected Areas is responsible for protected area management across the country. | | | three landscapes. Contributed to development of all project strategies. | Will lead or co-lead the coordination of Components 2, 3, and 4. Direct engagement with Regional Directions and/or other decentralized services of the ministry. | Impact: Potentially positive |
| Ministry of Economy, Planning and Regional Development (MINEPAT) | Key Direct beneficiary | MINEPAT is responsible for land use planning at the national level, public investments and the control and evaluation of development programs. | ALL, but in the context of this project mostly TRIDOM | 1,5 | The project design, including the elaboration of PLADDT, is in alignment with MINEPAT priorities as discussed during multiple consultations. | Member of PSC. Will lead the coordination of Component 1 on land use planning. Direct engagement with Regional Directions and/or other decentralized services of the ministry. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |
| Ministry of Tourism and Leisure (MINTOUL) | Key Direct beneficiary | MINTOUL is responsible for tourism within Cameroon. | ALL, but in the context of this project mostly CMRC | 4,5 | The project was designed in consultation with MINTOUL representative in Campo. Proposed strategies reflect the priorities of MINTOUL and the GoC as regards tourism development. | Member of PSC. Will co-lead the coordination of Component 4. Direct engagement with Regional Directions and/or other decentralized services of the ministry. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |
| Ministry of Social Affairs (MINAS) | Primary | MINAS is the ministry that deals with all matters relating to social issues in Cameroon and the specificities of population groups, in the context of the development of government projects. They are not responsible for consulting or conducting FPIC. It is the technical department that implements the initiative that is responsible for | ALL | ALL | Participated in consultation process in TRIDOM. Key stakeholder on issues pertaining to social development. | Member of PSC. Regular consultation by PMU with MINAS on project strategies. Direct engagement with Regional Directorates and/or other decentralized services of the ministry. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |

| Stakeholder Name | Stakeholder Type | Stakeholder profile | LS concerned | Component concerned | Issues raised (during PPG) and how they were addressed | Role in project implementation, and/or Consultation methodology | Interest in the project/ Impact by the project |
|---|------------------|---|---|---------------------|--|---|--|
| | | information and consultation. Also ensures that all sociological components are consulted, that their specificities are taken into account and most often helps to develop a social support plan and a dedicated development plan for the indigenous populations. | | | | | |
| Ministry of Territorial Administration (MINAT) | Secondary | Coordinates GoC actions on the ground through Divisional Officers. At the ground level, they are the one giving official authorization for any meetings organized | ALL, but in the context of this project mostly TRIDOM | 1, 5 | Participated in local consultations in TRIDOM. | Technical expertise and authority in LUP process. | Interest: Medium Impact: Potentially positive |
| Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development of Cameroon (MINADER) | Secondary | Mandate to prepare, plan and implement GoC programs relating to agriculture and rural development. Provides oversight to various value chains in the crop sub-sector; promoting food self-sufficiency and supporting agricultural development. | ALL, but in the context of this project mostly TRIDOM | 1, 3, 5 | Consulted as part of national consultation process. | Member of PSC. Engagement in LUP for TRIDOM. | Interest: Medium Impact: Potentially positive |
| Ministry of Mines and Technological Development (MINMIDT) | Secondary | Primary mandate is to promote systematic and scientific development of mineral resources of Cameroon through regulatory inspections of the mines, approval of mining plans and environment management plans to ensure minimal adverse impact on environment. | ALL, but in the context of this project mostly TRIDOM | 1, 5 | N/A | Member of PSC. Engagement in LUP for TRIDOM. | Interest: Medium Impact: Potentially positive |

| Stakeholder Name | Stakeholder Type | Stakeholder profile | LS concerned | Component concerned | Issues raised (during PPG) and how they were addressed | Role in project implementation, and/or Consultation methodology | Interest in the project/ Impact by the project |
|--|------------------|---|---|-----------------------|---|--|--|
| Ministry of Water and Energy Ministère de l'Eau et de l'Energiem (MINEE) | Secondary | Supervises the power and water sector in the country. | ALL, but in the context of this project mostly TRIDOM | 1, 5 | N/A | Member of PSC. Engagement in LUP for TRIDOM. | Interest: Medium Impact: Potentially positive |
| Ministry of State Property, Surveys and Land Tenure (MINDCAF) | Primary | Responsible for state property, surveys, and land tenure. | ALL, but in the context of this project mostly TRIDOM | 1, 5 | N/A | Member of PSC. Engagement in LUP for TRIDOM. | Interest: Medium Impact: Potentially positive |
| Other ministries: Ministry of Finances (MINFI); Ministry of Justice (MINJUSTICE); Minister of Public Works (MINTP); Ministry of Arts and Culture (MINAC); Ministry of Livestock, Fisheries and Animal Industries (MINEPIA) | Secondary | Various ministries with specific mandates designated by the GoC. | ALL | Dependent on ministry | N/A | Ministries will be involved in project based on relevance of mandates to project strategies. Numerous ministries may be involved in LUP process in TRIDOM, based on mapping of stakeholders. | Interest: Low Impact: Potentially positive |
| Regional and departmental technical services | Key | Regional and departmental representatives of different government ministries. Responsible for carrying out mandates of ministries at different administrative levels. | ALL | ALL | Various representatives participated in consultations at the landscape level. | Technical assistance of different departmental delegations will be involved in providing technical expertise to support the implementation of the project. They will be included in consultative processes within the landscapes and be targets for communication and knowledge management activities, | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |
| Sub-national administrations of regions and divisions | Key | Responsible for state administration at different levels. | ALL | ALL | Various representatives participated in consultations at the landscape level. | Important stakeholders in LUP process. Potential alignment with development priorities. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |
| Local administrations of municipalities and chiefdoms (villages) | Key | Responsible for administration at local levels. | ALL | ALL | Various representatives participated in | Important stakeholders in LUP process. Potential alignment with | Interest: High |

| Stakeholder Name | Stakeholder Type | Stakeholder profile | LS concerned | Component concerned | Issues raised (during PPG) and how they were addressed | Role in project implementation, and/or Consultation methodology | Interest in the project/ Impact by the project |
|--|---------------------------|--|--------------|---------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | consultations at the landscape level. | development priorities. Important to mobilize IPLCs stakeholders. | Impact: Potentially positive |
| Local councils (in particular councils of Campo, Somalomo, Lomié, Mintom, Ngoyla, Mouloundou and Salapoumbe) | Key | Administrative authorities at the levels of councils. | ALL | ALL | Representatives of local government were consulted | Administrative authorities over areas where project will intervene at the level of councils. Will be key stakeholders in component on LUP, as well as within other strategies. Meetings and consultations will be organized as needed. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |
| Conservation services of Campo Ma'an National Park and Lobéké National Park (LNP) | Key Direct beneficiary | Responsible as part of MINFOF for management of national parks in accordance with the laws and policies of Cameroon. Heavily dependent on external technical assistance and financial support. | CMRC, TNS | ALL | Participated extensively in consultations and development of strategies in and around CMNP and LNP. | Target project partners under strategies to improve management of high conservation value forests, undertake targeted actions to protect wildlife, recognize rights of IPLCs in protected areas and develop ecotourism value chain. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |
| INC (National Institute of Cartography) | Secondary | National state actor for cartography. | TRIDOM | 1 | N/A | Potential stakeholder for natural capital mapping and accounting. | Interest: Low Impact: Potentially positive |
| INS (National Institute of Statistics) | Secondary | National state actor for management of data. | TRIDOM | 1 | N/A | Potential source of information for natural capital mapping and accounting, and land use planning. | Interest: Low Impact: Potentially positive |
| Police, Gendarmerie, Customs, and the Justice System | Secondary | Along with MINFOF, actors responsible for the implementation and enforcement of environmental laws. | ALL | 2, 4 | N/A | Key stakeholders on issues of wildlife management to address threats from illegal trade. Project will not directly engage in law enforcement but will work to build the capacity of key stakeholders to responsibly enforce laws and strengthen transboundary cooperation. | Interest: Low Impact: Potentially positive |

| Stakeholder Name | Stakeholder Type | Stakeholder profile | LS concerned | Component concerned | Issues raised (during PPG) and how they were addressed | Role in project implementation, and/or Consultation methodology | Interest in the project/ Impact by the project |
|---|------------------|--|--------------|---------------------|--|--|--|
| <i>Regional and international bodies</i> | | | | | | | |
| Central African Forest Commission (COMIFAC) | Secondary | Regional intergovernmental body in charge of coordinating forest and environmental policy and actions, and made up of the forestry ministers of the participating Central African countries, including Cameroon. It is under leadership of a secretariat with its headquarters in Yaoundé. Second version of its Convergence Plan runs from 2015-2025. | ALL | ALL | Project will contribute to multiple of the priority areas of intervention of COMIFAC Convergence Plan. | Any coordination or communication with COMIFAC will be managed through the PSC and in conjunction with the Congo IP. | Interest: Medium Impact: Potentially positive |
| Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS) | Secondary | An Economic Community of the African Union for promotion of regional economic co-operation in Central Africa that aims to achieve collective autonomy, raise the standard of living of its populations and maintain economic stability through harmonious cooperation. | ALL | ALL | N/A | Any coordination or communication with ECCAS will be managed through the PSC and in conjunction with the Congo IP. | Interest: Low Impact: Neutral |
| Network of Central Africa Protected Areas (RAPAC) | Secondary | A sub-regional coordination initiative operating within the framework of COMIFAC that covers 82 protected areas in eight countries of Central Africa. Aims to serve as a multi-actor platform for knowledge sharing and action. | ALL | ALL | N/A | Any coordination or communication with RAPAC will be managed through the PSC and in conjunction with the Congo IP, or via national ministries. | Interest: Medium Impact: Potentially positive |
| Conference on Dense and Humid Forest Ecosystems of Central Africa (CEFDHAC) | Secondary | Started in May 1996, bi-annual conferences established to provide a broad discussion forum to | ALL | ALL | N/A | Any coordination or communication with CEFDHAC will be managed through the PSC and in conjunction with the | Interest: Medium |

| Stakeholder Name | Stakeholder Type | Stakeholder profile | LS concerned | Component concerned | Issues raised (during PPG) and how they were addressed | Role in project implementation, and/or Consultation methodology | Interest in the project/ Impact by the project |
|--|------------------|--|--------------|---------------------|--|--|--|
| | | foster collaboration on the conservation and sustainable use of the ecosystems of Central Africa's forests. | | | | Congo IP, or via national ministries. | Impact: Potentially positive |
| Central Africa Forest Observatory (OFAC) | Secondary | Created in 2007 as a specialized unit of COMIFAC to provide up-to-date, relevant data (including through the State of the Forest reports) on the region's forests and ecosystems that is needed for policymaking and to promote better governance and sustainable management of natural resources. Supported by the EU-funded Project to Strengthen and Institutionalize the Central Africa Forest Observatory (RIOFAC). | ALL | ALL | N/A | Any coordination or communication with OFAC will be managed as part of the M&E Plan of the project. | Interest: Medium Impact: Potentially positive |
| OCFSA (Organization for Wildlife Conservation in Africa) | Secondary | Platform concerned with wildlife conservation. | ALL | 2 | N/A | Any coordination or communication with OCSFA will be managed through the PSC and in conjunction with the Congo IP, or via national ministries. | Interest: Medium Impact: Potentially positive |
| REPALEAC (Network of indigenous and local people for the sustainable management of the forest ecosystem in Central Africa) | Secondary | Regional network bringing together indigenous peoples and local community organizations across countries of Central Africa. | ALL | ALL | N/A | Alignment of objectives. As part of the communications and knowledge management strategy, the project will engage with platforms aimed at engaging and empowering IPLCs in forest management. National representatives may be engaged in Technical Working Group. Exchange of knowledge. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |
| African Indigenous Women Organization Central | Secondary | An Africa-wide NGO started in 1998, whose members are composed of African | ALL | ALL | N/A | Alignment of objectives. Participation in relevant consultative processes given | Interest: High |

| Stakeholder Name | Stakeholder Type | Stakeholder profile | LS concerned | Component concerned | Issues raised (during PPG) and how they were addressed | Role in project implementation, and/or Consultation methodology | Interest in the project/ Impact by the project |
|--|--------------------|---|--------------|---------------------|--|---|--|
| African Network (AIWO-CAN) | | Indigenous Women representing NGOs and CBOs from all over the continent and that works towards the promotion of women's rights and indigenous rights throughout Africa. AIWO-CAN has been involved in the REDD+ process in Cameroon and has experience relevant to the project. | | | | relevant technical expertise. National representatives may be engaged in Technical Working Group. Exchange of knowledge. | Impact: Potentially positive |
| <i>International organizations, development partners</i> | | | | | | | |
| United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) | Key | Responsible for coordinating the UN's environmental activities and assisting developing countries in implementing environmentally sound policies and practices. | ALL | ALL | Project design process included coordination with RCP to ensure alignment of strategies and opportunities for synergies. | Lead Executing Agency for RCP of the Congo IP. Regular communication through reporting and work planning. Sharing of communication and knowledge management products. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |
| Congo Basin Institute (CBI) | Direct beneficiary | A network of permanent, multi-disciplinary enterprises (NGOs, universities, etc.) which aim to find solutions to the interconnected issues of climate change, human disease, food and water security, and loss of biodiversity. | TRIDOM | 3 | Consultation with partners of ebony project informed development of strategy under Component 3. | Part of consortium of partner under Component 3 that will participate in development of ebony value chain. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |
| International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA) | Direct beneficiary | A non-profit institution that generates agricultural innovations to meet Africa's most pressing challenges. Along with UCLA, a founding member of the CBI. An executing partner of the Ebony Project. | TRIDOM | 3 | Consultation with partners of ebony project informed development of strategy under Component 3. | Part of consortium of partner under Component 3 that will participate in development of ebony value chain. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |

| Stakeholder Name | Stakeholder Type | Stakeholder profile | LS concerned | Component concerned | Issues raised (during PPG) and how they were addressed | Role in project implementation, and/or Consultation methodology | Interest in the project/ Impact by the project |
|---|---------------------------|--|--------------|---------------------|--|--|--|
| World Wildlife Fund (WWF-US) | Key Direct beneficiary | International organization working in the field of nature conservation and sustainable use of natural resources. | ALL | ALL | Led project design. | Implementing Agency. Observer to PSC. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |
| World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF- Cameroon) | Key Direct beneficiary | International organization working in the field of nature conservation and sustainable use of natural resources. | ALL | ALL | Consulted throughout project design. | Key executing partner under Component 4 as part of Gorilla Habituation Project. Financial Administrator (FA). Source of technical expertise. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |
| African Wildlife Foundation (AWF) | Key Direct beneficiary | International organization working in the field of nature conservation and sustainable use of natural resources. | CMRC, TRIDOM | 2,3,4,5 | Directly involved in consultations in Campo. Strategies under Components 2 and 4 were informed by their input. | Involved in project design. Participated in plenary meetings and small group meetings in Campo. In Campo, AWF will be an executing partner under Components 3 & 4 building on their support to development of ecotourism, providing technical support to MINFOF to improve PA management effectiveness, and supporting local communities to improve their well-being. In addition, technical resource and potential partner for Component 3, given ongoing work to develop NTFP value chains with IPLCs. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |
| Zoological Society of London (ZSL) | Secondary | International organization working in the field of nature conservation and sustainable use of natural resources. Currently implementing projects in TRIDOM around Dja National Park. | TRIDOM | 1,2,3 | Participated in consultations in TRIDOM and informed strategies for that landscape. | Potential synergies between project and ZSL initiatives. Exchange of knowledge. | Interest: Medium Impact: Potentially positive |
| CUSO International (Canadian University Service Overseas) | Secondary | International development organization that works to place skilled Canadians with communities around the world. | CMRC | 4,5 | N/A | Technical expertise in community-based tourism in Campo, notably in Ebodjé. Synergies between the technical areas of intervention of CUSO volunteers and the project under | Interest: Medium Impact: Potentially positive |

| Stakeholder Name | Stakeholder Type | Stakeholder profile | LS concerned | Component concerned | Issues raised (during PPG) and how they were addressed | Role in project implementation, and/or Consultation methodology | Interest in the project/ Impact by the project |
|--|------------------|--|--|---------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | Component 4. Will be included in participatory consultative processes under Component 4, as relevant. May be involved in supporting implementation of some activities. | |
| Sangha Tri-National Trust Fund (FTNS) | Primary | Environmental trust fund established to support preservation of the biodiversity of the protected areas of the TNS, support the improvement of the well-being of the populations of the TNS and support cross-border cooperation. | TNS | 1,2,3,5 | Participated in consultations at national level. Input used to inform strategy under Component 2 and 3. | Co-financer of the project in Campo. Engagement will be maintained to capitalize on potential synergies between project and FTNS initiatives and to exchange knowledge. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |
| Funds for the Environment and Development of Cameroon (FEDEC) | Primary | A trust fund under Dutch law, FEDEC was created as a provision to the Environmental Management Plan of the Chad-Cameroon Pipeline Project. FEDEC's activities in CMNP aim to provide long-term financial support for the maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity. Its funds in Campo are executed through AWF. | CMRC | 2,3,4,5 | Participated in consultations at national level. Input used to inform strategy under Component 2, 3 and 4. | Co-financer of the project in Campo. Engagement will be maintained to capitalize on potential synergies between project and FEDEC initiatives and to exchange knowledge. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |
| Other GEF Agencies currently implementing projects in Cameroon including United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) | Secondary | Other partners working on GEF projects within Cameroon, and more specifically the project's targeted landscapes | Current project in TRIDOM led by UNDP | ALL | N/A | Potential synergies of objectives. Key opportunities for knowledge exchange. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |
| International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) | Secondary | International organization working in the field of nature conservation and sustainable use of natural resources. Specifically involved in transboundary | TNS, TRIDOM, national & regional level | 1,2,3,5 | N/A | Potential synergies between project and IUCN initiatives. Exchange of knowledge. | Potential synergies between project and IUCN initiatives |

| Stakeholder Name | Stakeholder Type | Stakeholder profile | LS concerned | Component concerned | Issues raised (during PPG) and how they were addressed | Role in project implementation, and/or Consultation methodology | Interest in the project/ Impact by the project |
|--|---------------------------|---|--------------|---------------------|---|---|--|
| | | cooperation, biodiversity conservation, national law enforcement strategy, support to local populations, land use planning within context of the proposed transboundary biosphere reserve in TRIDOM, improved governance, etc. | | | | | |
| <i>Civil society</i> | | | | | | | |
| Forest-dependent local communities (primarily Bantu ethnic groups, including among others the Bassa'a, Bakoko, Douala, Ewondo, Bulu, Ndjem and Fang) and their organizations in the project landscapes | Key Direct beneficiary | Forest-dependent local communities that do not identify as indigenous. | ALL | ALL | Issues raised are captured in summaries provided above and have been taken into consideration in project design. | Represented in PSC. Target stakeholders of the project that will be engaged under all strategies, including in KM and M&E. Target communities to be identified via participatory processes under components. FPIC procedures will be implemented as relevant. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |
| Forest-dependent indigenous peoples (Baka and Bagyeli/Bakola) and their organizations in the project landscapes | Key Direct beneficiary | Among the communities that self-identify as indigenous within the project area of Cameroon are the Bagyeli or Bakola and the Baka. Various organizations have been established to support, work with and represent different groups of indigenous peoples and are active in the project area. | ALL | ALL | Issues raised are captured in summaries provided above and have been taken into consideration in project design. | Represented in PSC. Target stakeholders of the project that will be engaged under all strategies, including in KM and M&E. Target communities to be identified via participatory processes under components. FPIC procedures will be implemented as relevant. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |
| RACOPY (Pygmy Concerted Action Research Network) | Key | A national network of 25 organizations working on issues associated with forest indigenous peoples, including community rights and forestry. Aims to coordinate actions between different civil society actors, including indigenous | ALL | ALL | Consulted during project preparation. Issues raised integrated into project design, notably recognizing rights, strengthening governance systems, and addressing livelihoods. | Consulted on project design on alignment of objectives. Key representative platform for indigenous peoples that is active in the project landscapes. Will continue to be engaged via multiple project strategies to mobilize target stakeholder groups. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |

| Stakeholder Name | Stakeholder Type | Stakeholder profile | LS concerned | Component concerned | Issues raised (during PPG) and how they were addressed | Role in project implementation, and/or Consultation methodology | Interest in the project/ Impact by the project |
|--|------------------|--|--------------|---------------------|--|--|--|
| | | community based organizations, working on these issues. | | | | Exchange of knowledge. | |
| Gbabandi platform (including Okani, ASBAK, ADEBAKA, ABAGUENI, ABAWONI, ARBO, ASBABUK and CADDAP) | Key | A national level platform of hunter-gatherer indigenous organizations established in 2016, which aims to carry out actions to lobby the GoC for a better implementation of the UNDRIP and for a better integration of the rights of indigenous peoples in actions to progress sustainable development. | ALL | ALL | Individual members of platform were consulted during project design process, and the issues raised have been considered in project design. | Alignment of objectives. As part of the communications and knowledge management strategy, the project will engage with platforms aimed at engaging and empowering IPLCs in forest management. Exchange of knowledge. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |
| ASBABUK (Association Sanguia Baka Buma'a Kpode) | Key | Local association of Baka in TNS and TRIDOM landscapes. | TNS, TRIDOM | 1, 2, 3, 5 | Participated in consultation process. | Key stakeholder to mobilize engagement of Baka, including through specific support to strengthen the implementation and monitoring of agreement between ASBABUK and MINFOF. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |
| Village committees (e.g., Kika-Socambo, Mambélé-Mbatéka, Mbangoe 2, Malapa Fleuve, Moloundou rivière-Ndongo) | Secondary | Village committees are responsible for overseeing management of forest and wildlife revenues for development projects in their localities. The committees were established in 2010 through a joint decision by ministries of finance, territorial administration and MINFOF. They are directly supervised by local councils. | TNS, | 2, 3, 5 | Participated in consultation process in TNS landscape. | Play a role in forest management in peripheral zone of LNP. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |
| Tropical Forest and Rural Development Association (TR-RD) | Primary | NGO operating in Cameroon on issues of forests and development. | CMRC, TRIDOM | 3 | Consulted during project design. Inputs used to inform Component 3. | Potential partner on development of NTFP value chains. Already active in Campo and TRIDOM where it works with AWF and other partners to develop NTFP value chains. Technical expertise in key project area. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |

| Stakeholder Name | Stakeholder Type | Stakeholder profile | LS concerned | Component concerned | Issues raised (during PPG) and how they were addressed | Role in project implementation, and/or Consultation methodology | Interest in the project/ Impact by the project |
|---|------------------|---|--------------|---------------------|--|---|--|
| COVAREFs 1, 2, 3, 10, 14 (Wildlife Management Committees) | Primary | Community-based organizations that play a critical role in wildlife management. Created by government as part of participatory management strategy to empower IPLCs to manage wildlife in designated community hunting areas. Their participation and effective involvement in wildlife management can significantly contribute to improved wildlife management, poverty alleviation and development through revenues generated from trophy hunting in community hunting areas. | TNS, TRIDOM | 1,2,3,5 | Consulted during project preparation. Issues raised integrated into project design, including support to establish mutually-beneficial agreements. | Consulted on project design. Key stakeholder under Components 1 and 3, including to advance the establishment of equitable and transparent management agreements that recognize the rights of IPLCs, between COVAREFs and professional hunting outfits. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |
| Forests and Rural Development (FODER) | Secondary | Non-profit association, established in 2002 to encourage sustainable development in Cameroon. Work to ensure justice and equity, preserve biodiversity and restore the environment | ALL | ALL | Consulted at national level. Input used to inform project design. | Expertise in forest governance, including law enforcement, communities' rights, transparency and the fight against corruption, by encouraging participatory decision-making processes. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |
| CEFAID (Support to Development Initiatives in Cameroon) | Secondary | Cameroonian CSO focused on the sustainable management of natural resources. | ALL | ALL | Participated in consultation processes in TNS and TRIDOM. | Experience in consultations with IPLCs. Potential source of expertise. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |
| Centre for Environment and Development (CED) | Secondary | Cameroonian NGO created in 1994 that supports community rights for forest people. | ALL | ALL | N/A | Expertise in linking biodiversity conservation to improved livelihoods or poverty reduction, by providing incentives and support to develop community activities that protect and restore | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |

| Stakeholder Name | Stakeholder Type | Stakeholder profile | LS concerned | Component concerned | Issues raised (during PPG) and how they were addressed | Role in project implementation, and/or Consultation methodology | Interest in the project/ Impact by the project |
|--|-------------------------------|---|--------------|---------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | forest cover and biodiversity while improving livelihoods. | |
| Local organizations/ associations: Alliance, APED, BACUDA, BASS-PROTOMAR, EBOTOUR, PDCAM, Tubé Awù, PLATFERCAM, Okani., CIFED, ADELFODEMO, AAFEBEN, OCBB, APIFED, WHCS, CIERAD, CREDI, Natue Vision +, COTRAMO, ASBAK, ASTRADHE, CAFT-Coop-CA, GIC CODENZOP, NGOMITRI, REFEDEM, Women's Network of Somalomo, RAFASO/ AFAIRD, etc. | Key Direct beneficiary | Provide key technical support to local communities on natural resources management, advocacy, governance, tourism, and livelihood improvement. Promotion of human rights; support for women and indigenous peoples in the promotion, processing and marketing of NTFPs. | ALL | ALL | Numerous local organizations and associations participated in the consultation process, details of which can be found in the reports produced at the national level and for each landscape. These included many organizations working to empower women and indigenous peoples. They provided key information that informed the development of all project strategies. | Targeted technical support to IPLCs in a range of areas. Beneficiaries of capacity building as part of long-term sustainability approach that aims to build local capacity. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |
| <i>Private sector</i> | | | | | | | |
| Taylor Guitars | Key Private sector partner | Private company leading manufacturer of acoustic and electric guitars. Part of PPP with the MINEPDED to support Ebony Project. | CMRC | 3, 5 | Regularly consulted during project design process. Strategy under Component 3 has been designed taking into consideration their inputs. | Co-financer on Component 3. Member of PSC. Synergies between project and Ebony Project supported by Taylor Guitars as part of their efforts to establish a sustainable value chain for ebony. Project will support expansion of project to engage IPLCs and scaling out of lessons learned. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |
| Jengi Tours | Key Private sector partner | Private company operating in the tourism sector in Cameroon, and specifically in and around CMNP. | CMRC | 4, 5 | Participated in project design process. | Co-financer on Component 4. Member of PSC. Synergies between project and objectives of Jengi Tours to develop ecotourism at CMNP. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |
| Crelicam | Key | Ebony sawmill that is part of PPP for development of | TRIDOM | 3 | Participated in project design process for Component 3. | Part of consortium of partners that will be involved in expansion of Ebony Project. | Interest: High |

| Stakeholder Name | Stakeholder Type | Stakeholder profile | LS concerned | Component concerned | Issues raised (during PPG) and how they were addressed | Role in project implementation, and/or Consultation methodology | Interest in the project/ Impact by the project |
|--|------------------------|---|--------------|---------------------|---|--|--|
| | Private sector partner | sustainable ebony value chain. | | | | | Impact: Potentially positive |
| JMN Consulting | Primary | Consultancy firm providing technical support to GoC on LUP. | TRIDOM | 1 | Consulted as part of national consultation process and input used to inform Component 1. | Source of expertise on LUP framework and process in Cameroon. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |
| Community forest enterprises (CODDUMA, ASDEBYM, ADBAM, TO'OKPASSI, ASBAM and EMERDI) | Secondary | Enterprises in community forest areas. | ALL | 1, 2, 3, 5 | Participated in consultation process in some landscapes. Community forestry in Cameroon faces many well-documented challenges and, in some areas, has been largely abandoned. | Actors concerned with community forest areas. Important in both LUP process and in improving governance systems around protected areas. Also potential source of NTFPs. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |
| Logging companies (SIM, FIPCAM, GRACOVIR, STBK, CTSC, SBEC (Groupe Thanry), SEFAC, etc.) | Secondary | Logging companies operating within the project areas. | ALL | 1, 2, 3, 5 | SIM participated in consultations in TRIDOM. | Important stakeholder in land use and conservation planning. Important stakeholder in terms of recognizing the access rights of IPLCs. Potential stakeholder in development of value chains. | Interest: Medium Impact: Potentially positive |
| SAFARI Operators (e.g., Boumba Safari, Faro Lobeke, Ngoko Safari) | Secondary | Safari companies operating within the project areas. | TRIDOM, TNS | 1, 2, 3, 5 | N/A | Important stakeholder in land use and conservation planning. Important stakeholder in terms of recognizing the access rights of IPLCs. | Interest: Medium Impact: Potentially positive |
| Mining companies | Secondary | Mining companies operating within the project areas. | TRIDOM | 1, 5 | N/A | Important stakeholder in land use and conservation planning. Important stakeholder in terms of recognizing the access rights of IPLCs. | Interest: Low Impact: Potentially positive |
| Hevea-Cameroon (HEVECAM) | Secondary | Industrial agriculture company operating in Campo. | Campo | 3, 4, 5 | N/A | Potential involvement in development of value chains. | Interest: Low |

| Stakeholder Name | Stakeholder Type | Stakeholder profile | LS concerned | Component concerned | Issues raised (during PPG) and how they were addressed | Role in project implementation, and/or Consultation methodology | Interest in the project/ Impact by the project |
|---|---|--|--------------|---------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | | Impact: Potentially positive |
| Tourism operators (tour operators, tourism agencies, hotels/restaurant, etc.) | Secondary | Private sector actors within the tourism value chain Key stakeholders in the development of ecotourism value chain. | Campo | 4,5 | Jengi Tours participated in project design process. Project design aligns with tourism development plan for CMNP that was developed in a participatory manner, including with tourism operators. | Participants in collective thinking on development of ecotourism value chain under Component 4. Through the development of ecotourism products and the strengthening of capacity for ecotourism, project will have a positive impact on these stakeholders. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |
| Financial institutions | Secondary | Important means for IPLCs enterprises to acquire financial means to develop value chains. | ALL | 3, 4 | N/A | Potential partners within strategies to develop more sustainable value chains. Targeted engagement under Components 2 and 4. | Interest: Medium Impact: Potentially positive |
| Other private sectors actors: input providers, off-takers, distributors, service providers, providers of agrometeorological information, etc. | Secondary | Variety of private sector actors that have the potential to play a role in developing or strengthening value chains. | ALL | 3 | N/A | Partners the development of particular value chains into more sustainable and profitable ventures; resource on the commercial and marketing needs. | Interest: Medium Impact: Potentially positive |
| <i>Academic, research or training institutions</i> | | | | | | | |
| University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) | Direct beneficiary Executing partner | Academic institution in the United States. Along with IITA, a founding member of the CBI. An executing partner of the Ebony Project. | TRIDOM | 3 | Consultation with partners of ebony project informed development of strategy under Component 3. | Executing partner under Component 3 that will lead a consortium of partners to develop ebony value chain. Represented in PSC. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |
| Higher Institute for Environmental Science (HIES) | Primary | Educational institute in Cameroon. | TRIDOM | 3 | Consultation with partners of ebony project informed development of strategy under Component 3. | Partner under Ebony Project to undertake ecology research. | Interest: High Impact: Potentially positive |
| French Agricultural Research Centre for International Development (CIRAD) | Secondary | French research institute that is active in Cameroon looking at issues of development. | ALL | ALL | N/A | Potential source of punctual expertise, Target for knowledge exchange. | Interest: Medium Impact: Potentially positive |

| Stakeholder Name | Stakeholder Type | Stakeholder profile | LS concerned | Component concerned | Issues raised (during PPG) and how they were addressed | Role in project implementation, and/or Consultation methodology | Interest in the project/ Impact by the project |
|--|------------------|--|--------------|---------------------|--|--|--|
| CIFOR (Center for International Forestry Research) | Secondary | Non-profit, scientific institution that conducts research on forest and landscape management globally. | ALL | ALL | Consulted as part of national consultation process. | Potential source of punctual expertise, Target for knowledge exchange. | Interest: Medium Impact: Potentially positive |

Stakeholder Engagement Plan

The stakeholder engagement plan will have to be updated after the finalization of the safeguards process and the development of associated plans, including with respect to FPIC measures as applicable to communities affected by project activities.

The table below summarizes the main methods for consultation and engagement of different stakeholder groups, at both national and local levels. In addition, under Output 5.1.2, the project will develop a communication and knowledge management strategy (including timeline) to ensure information dissemination and sharing of knowledge with project stakeholders.

Table 6: Main methods of consultation and engagement

| Stakeholder group | Primary methods for consultation and engagement | Means | Timetable | Responsible |
|------------------------------------|--|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1. National and local state actors | <p>National and local government stakeholders were consulted through the project development process and will be reconvened at project inception. At the national level key actor in this groups will be members of the PSC and Technical Working Group.</p> <p>Key activities for consultation and engagement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Component 1: Stakeholder and political ecology mapping; planning and implementation of inclusive LUP process, including in decision-making bodies associated with LUP process; targets of communication and KM products (maps, strategic documents on lessons learned) • Component 2: Participatory assessment of standards, conditions, and accountability in key areas of protected area management; elaboration of management documents and feasibility studies; activities to strengthen governance of protected areas, including meetings of governance bodies; transboundary consultative platforms • Component 3: Consultations on development of NTFP value chains; meetings between stakeholders to establish agreements between IPLCs and decentralized local services to link the sustainable use of NTFP with SFM practices and biodiversity conservation in forest management units; PPP for development of ebony value chains; targets of communication and KM products (strategic document to duplicate model) • Component 4: Technical assistance for ongoing development of appropriate policies & procedures, standards, and systems to enable the realization of tourism investment in CMNP; skills development; advocacy of CMNP as pilot site for ecotourism development; designing benefit-sharing mechanisms • Component 5: Targets of communication and KM products, participate in bilateral or regional events to exchange knowledge and coordinate on project strategies for transboundary landscapes | <p>Inception workshop Annual PSC meetings PPRs and PIRs Workplans and budgets Project Reviews Strategic documents Technical reports Communication and knowledge management products Consultations, trainings, and workshops Email, phone, and face-to-face meetings</p> <p>Communication methods and materials will be developed taking into consideration target audiences and languages.</p> | <p>The timetable for engagement means will be aligned with the project work plan and M&E process.</p> | <p>PND, PMU, executing partners</p> |

| Stakeholder group | Primary methods for consultation and engagement | Means | Timetable | Responsible |
|--|--|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 2. Civil society – IPLCs and their organizations | <p>IPLCs were consulted directly and through representative organizations during project design, and will be key stakeholders under each of its 5 components. Additional consultations will be undertaken at the start of the project and throughout its implementation to refine project strategies. As such, consultations with communities and participatory approaches have been explicitly incorporated into all relevant activities of the work plan.</p> <p>Key activities for consultation and engagement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Component 1: Stakeholder and political ecology mapping; inclusion of knowledge in natural capital mapping and accounting; planning and implementation of inclusive LUP process, including in decision-making bodies associated with LUP process; targets of communication and KM products • Component 2: Consultations and inclusion of knowledge on strategies for development of NTFP value chains; activities to develop or strengthen value chains, including trainings, small grants, etc.; activities to establish, implement and monitor mutually beneficial partnerships between IPLCs and private sector operators (managers of concessions, input providers, off-takers, financial institutions, etc.) and establish MoUs or other forms of agreements with clear benefit-sharing mechanisms; MoUs or other forms of agreements between IPLCs and private sector actors, resource managers or decentralized local services to link the sustainable use of NTFP with SFM practices and biodiversity conservation in forest management units; partners for the expansion of ebony project model; PPP for development of ebony value chains; participatory monitoring systems; targets of communication and KM products (strategic document to duplicate model) • Component 3: Participatory assessment of standards, conditions, and accountability in key areas of protected area management; elaboration of management documents and feasibility studies; activities to strengthen governance of protected areas, including participation in meetings of governance bodies; strengthening of GRM; activities to develop, implement, monitor and report on multi-stakeholder agreements that strengthen the recognition of IPLCs rights and their engagement/empowerment in the management of high conservation value forests (such as the MINFOF – ASBABUK agreement, the Mambélé Convention; participatory monitoring systems, transboundary consultative platforms • Component 4: Activities to develop tourism products, including feasibility study; targets of awareness raising and health campaigns; skills development; equitable benefit-sharing mechanisms • Component 5: Targets of communication and KM products, participate in bilateral or regional events to exchange knowledge and coordinate on project strategies for transboundary landscapes | <p>Inception workshop Annual PSC meetings PPRs and PIRs Workplans and budgets Project Reviews Strategic documents Technical reports Communication and knowledge management products Face-to-face consultations Focus groups Trainings and workshops Small grants mechanisms Exchange visits Facilitation of agreements</p> <p>Communication methods and materials will be developed taking into consideration target audiences and languages.</p> | <p>The timetable for engagement means will be aligned with the project work plan and M&E process.</p> | <p>PMU, executing partners</p> |

| Stakeholder group | Primary methods for consultation and engagement | Means | Timetable | Responsible |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| 3. Regional and international organizations, development partners | <p>Regional and international organizations have been consulted during the project design phase and will continue to be kept informed of the project activities. In addition, knowledge management products under all project strategies will be shared as relevant at the regional and international level. Direct engagement at the regional level will be closely coordinated with the Congo IP RCP.</p> <p>Key activities for consultation and engagement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Component 5: Regional coordination, knowledge exchange, bilateral or regional events | <p>Transboundary consultative platforms Bilateral and regional events to coordinate and exchange knowledge Knowledge management platform and the Congo IP online Community of Practice Communication and knowledge management products</p> | <p>The timetable for engagement means will be aligned with the project work plan and M&E process.</p> | <p>PMU, executing partners, Congo IP RCP</p> |
| 4. Private sector | <p>Private sector stakeholders that have been consulted during the project design phase include project co-financers Taylor Guitars and Jengi Tours (who will be represented in PSC), as well as other private sector operators working in the project landscapes. Private sector actors will be key stakeholders in the development of sustainable value chains under Components 2 and 4. They are also important actors in land use planning and developing mutually-beneficial agreements in the periphery of protected areas that recognize the rights of IPLCs.</p> <p>Key activities for consultation and engagement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Component 1: Participants in LUP process; targets of communications and knowledge management products on natural capital • Component 2: Consultation on protected area management and business planning; participation in activities to strengthen governance of protected areas; agreements with IPLCs in peripheral forest management units • Component 3: Consultation on strategies to develop NTFP value chains; development of agreements with IPLCs; PPP for ebony value chain; targets of communication and KM products (strategic document on lessons learned from model) • Component 4: PPP for ecotourism development; meetings between key stakeholders for CMNP ecotourism development; design and implementation of equitable benefit-sharing mechanisms • Component 5: Targets of communication and KM products, participate in events to exchange knowledge | <p>Inception workshop Annual PSC meetings PPRs and PIRs Workplans and budgets Project Reviews Strategic documents Technical reports Communication and knowledge management products</p> | <p>The timetable for engagement means will be aligned with the project work plan and M&E process.</p> | <p>PMU, executing partners</p> |
| 5. National /international research institutions | <p>Members of this group were consulted during project design and will be engaged as relevant to source relevant expertise, ensure that the project is building on best available knowledge, and applying best practices. They will be contacted during key strategic process to inform technical aspects of the project.</p> <p>Key activities for consultation and engagement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Component 1: Natural capital mapping and accounting; designing road map for LUP process | <p>Punctual email, phone, and face-to-face meetings Participation in project design and consultation processes</p> | <p>The timetable for engagement means will be aligned with the project work plan and M&E process.</p> | <p>PMU, executing partners</p> |

| Stakeholder group | Primary methods for consultation and engagement | Means | Timetable | Responsible |
|-------------------|---|-------|-----------|-------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Component 2: Design of participatory monitoring systems, biomonitoring, zoonotic disease surveillance systems and health monitoring • Component 3: Consultations on strategies for development of NTFP value chains, design of participatory monitoring systems • Component 4: Design of participatory monitoring systems • Component 5: Targets of communication and KM products, participate in events to exchange knowledge | | | |

Target beneficiaries

A primary aim of the project is to ensure that IPLCs, including women and youth, are empowered and engage in SFM. As such, the project will ensure that their views and participation are facilitated and has included expertise in gender and social development in the PMU to this effect. The Social Safeguards/Gender Specialist will work with MINAS and other key partners to integrate these considerations across project strategies. In addition, the project's communications and knowledge management strategy will design communications, awareness raising, and KM campaigns considering different demographics, and apply methods/materials specifically designed to target these groups. This strategy will be used simultaneously to ensure that the needs, perspectives, and concerns of different groups (i.e., women, men, youth, cross-cultural) in regards to diverse aspects of SFM are better understood and brought forth to the greater public. To try and help mobilize these target stakeholder groups, the project will engage and work with representative organizations and traditional leaders and apply effective channels for communicating based on local preferences, building on efforts that have been initiated during the project design process.

A Gender Action Plan has also been developed that details by outcome specific actions and proposed indicators to monitor women's engagement in the project and its impacts on this group. Among the types of specific actions proposed are: identifying and addressing barriers to their participation (e.g. support costs of participation, engage with representatives to mobilize key groups); promoting dialogues that are ongoing and open, and gender and inter-generationally inclusive whenever possible and employing gender-specific meetings/sessions when this is not feasible; actively recruiting female and indigenous people trainees; conducting trainings in alignment with gender-sensitive training or skills development strategies; pro-actively identifying target IPLCs and women's associations to include in project actions and ensuring women and their organizations have equal access and opportunities; ensuring IPLCs, including in particular women's, knowledge is incorporated into strategic thinking; supporting equitable benefit-sharing mechanisms; and ensuring that ToRs for project consultancies specify gender/indigenous people specific analyses and/or gender/ indigenous people specialists.

Indigenous Peoples and Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC)

Cameroon has ratified numerous international conventions and declarations that adhere to the respect of FPIC of local communities. These include the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights, the Rio Convention, and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). Regionally, COMIFAC, of which Cameroon is a member, developed "Regional Directives on the Participation of Local and Indigenous Populations and NGOs in the Sustainable Management of Central African Forests", which includes FPIC but its implementation has been difficult. Other legal texts do explicitly call for consent, but generally promote participation. For example, the 2011 Orientation Law for Land Use Planning and Sustainable Development calls for local participation in all decisions regarding land allocation and use. Within the framework of REDD+, MINFOF also adopted in 2014 national guidelines for obtaining FPIC. Any project or activity related to the REDD+ process in the country has to follow these guidelines. In addition, numerous international actors operating in Cameroon have adopted safeguards policies that incorporate the principle of FPIC.

GRIEVANCES MECHANISM

WWF is committed to ensuring that its projects and programs are implemented in accordance with the Organizations' environmental and social obligations.

WWF's Policy on Accountability and Grievance Mechanism, also known as WWF Project Complaints Resolution Policy, is not intended to replace project and country-level dispute resolution and redress mechanisms. This mechanism is designed to:

- Address potential breaches of WWF's policies and procedures;
- Be independent, transparent, and effective;
- Be accessible to project-affected people;
- Keep complainants abreast of progress of cases brought forward; and
- Maintain records on all cases and issues brought forward for review.

Project-affected communities and other interested stakeholders may raise a grievance at any time to the Project Team and WWF (see above). The Project Team will be responsible for informing project-affected parties about the Accountability and Grievance Mechanism. Contact information of the Project Team and WWF will be made publicly available. A grievance can be filed with the Project Complaints Officer (PCO), a WWF staff member fully independent from the Project Team, who is responsible for the WWF Accountability and Grievance Mechanism and who can be reached by email or mail.

Email: SafeguardsComplaint@wwfus.org

Mailing address:

Project Complaints Officer Safeguards Complaints,
World Wildlife Fund
1250 24th Street NW
Washington, DC 20037

The PCO will respond within 10 business days of receipt, and claims will be filed and included in project monitoring. In addition to the above, projects requiring FPIC or triggering an Indigenous People's Plan (IPP) will also include local conflict resolution and grievance redress mechanisms in the respective safeguards documents. These will be developed with the participation of the affected communities in culturally appropriate ways and will ensure adequate representation from vulnerable or marginalize groups and subgroups.

Project-level grievance mechanism

The project will establish grievance mechanisms at field level to file complaints during project inception phase. Contact information and information on the process to file a complaint will be disclosed in all meetings, workshops and other related events throughout the life of the project. In addition, it is expected that all awareness raising material to be distributed will include the necessary information regarding the contacts and the process for filing grievances.

The project will also be responsible for documenting and reporting as part of the safeguards performance monitoring on any grievances received and how they were addressed.

The mechanism includes the following stages:

- In the instance in which the claimant has the means to directly file the claim, he/she has the right to do so, presenting it directly to the Project Management Unit (PMU). The process of filing a complaint will duly consider anonymity as well as any existing traditional or indigenous dispute resolution mechanisms and it will not interfere with the community's self-governance system.

- The complainant files a complaint through one of the channels of the grievance mechanism (as described below). This will be sent to the National Project Director (NPD) to assess whether the complaint is eligible. The confidentiality of the complaint must be preserved during the process.
- The NPD will be responsible for recording the grievance and how it has been addressed if a resolution was agreed.
- If the situation is deemed too complex by the NPD, or the complainer does not accept the resolution, the complaint must be sent to a higher level (as described below), until a solution or acceptance is reached.
- For every complaint received, a written proof will be sent within ten (10) working days; afterwards, a resolution proposal will be made within thirty (30) working days.
- In compliance with the resolution, the person in charge of dealing with the complaint, may interact with the complainant, or may call for interviews and meetings, to better understand the reasons.
- All complaint received, its response and resolutions, must be duly registered.

Internal process

Level 1: Project Management Unit (PMU). The complaint could come in writing or orally to the PMU directly. At this level, received complaints will be registered, investigated and solved by the PMU.

Level 2: If the complaint has not been solved and could not be solved in level 1, then the NPD elevates it to the WWF focal point.

MONITORING AND REPORTING

The PMU, under the overall supervision of MINEPDED, will be responsible for ensuring stakeholder engagement as outlined in the SEP. It will also be responsible for monitoring and reporting on stakeholder engagement as part of the project-level results-based M&E Plan and through the semi-annual Project Progress Reports (PPRs). The PMU will also be responsible for the development, implementation, and monitoring of the project's communication and knowledge management strategy (Output 5.1.2).

Under project Component 2 (Outcome 2.2) and Component 3 (Outputs 3.1 and Output 3.2) participatory systems which include target beneficiaries will also be established to monitor and evaluate the impacts of the project's efforts to improve the management effectiveness and governance of high conservation value forests and develop sustainable value chains. The project's M&E system will include disaggregated data to assess its impacts more comprehensively on different groups of stakeholders, including IPLCs, women and youth.

Budget for stakeholder engagement has been allocated through the meeting, training and travel budget lines as shown in Appendix 9.